

Tallmadge Charter Township  
Special Planning Commission Meeting  
VIA Zoom  
May 12, 2020

7:30 PM Matt Fenske called the meeting to order.

Members Present: Matt Fenske, Marv Bennink, Joel Terpstra, Dick Temple, Curt Rypma, Dave Hanko, Jacob Smith.

Also Present: Greg Ransford – Township Planner and members of the public.

Approval of the agenda: Joel Terpstra motioned to approve the agenda. Marv Bennink supported. Carried unanimously.

Approval of the February 25, 2020 regular meeting minutes: Marv Bennink motioned to approve the February 25, 2020 regular meeting minutes. Joel Terpstra supported. Carried unanimously.

Non Agenda Items: Colin Yonkers-11425 Ivy Grove: stated concerned about Sessions Pointe with allowing town homes.

New Business:

Tallmadge Pointe Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Development Plan  
- Seeking 28 Two-Family residential unit buildings

Doug Kloostra: stated same plan that was submitted back in 2018. Let the application expire due to engineering. Re-applying for the same PUD, layout, and density. Added: Additional off-street parking, 28 spaces. Street lights added, and bike path along Leonard St. has been added.

Greg Ransford stated Dave Hanko and Curt Rypma will be recusing themselves for conflicts of interest.

Planning Commission discussed off-street parking during the day and overnight. Concerns brought up about the width of the road and allowing enough room for fire trucks to get through.

Doug Kloostra: stated the previous meeting he thought no overnight parking signs were discussed.

Joel Terpstra: asked Greg Ransford to look into it.

Doug Kloostra: proposed no parking from lots 5 to 10. Start signage by lot number 5 to lot 10. Will state no off-street parking.

Ron Bultje: questioned restrictions to one side of the road? Would be fine with a recommendation on parking. This isn't a final plan yet. Still waiting on information on drainage. Still need to have the final public hearing with the final plan.

Marv Bennik asked Doug Kloostra is he's comfortable with the suggestions made.

Doug Kloostra: stated yes.

Ron Bultje: vote should be by roll call.

Joel Terpstra motioned to approve the preliminary concept proposed with the changes made from 2018 based on the preliminary plan meets the standards of Section 14.03b, with the conditions that the developer provide further info on drainage approval for the final plan submission and no-parking on the street between lots 5 and 10, as approved by the FD. Dick Temple supported. Marv Bennink Yes. Jacob Smith Yes. Dick Temple Yes. Joel T Yes Matt Fenske Yes. Motion carries.

Curt Rypma and Dave Hanko returned to the table.

#### Sessions Pointe Planned Unit Development – Major Amendment Preliminary Development Plan

- Seeking to amend three commercial lots for multi-family residential use and increase the area of the PUD with a fourth lot for multi-family residential use for a total of no more than 50 residential units.

Ben Nash: stated he's looking to seek approval to amend the current PUD to allow for multi-family, and add an additional lot to the existing PUD. Thinks this would help attract other business to Sessions and be attractive. Will help get Lot 9 into the PUD. For the current residents, believes it will provide a buffer from commercial to residential. Noise will be less, aesthetic benefits and less traffic than if it was commercial.

Matt Fenske: asked Greg if he has a summary to give.

Greg Ransford: accurate the lots have sat vacant for a number of years. Unable to fill the commercial spots. The applicant did approach the Planning Commission in February to ask what their comments are. The Planning Commission direction was the density proposed is to be determined. The Planning Commission was comfortable with an application to come forward, but they did feel there should be a buffer between the multi-family and single-family residential. Traffic was a concern. During the 2004 application, Lot 9 was supposed to stay as part of the development but not industrial. The lot has frontage on Sessions Drive, and the Township didn't want to allow industrial with access to Sessions Drive. The application process, its unique, because it's prior to the original PUD language.

Ron Bultje: stated his concern is 4.86 acres with the additional lot. Looking at a request for 50 units is way above the high-density allowed in the master plan. If commercial is done on a couple lots, the density seems too high to begin with. Inclined to think this is a separate portion of the PUD that is residential. Need to have a base density. Need to have a parallel plan. 50 seems way to high.

