

Tallmadge Charter Township
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 25, 2020

7:00 PM Matt Fenske called the meeting to order.

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

Also Present: Greg Ransford, Emma Posillico and members of the public.

Approval of the Agenda:

Joel Terpstra moved to approve the Agenda with the conditions that there is a grammatical error on the agenda. This is a public hearing and this is the Final Site plan, not Preliminary. Dave Hanko support.

Matt Fenske: Yes; Curt Rypma: Yes; Dave Hanko: Yes; Marv Bennink: Yes; Jacob Smith: Yes; Dick Temple: Yes; Joel Terpstra: Yes

Approval of the minutes from the July 28th, 2020 Regular Meeting

Joel Terpstra motioned to approve. Dave Hanko support. Motion carried.

Non-Agenda Items: None

New Business:

- Public Hearing
 - Sessions Pointe Planned Unit Development – Major Amendment Final Development Plan & Rezoning of land to the PUD

Jason Vanderkodde: stated he will first address question from the Planning Commission. Presented plans T2.03D and T2.03E – Item 1: added parking spaces on north side of Lots 3 and 4 – those are on the document. 2: Accommodate 10 spaces for total on Lots 8 and 9- actually fit 11 spaces, only difference between plans D and E – looking for feedback from the Planning Commission between the two parking configurations, prefer D but open to E. Item 3: Modify NW parking space on Lot 4 – did accommodate. Item 4: commit to multi-family use – we have agreed to and removed commercial and industrial. Item 5: Prohibit parking in drive areas; pursuant to Association By-Laws – we have agreed to. Item 6: Alignment of driveway between Lot 4 and 9 with an easement to the open space and the adjacent condominium, the developer provided. Between units 23, 31, 42 and 35. Open to doing that if the that's the direction of the Planning Commission, can also put it back between units 23, 24 and 25. Item 7: parking constructed at same time as drive- we have agreed to. Item 8: trees to remain on lots 2 and 7 shall remain. Those are shown on the fourth drawing of that set. Item 9: Limit density to 42 Units.

Jason answered Greg's Comments

1. Requirement for a pathway along M-45: Read the ordinance and Lot 1 is adjacent to M-45, the Lots we are dealing with are 3, 4, 8 and 9. They are internal to the development with Sessions addresses. We feel that conversation is better left for the development of Lot 1. We show sidewalks along Lot 1 so the developer is aware that it needs to go in.
2. Landscape, Lighting and Sidewalks – our proposal is to be consistent with or better than the commercial phase and residential Phase 1 and Phase 2. Providing sidewalks on both sides. Similar with street trees and street lighting, providing along Sessions Dr.
3. Dumpsters: Don't anticipate having stand alone dumpsters, will be roll out units that will be stored in garages.

Greg Ransford: stated concerning the pathway, Lot 1 is part of the PUD as a whole, so our interpretation of the language is that the developer should be responsible for the installation of the pathway. Recommends the Planning Commission addresses it now.

Ben Nash: stated he's not opposed to putting the sidewalk in, but needs time to work with the Township for what is a reasonable way to connect this.

Dick Temple: stated he likes Plan D. Larger parking areas should have a few pole lights.

Joel Terpstra: stated he feels we should address the PUD as a whole and would have to address the sidewalk on Lot 1. Concerned about what the final elevations will look like and would like a final site plan with elevations be submitted before it's built.

Dave Hanko: stated he's concerned about dumpsters. Doesn't feel there's enough room for individual dumpsters.

Joel Terpstra motioned to open public hearing. Dick Temple supported.

Matt Fenske: Yes; Curt Rypma: Yes; Dave Hanko: Yes; Marv Bennink: Yes; Jacob Smith; Dick Temple: Yes; Joel Terpstra: Yes

Jeff Rozema: 528 Ivy Grove S. – stated by letter, concerned that their property value will decrease. Purchased their lot knowing they will have commercial behind them and did not want residential, especially a two-story home. Concerned about college kids living there.

Tom and Debbie Schereda: 11398 Sessions Dr.: stated by letter, their experience is that developers are dishonest. Was told there would be no phase 2 development and there was. Their sprinkler lines in the commons were cut and never fixed. Ben Nash stated he will only help with road repair on Sessions if they only go along with the town home development. Concerned about renters coming into the town homes with GVSU 10 minutes away.

Marie Schmidt: 540 Ivy Grove: stated as a resident, her biggest concern is rental properties, which would be right in her back yard. Concerned about traffic, it's a very dangerous corner. Our phase had spoke with Ben Nash about helping towards road repair, felt her silence was trying to be bought. Was told he would give them the money with the support of the town homes.

Mike Young: 460 Ivy Grove - asked if a traffic study has been done as to the impact of an additional 100 cars and the 58 new homes in the rear development? We understand what the traffic impact will be and how it will affect the community. Why was the Master Plan addressed last year and why has it changed already? Concerned about density. Mr. Nash is not a resident of Tallmadge Township and he is just pedaling this off to someone else.

John Perna: 11757 Sessions Dr.- stated seconds what has been said so far. One of the first residents in the second phase. Moved away from Grand Rapids to get away from apartments. Bought knowing there was going to be commercial up front, not looking to move next to rentals. Was sold one thing and now its changing to another.

