



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

**Monday, August 18, 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. Jerry Hall	Present
Mr. Perry Hopkins	Present
Mr. Mark Laws	Excused
Mr. Craig Owens, Chairperson	Present
3. City Planner **Carmine Avantini** was recognized as being in attendance.
4. **Motion by Atchison, supported by Bremmer, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 3, 2014.**

**VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.**
5. **Motion by Hall, supported by Bray, to approve the agenda.**

**VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.**
6. There were no public comments.
7. There were no scheduled public hearings.
8. NEW BUSINESS.
  - A. Site Plan Review for Cedar Springs Brewing Company LLC, 95 N. Main St. **Avantini** reviewed his final site plan review letter dated August 8, 2014 (**attached Item A**) with Commissioners. Plans call for the construction of an approximate 7,500-square-foot brew pub and a 1,652-square-foot biergarten outdoor seating area to the rear of the building. Estimated occupancy of the

building was 150-155 patrons in the main dining area and another 90-100 in the outdoor biergarten. He addressed the following concerns:

- Scale of the site plan.
- Landscape plan for the western edge of the parking lot facing Second Street.
- Material samples needed to be provided.
- Parking spaces – while adequate presently, they may need to be adjusted at a later date.
- A lighting plan needs to be provided.
- Signage needed to meet the requirements of the ordinance.

The City Engineer's Site Plan Review (**attached Item B**) was also offered for review.

**Avantini** stated two options were available to the applicant regarding signage: a variance through the Zoning Board of Appeals or if the Planning Commission moved forward with a Planned Unit Development concept for the downtown, signage could be addressed in that manner.

**David Ringler**, owner of the Cedar Springs Brewery Company, stated that the scale of the site plan had been addressed. The landscape plan, however, had been purposely left open so that the public would have access from the White Pine Trail to Second Street. The biergarten fencing was going to be decorative and open at the rear. According to Michigan Liquor Control rulings outdoor service areas only needed to be clearly marked; but did not need to be enclosed. The lighting fixtures would be provided and requirements would be complied with; but the big issue was the signage. Flags, as were being proposed for the building, were a big part of the business's marketing plan, he explained.

**Avantini** said the signage itself appeared to meet the City's ordinances; but the flags were the issue. Under the current sign ordinance, flags are not defined as signs. Once the new sign ordinance goes into effect, the proposed signs would fall under the new sign ordinance requirements. Presently, it was his opinion that the flags could be considered an architectural theme of the building.

**Hall** said he did not have a problem with the landscaping issue as he felt shrubbery would interfere with snow plowing. The City traditionally needed open space for storing snow, he said.

**Motion by Hall, supported by Hopkins, to approve the site plan review for Cedar Springs Brewing Company LLC with the following conditions:**

1. **Submission of a revised site plan that adequately addresses the information items identified in the City Planner's letter dated August 8, 2014.**
2. **Submission of building material samples, for administrative review and approval.**
3. **A photometric grid, overlaid on the site plan, must be submitted for review to determine that the light levels are not above 10 or below .5 candles anywhere in the site.**
4. **Review and approval from other applicable departments and agencies.**

**5. Approval of 15 exterior 3-foot by 5-foot gonfalons (flags) as a part of the architectural design of the building and specific marketing plan.**

**VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.**

**9. OLD BUSINESS.**

**A. Discussion regarding establishing a downtown PUD.**

**Owens** stated that the PUD Committee would be holding a conference call on August 25 with a developer who had worked with PUDs to get his insight and to have the opportunity to ask questions. The committee would provide input regarding the conversation at the October Planning Commission meeting at which time, the City Planner would also provide sample language for downtown PUDs for review and comment.

**10. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.**

**A. There was no correspondence.**

**B. Staff Comments:**

**Taylor** informed Commissioners of the hiring of a new Code Enforcement Officer and The Pines condo project was moving forward.

**C. Planning Commission Members:**

**Atchison** cautioned members regarding developers talking them into making decisions.

**Bremmer** said the Commission needed to be less restrictive and more business friendly. She also questioned when the moratorium on parking on City right-of-ways was going to go into effect and asked what the City was doing to advertise the deadline.

**Owens** said the City should be enforcing parking restrictions by the Fire Station so that fire apparatus would not be hindered when trying to leave the station on an emergency call.