Jason Vanderkodde: stated he based the density on ordinance for R3. Which is 43.83 units x 20% open space which actually allowed for 52 units. Second comment: back in the 2006 approval there were actually 182 units approved. Still 53 units less now that there is residential.

Note: Jason did cut out during his speaking.

Ron Bultje: stated that the Lots aren't zoned R3.

Dick Temple: are they asking for special permission to use this property in a different way.

Ron Bultje: stated he's concerned the developer is asking to rezone to R3 and then use that density. R3 is not the underlying zoning so you can't use that as the base for the density.

Jason Vanderkodde: referring back to narrative. Under density and traffic on 3, 4, 8, and 9 would be maximum 50. This could be reduced. Indicated they would still like to find a commercial user on lots 3, 4, or 8. Mixed use request on the PUD.

Curt Rypma: asked Ron how he would suggest to do this?

Ron Bultje: stated Lot 3, 4, 8, and 9 might be entirely residential. If so, there would be up to 50 units allowed. It's not R3. Could develop with no commercial. Mixed use is a commercial building with some residential units upstairs. If this is going to be residential, it needs to be rezoned to proper zoning and then you can establish what the correct density would be. There is too much flexibility by the developer with no control by the Township. Need a clear definition of what's going to be there. Zoning is not R3. No reason to disagree with Jason's calculations then. Medium density would be duplexes. Would have to amend the master plan to allow residential.

Planning Commission Thoughts:

Marv Bennink: stated he feels R2 layout would be a more natural transition. Suggesting Duplex's vs. 4-unit town homes.

Joel Terpstra: stated we just approved an R2 concept with a 30-foot road with concern about parking. Direction for Jason, wouldn't want to come back with anything less than 30 feet wide with some type of turn around for a fire truck.

Curt Rypma: stated he agrees that the density is too much. Work within the parameters of the PUD. Fine with 4 plex with appropriate density, need wider roads, flexible on duplex or four.

Dave Hanko: stated he agrees with Curt. It's the density that's the issue. Likes the four-plex better than the duplex next to commercial. Thinks 25 to 30 units would be better. Likes Lot 9 included.

Dick Temple: stated he feels town homes are appropriate solution.

Jacob Smith: stated he leans towards duplex for the density.

Ben Nash: stated he appreciates comments. Put in countless hours and thousands of dollars. Feels this is a good plan to present to the board. Feels the board is not in favor for the density proposed. It's a numbers issues, can't sell lots for X amount of dollars if I can't put the density on it. Need to see if the numbers work, they won't go farther. Will just keep it commercial, and that may mean it would be a metal building. Those lots are challenging. Trying to do what's right by the township and residents. But if he can't do it, then he will leave it as is and don't think it will look as pleasing.

Ron Bultje: stated not to encourage to establish a number. Table it based on the discussion had and have the applicant come back with more information.

Greg Ransford: Questions came up about rental vs owner.

Ron B: because it is a PUD we can put conditions on PUD. We can put conditions on that which we wouldn't put on a normal development and limit the users to owners rather than renters

Greg Ransford: stated to clarify for public. Our commercial façade standards would restrict an all metal building with an overhead door front. Language is clear what the front has to be.

Joel Terpstra motioned to table to June 23, 2020 meeting. Curt Rypma supported. Dave Hanko Yes. Marv Bennink Yes. Dick Temple Yes. Jacob Smith Yes. Joel Terpstra Yes. Curt Rypma Yes. Matt Fenske Yes. Motion carries to table.

Old Business: None

PC Comments:

Joel Terpstra asked about Lucas concrete. Had site plan approval. Using as staging ground.

Toby VanEss: stated he has not seen application. Will check out tomorrow and find out what's going on.

Curt Rympa motioned to adjourn. Joel Terpstra supported and it carried unanimously

Meeting ended at 9:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl King

Administrative Assistant