Sarah Bruischat: 11422 Ivy Grove West: stated she has questions. 1) Has there been a study done on what the neighboring property values will be? Will it be a negative affect? 2) Area size of the units are under the zoning requirements, same with the yard size? 3) With all the new multi-family in the area will there be a demand for the market? 4) Feels we need a traffic study.

Collin Yonkers: 11425 Ivy Grove NW: asked what is the township's need for changing this from the Master Plan? Feels that they do not want rental properties in Tallmadge Township. Feels there needs to be a traffic study.

David Hop: 11472 Sessions Dr.: asked if all their questions will be answered?

Matt Fenske: stated they will try with the best of their abilities to answer questions.

David Hopp: asked Ben Nash if he intended to sell as commercial or was it always intended to sell as residential? The properties are listed as residential. Feel like a bait and switch.

Greg Ransford: stated all questions should be answered at the end.

Mark Miedema: 473 Ivy Grove N: stated they are all coming from a point in protecting their property value. All the issues are revolving around density. Is it possible to insure no rentals? Feels the sidewalk on M-45 should be addressed.

Nate Hoffman: 465 Ivy Grove South: stated this was supposed to be the final meeting, but there seems to be a lot of unknowns. If they've had 7 months to put this together, feels the developer hasn't put a lot of thought in.

Joe Westdorp: 11479 Sessions Dr.: stated when we moved this was our retirement home. Feels that it will be mostly college age students moving. And wants to know what will happen if they park on the road. Support of the rest of the comments. Do not want rentals.

Lonna DenHarder 536 Ivy Gorve N: should this go through; is there a time limit this has to be built? Or is each phase going to take up to 10 years?

Joel Terpstra motioned to close public hearing. Dave Hanko support.

Matt Fenske: Yes; Curt Rypma: Yes; Dave Hanko: Yes; Marv Bennink: Yes; Jacob Smith: Yes; Dick Temple: Yes; Joel Terpstra: Yes

Cheryl King: stated questions or concerns from residents:

- 1) Will this decrease property value?
- 2) Concerned about rental properties.
- 3) Has a traffic study been done?
- 4) Why did the Master Plan change from a year ago?
- 5) Why do the home sizes and yard sizes not need to meet the zoning requirements?
- 6) Will there be a demand for the 42 units with the new multi-family that is in the surrounding area?
- 7) Ben Nash – Did you always intend to sell the lots as residential or commercial?
- 8) How will they enforce when there is parking on the road?
- 9) Is there a time limit for the building process?

Dave Caldon: stated

- 1) they intended to develop these lots as premier commercial lots. Found out there is no premier development
- 2) traffic issues – we have looked at this. The traffic load for commercial would be higher than town homes. Not a lot of use to do a study because it would improve from the commercial use.
- 3) Does not want a frat house either. If zoning doesn't protect from the rental of students, they would put this into documents that rentals would only be allowed to single-family. Willing to stipulate this as a condition of approval.
- 4) Highly confident there is a market for this use and this multi-family style is not available in the Township.

Matt Fenske: asked Greg if a traffic study was provided?

Greg Ransford: stated a traffic study wasn't completed, but what the developer did submit to our engineer was a traffic analysis and was consistent with what would be expected for Lake Michigan Drive. Stated the Planning Commission can ask for a traffic study.

Jason Vanderkodde: stated the traffic analysis showed the multi-family residential use would be significantly less than that of commercial.

Jason Vanderkodde: stated

- 1) Setbacks for Multi-Family District: reason is the PUD was designed with an open space concept and cluster the resulting density, which gives the smaller setbacks.
- 2) Presenting 3 Phases – Would like to build in phases. Not sure of the timeline, do not anticipate 10 years to complete.
- 3) Parking Enforcement – would be the same as Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Matt Fenske: asked will there be a home owners association?

Dave Caldon: stated intent to have a separate association for the residential and one for commercial. Stated it will be similar, a condominium development, similar to the other associations.

Dave Caldon: stated regarding the size of the units, this is a PUD, no requirements for town home sizes to his knowledge. Left a broad range to have units of different sizes to meet a broad market. The PUD doesn't have to abide by the zoning ordinance.

Ron Bultje: stated if the projects comes back to the Planning Commission for elevation review, the Fire Department can then review.

Dave Caldon: stated they have not done a study on value of adjacent property homes. Would depend on the types of users that are interested in the property. Feels the townhouses would be a better option than a dog kennel or used car lot.

Dave Hanko: asked what will the price of these town homes be selling for?

Ben Nash: stated they are not sure yet. They are not looking to build these. Intend to sell to a reputable builder in town. \$250-\$300,000.

Joel Terpstra: stated concerned that the Fire Department hasn't signed off, but understand why, because he has nothing to conceptually approve. Comfortable with Ron's direction to make elevations a condition. Feels it is a good buffer between single-family and commercial.

Matt Fenske: stated he's concerned about market value of the buildings.

Dave Hanko: stated he would like to have plans come back to planning commission. Concerned about a nice-looking community and property values. Likes the transition.

Dick Temple motioned to table an action until the next meeting. Joel Terpstra support. Matt Fenske: Yes; Curt Rypma: Yes; Dave Hanko: Yes; Marv Bennink: Yes; Jake Smith: Yes; Dick Temple: Yes; Joel Terpstra: Yes

Old Business: None

PC Comments: None

Joel Terpstra motioned to adjourn. Dave Hanko support. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl King
Administrative Assistant