**11. Hall** outlined some items to be discussed at the upcoming City Council meeting.

**12. There was no report from the Planning Consultant.**

**13. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.**

---

Linda Christensen, City Clerk

---

Craig Owens, Chairperson

ITEM A



## CIB PLANNING

---

Community Image Builders

August 8, 2014

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

Attention: Mr. Thad Taylor, City Manager

Subject: **Final Site Plan Review, Cedar Springs Brewing Company**, located at the southwest corner of North Main Street and W. Maple Street, NE., site plan dated July 2014.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At your request, we have completed our review of the final site plan the Cedar Springs Brewing Company, 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 29 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 150-155 patrons in the main dining area and another 90-100 in the outdoor biergarten area. 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.

The opinions in this report are based on a review of the site plan submitted by the applicant and conformance to City plans and ordinance standards. Key review item points in this letter are underlined for the benefit of the applicant. Please note that the applicant and their design professionals shall be responsible for the accuracy and validity of information presented with the application and on the site plan. Based upon our review of the submitted documents, we offer the following comments for your consideration:

### REVIEW COMMENTS

**1. Information Items.** The following items must be changed and/ or submitted for administrative review and approval:

- a. The scale on the site plan indicates that it is 1"=30' when in fact the plan is scaled at 1"=20'.

17195 Silver Parkway, #309  
Fenton, MI 48430

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

- b. The landscape plan fails to completely show western edge of the parking lot, facing Second Street, and this needs to be corrected.

**2. 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

**3. 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. Material samples must be provided for administrative review and approval.

**4. 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.

	Required	Provided	Comments
<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 (83 spaces) or 1 per each 70 sq. ft. UFA, plus 1 per each 3 employees (60), whichever is greater. <b>Total Required: 83 spaces</b>	Parking lot = 29 spaces On-street = approx. 20 spaces Library lot = 54 spaces <b>Total Provided: 103 spaces</b>	Although the combination of off-street, on-street, and Library parking spaces meets ordinance requirements, an additional parking lot should be investigated in the future for the property 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>

**5. Landscape Plan.** *Section 40-513(c)(4), Parking area design standards*, states that "Parking lots shall be setback a minimum 20 feet from the front property line and ten feet from any side property line." The north parking lot is setback approximately four (4) feet from the north property line, facing W. Maple Street. Although this does not meet the setback requirements, decorative black aluminum fencing with brick piers and landscaping are used to screen the parking lot from the road and we find this trade-off to be acceptable. Additional shrubs are also needed to screen the four (4) parking spaces facing Second Street.

**6. Biergarten Fencing.** It appears from the renderings that the biergarten will be enclosed with a decorative fence and a detail must be provided.

**7. Lighting Plan.** We are concerned that a single-two headed light pole may not be sufficient to adequately light the parking lot. A photometric grid, overlaid on the site plan, must be submitted for review to determine that the light levels are not above 10 or below .5 foot candles anywhere in the site.

**8. Signage.** Although the elevations depict signage and flags on the building, they are not being approved as part of final site plan review and must meet all ordinance requirements.

**9. Other Department and Agency Review.** Site plan approval must be conditioned upon review and approval from other applicable departments and agencies.

## RECOMMENDATION

Although there are still some information and minor items that must be addressed, **we recommend final site plan approval for the Cedar Springs Brewing Company**, conditioned upon the following:

1. Submission of a revised site plan that adequately addresses the information items identified above, for administrative review and approval;
2. Submission of building material samples, for administrative review and approval;
3. The planting of additional shrubs to screen the four (4) parking spaces facing Second Street;
4. A photometric grid, overlaid on the site plan, must be submitted for review to determine that the light levels are not above 10 or below .5 foot candles anywhere in the site.
5. Review and approval from other applicable departments and agencies.

Sincerely,

**CIB PLANNING**



Carmine P. Avantini, AICP



August 5, 2014  
Project No. G140268

Mr. Thad Taylor  
City Manager  
City of Cedar Springs  
66 South Main Street  
Cedar Springs, MI 49319-0310

Re: Cedar Springs Brewing Company  
Site Plan Review

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. (FTCH) has reviewed the site plan for the Cedar Springs Brewing Company (95 North Main Street) dated July 29, 2014. The site plan was prepared by Callen Engineering, Inc. and was received in our office by email on July 31, 2014.

