



**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the  
Cedar Springs Planning Commission**

**Tuesday, April 1, 2014**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Cedar Springs City Hall  
66 S. Main St.  
Cedar Springs, Michigan**

1. The Meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson **Craig Owens** at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL:

Ms. Lisa Atchison	Present
Mr. Dale Bray	Present
Mrs. Kathy Bremmer	Present
Ms. Sherri Foster	Present
Mr. Gerald Hall	Excused
Mr. Perry Hopkins	Present
Mr. Mark Laws	Arrived 7:15 p.m.
Chairperson Mr. Craig Owens	Present

3. City Planner **Carmine Avantini** was recognized as being in attendance.

4. **Motion by Bray, supported by Hopkins, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 4, 2014.**

**VOTE: 6 – 0, Motion Carried.**

5. **Motion by Bray, supported by Hopkins, to approve the agenda.**

**VOTE: 6 – 0, Motion Carried.**

6. There were no Public Comments.

7. There were no scheduled public hearings.

8. NEW BUSINESS.

A. **Nicol DeMol**, Trout Unlimited, Rogue River Home Rivers Initiative Project Manager, and **Andy Bowman** gave a presentation regarding the Home Rivers Project. They presented a stormwater guidebook to Commissioners.

B. Preliminary site plan review for Cedar Springs Brewing Company: **Avantini** stated the Planning Commission was not being asked to approve the site plan for the company that evening; but to discuss if the general concept was appropriate for the downtown. Commissioners reviewed the letter provided by **Avantini (attached Item A)** in which he provided preliminary review comments regarding the proposed construction. According to **Avantini** the key issue with the preliminary plan is parking. Based on City Ordinance requirements, 89 spaces are required and 73 are provided in the plan. However, if he were to look more closely at on site and ancillary parking spaces, the ordinance's parking requirements would be met, he said.

**Dave Ringler**, Cedar Springs Brewing Company, stated he had some concerns regarding the site plan that might be in conflict with City ordinances: having the Biergarten open year round for activities, the amount of signage allowed, outdoor seating requirements and parking lot surface. All will be addressed in a formal site plan review.

9. OLD BUSINESS.

A. **Avantini** said he was still receiving comments from the City Attorney regarding the proposed sign ordinance; but those changes should be relatively minor. He suggested setting a date for a public hearing on the ordinance.

**Motion by Hopkins, supported by Laws, to set a public hearing on the proposed sign ordinance for the May 6, 2014 Planning Commission meeting.**

**VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.**

Owens reminded Commissioners of comments made in a letter from the City Attorney regarding the proposed sign ordinance: "With sign regulations, if a municipal planning commission is uncertain, it is better to err on the side of being conservative and more restrictive. If a particular sign regulation proves to be too restrictive or undesirable, it can always be amended and liberalized later. However, as you know, once a sign is legally installed (and no matter how bad or offensive the sign might turn out to be later), that sign gains lawful nonconforming status if the sign regulations are later tightened up and the existing sign generally cannot be banned."

- B. Discussion regarding Planning Commission bylaws.  
**Owens** reminded Commissioners they should counsel themselves regarding Section 5. Conflict of Interest.  
**Avantini** suggested making certain the Commission's bylaws matched language in the Zoning Enabling Act regarding conflict of interest.  
**Owens** also pointed out Section 6. Seminars, Continuing Planning Education, reminding Commissioners of the yearly training requirement for Commissioners.

10. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.

- A. There was no correspondence.
  - B. There were no staff comments.
  - C. There were no comments from Planning Commission Members.
  - D. There were no comments from members of the audience.
11. There was no report of the City Council representative.
12. There was no report from the Planning Consultant.
13. The Meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

---

Linda Christensen, City Clerk

---

Craig Owens, Chairperson

ITEM A



CIB PLANNING

Community Image Builders

March 26, 2014

City of Cedar Springs  
PO Box 310  
66 S. Main Street  
Cedar Springs, MI 49319

Attention: Mr. Thad Taylor, City Manager

Subject: **Preliminary Site Plan Review, Cedar Springs Brewing Company**, located at the southwest corner of North Main Street and W. Maple Street, NE.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At your request we have completed a preliminary site plan review for the above property, which would allow construction of an approximate 7,900 square foot Brew Pub and associated 1,652 square foot biergarten outdoor seating area to the rear of the building. A 36 car parking lot is also proposed to the rear of the site, abutting N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The estimated occupancy of the building is 154 patrons in the main dining area and another 110 in the outdoor biergarten area. As a result, maximum use of the business will occur primarily during the warm weather months.