The applicant has proposed a new business to be located at the site of an existing building and parking lot located on the southwest corner of Main and Maple Streets. The proposed site work would include the following major items:

- Removal of the existing building, foundation, and parking lot located at 95 North Main Street.
- Removal of portions of the City sidewalk, curb and gutter and asphalt pavement along Maple and Main Streets to allow for reconfiguration of driveway access points.
- Construct a one-story brewery and brew pub with a square footage of 5,760. An open air Biergarten of 1,640 square feet is proposed west of the brewery.
- Constructing a parking lot including a porous concrete pavement and storage system to accommodate storm water runoff. The parking lot is shown to have one entrance from Second Street.
- Partial replacement of the City sidewalk along Maple and Main Streets.
- Construction of a dumpster enclosure.
- Landscaping including trees, shrubs, hops screen, and decorative fence along Maple Street.
- Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control during construction.

## Storm Water and Drainage

The current Storm Water Ordinance (SWO) applies to any development site that will alter the storm water drainage characteristics. The proposed development is located in Storm Zone C. The design standards for Zone C are identified below along with how the applicant is meeting those requirements.

### Flood Control

Storm Zone C does allow for direct conveyance of storm water runoff provided it is within the capacity of the downstream system. The applicant was given the option of proving the downstream system had capacity for the new development or limiting the amount of runoff leaving the site. They chose to propose an infiltration system to capture the storm water runoff from the site and infiltrate back in to the groundwater. The infiltration system consists of a porous concrete pavement section in the middle of the parking lot with a minimum 3.5-foot-deep stone bed for storage and infiltration under the porous pavement. The system is designed to accommodate the



runoff from the 100-year storm event for the site. Calculations were provided by the engineer for our review. The applicant also had a soil percolation test performed and is using one-half of the tested infiltration rate. As designed, the system satisfies the SWO requirements for flood control.

### **Bank Erosion Control**

The stormwater runoff shall not exceed the capacity of the downstream conveyance system in accordance with the SWO design standard for Bank Erosion Control. Since the runoff will stay onsite and be infiltrated, this requirement is being met by the current design.

### **Water Quality Control**

Zone C of the SWO requires the use of sediment basins, enhancement of buffer strips and reduction of directly connected impervious area. The use of an infiltration system satisfies these requirements since runoff is not leaving the site to potentially impact adjacent water courses.

### **Storm Water System Maintenance**

The applicant/owner shall be responsible for the maintenance of the storm water system. It is critical to the function of the system that it be maintained and cleaned periodically as necessary. The potential downfall of a porous pavement system is clogging of the system with sediment which reduces the infiltration rate. Sediment should be prevented from entering the system and periodic cleaning of the pavement with a vacuum truck will likely be necessary. The applicant should commit to the necessary maintenance required for the system to function as intended.

## **Utilities**

The site plan does not indicate water or sanitary sewer services will be replaced.

### **Sanitary Sewer**

In an email exchange with the engineer, they indicated the intent is to connect to the existing sanitary lateral. The City currently has a project under design to complete sanitary sewer and lateral lining in this area. It is our recommendation (for the developers own benefit), they replace the sanitary sewer lateral from the building connection to the City road right-of-way.

### **Water Service**

The water service for the building is not being shown for replacement. Currently, the building is served with water off from Maple Street. If the applicant desires new water services, it should be their responsibility to construct and pay for the new water service as necessary. Any roadway reconstruction required should meet the City standards as far as pavement thickness and aggregate base requirements.

## **General Plan Comments**

### **Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control**

Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control (SESC) measures are indicated on Sheet C2.0. The applicant will need to obtain a SESC permit from the Kent County Road Commission prior to beginning any earth change activities.



Mr. Thad Taylor  
Page 3  
August 5, 2014



### **Replacement of City Sidewalks and Curbs**

The portion of City sidewalk, drive and curb and gutter should be replaced to City Standards and to meet American's with Disabilities Act guideline for sidewalk. The drawings indicate an existing driveway will be removed along Main Street. The replacement of the surface in this area should match the surrounding streetscape to be consistent. Brick pavers should match in material and pattern.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the site plan being submitted is acceptable from an engineering standpoint. The applicant has met the City SWO design requirements and other items on the plan appear to be acceptable. The applicant will need to obtain a SESC permit prior to beginning any excavation onsite. They should also provide details regarding the utility services once those are finalized.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at 616.464.3927 or mlberrevoets@ftch.com.

Sincerely,

FISHBECK, THOMPSON, CARR & HUBER, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Michael L. Berrevoets". The signature is stylized and written in cursive.

Michael L. Berrevoets, PE

jc2

By email

cc: Mr. Carmine Avantini, AICP - LSL Planning, Inc.  
Mr. David Ringler - Cedar Springs Brewing Company