The design of the building will be traditional in nature and have a two-story appearance, although only a small portion of the main structure will have a mezzanine. Much of the main building will be constructed of brick while the remainder utilizes what appears to be an architectural metal siding. The subject site is zoned B-2, Central Business District where Brew pubs are permitted by right. Based upon our review of the submitted documents, we offer the following comments for your consideration:

**REVIEW COMMENTS**

**1. Dimensional Requirements.** The following table indicates that the dimensional requirements of the ordinance will be met by the proposed development.

District	Minimum Lot Size per Unit (a)(b)		Maximum Lot Coverage (in %)	Minimum Yard Setbacks (ft.)			Max. Building Height	
	Area (in sq. ft.)	Width (in ft.)		Front (b)	Each Side (c)	Rear	Stories	Feet
B-2	—	—	—	(l)	—	—	3	45

17195 Silver Parkway, #309  
Fenton, MI 48430

Phone: 810-335-3800  
Email: [avantini@cibplanning.com](mailto:avantini@cibplanning.com)

**2. Building Design.** The proposed building design is very appropriate for a traditional downtown, will greatly enhance the character of the city, and will set an example for future buildings in the downtown area. A detailed description of the proposed materials and samples must be included as part of the final site plan/building elevation submission for Planning Commission review and approval.

**3. Parking.** Section 40-516(c), Location of parking, states that for downtown parking, “The off-street parking facilities required for nonresidential uses in the Central Business (B-2) Zoning District may be located up to 500 feet from the lot line of the parcel they are intended to serve; provided, however, that they shall not be located in a residential zoning district. Up to 50 percent of the required parking may include on-street parking or shared parking. Municipal parking lots may be considered as counting toward the required parking if approved by the planning commission after submittal of a parking demand study that addresses parking needs and availability within 500 feet of the subject site.” Although the site includes a small parking lot to the rear of the building, the use of additional on- and off-street public parking will also be needed. The following table identifies the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development under the ordinance, considering the above standards.

	<b>Required</b>	<b>Provided</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Parking Spaces</b>	1 space per each 3 persons allowed within the maximum occupancy load as established by local, state or county fire, health or state construction codes, plus 1 per each 3 employees (89 spaces) or 1 per each 70 sq. ft. UFA, plus 1 per each 3 employees (60), whichever is greater. <b>Total Required: 89 spaces</b>	Parking lot = 33 spaces On-street = approx. 25 spaces Trail head spaces = 15 spaces <b>Total Provided: 73 spaces</b>	Although the combination of off-street, on-street, and trail head parking spaces comes close to providing enough parking for the project during peak periods, an additional parking lot should be investigated for the area between N. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and the trail head parking lot, utilizing grass pavers.
<b>Loading Spaces</b>	2,000—20,000 s.f.: <b>1 space</b>	<b>1 space</b>	<b>In compliance</b>

During peak periods, there will likely be a shortage of parking immediately around the building. This is a traditional downtown, however, and a shortage of parking is usually an indicator of success. Still, the Planning Commission should provide feedback to the applicant on available parking and discuss future plans to add spaces. The final site plan submission must also provide more detailed information on the parking lot construction and dimensions. It also appears that the proposed lot will yield more than the 33 spaces that are shown on the diagram.

**4. Landscaping & Public Improvements.** The renderings indicate the use of landscaping in the parking lot and the final site plan submission will require a complete landscape plan, meeting ordinance requirements. In addition, the site plan should address any public improvements planned around the building, including any streetscape enhancements.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Since this is a preliminary review only, the Planning Commission should provide feedback to the applicant on the submitted diagrams and not take formal action. Therefore, a formal recommendation is not provided at this time. The goal is to give direction so the final site plan submittal will closely match the expectations of the Commission.

Sincerely,

**CIB PLANNING**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Carmine P. Avantini".

Carmine P. Avantini, AICP