



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

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

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	Excused
Mrs. Kathy Bremmer	Present
Mr. Clinton Conley	Present
Ms. Sherri Foster	Present
Mr. Jerry Hall	Excused
Mr. Perry Hopkins	Present
Mr. Mark Laws	Present
Mr. Craig Owens, Chairperson	Present

3. City Planner Carmine Avantini was recognized as being present.

4. **Motion by Bremmer, supported by Hopkins, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 11, 2014.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

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

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Kurt Mabie, said in talking with various developers and builders that there seemed to be a common theme – the City of Cedar Springs would not work with them. Businesses were leaving and not coming into the City, he said. There was something drastically wrong here.

Sue Wolfe, suggested a new zoning district and ordinance for publically owned land.

Duane McIntyre, stated he didn't get the information that had been sent out regarding the PUD ordinance and questioned some of the requirements such as 14 ft. ceiling height requirements, two-story requirements and garages being set five feet behind structures.

7. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS.

- A. **Motion by Foster, supported by Bremmer, to open a public hearing on a Special Land Use as requested by CD Barnes, authorized agent on behalf of Fouroost, LLC, buyer, developer, for property located at 13900 White Creek Ave.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

The Public Hearing opened at 7:17 p.m.

1. **Avantini** reviewed the application stating the applicant met all the general and specific requirements of the zoning code. He recommended approval conditional upon site plan approval.
2. There were no public comments.
3. **Motion by Atchison, supported by Foster, to close the Public Hearing.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:21 p.m.

8. NEW BUSINESS.

- A. Site Plan Review for CD Barnes Construction for 13900 White Creek Avenue.

Avantini reviewed his review letter dated August 11, 2015 (**Attached Item A**) The applicant proposed to construct a 6,825-square-foot multi-tenant retail building with parking and site improvements. He recommended deferral of sidewalk construction until future connections were made on abutting sites. The applicant was also asking for leeway on treatment of the rear elevation. The outstanding item was the curbing of the striped island to the rear of the building, he said. The engineer's review letter dated August 28, 2015 (**Attached Item B**) was also offered.

Jeff Brinks, Williams and Works, stated the client would like to leave the island striped, but without curbing which would provide a barrier for snow plowing, he explained.

1. **Motion by Atchison, supported by Bremmer, to approve the Site Plan for 13900 White Creek Avenue with the following conditions:**

- **Special Land Use Approval.**
- **Planning Commission approval of the sidewalk deferral, identified in the Planner Letter dated August 11, 2015, Item # 4.**
- **The addition of one-way signage in the rear parking lot to ensure that traffic flows in the proper direction.**
- **Acceptance of the landscape plan under Item # 6 of the Planner's Review letter dated August 11, 2015.**

- The dumpster enclosure must be constructed of color-integrated, decorative concrete block with a color that matches the building.
- Review and approval of the other applicable departments and agencies.
- Decorative pole covers are to be utilized.

B. **Motion by Bremmer, supported by Hopkins, to approve a Special Land Use for property located at 13900 White Creek Avenue.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

9. OLD BUSINESS.

A. Discussion on Planning Commission bylaws:

City Manager **Thad Taylor** stated the City Council had suggested language to be added to Section 2. Meetings, Item E. Agenda, to read: "Persons wishing to be on the agenda should meet with City employees to make sure that plans are completed properly before being added to the agenda."

Owens said the purpose of bylaws was how we do business. They were an internal operation. The agenda was prepared and sent to us, he said.

Hopkins said people needed to know how to get on an agenda. He suggested putting information the website on how to get an item on an agenda.

Avantini said bylaws were how an organization operates and conducts business. Policies belonged in ordinances and State law. They were not appropriate in bylaws.

10. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.

A. There was no correspondence.

B. Staff Comments:

1. **Taylor** stated Advance Auto Parts parapets appeared to be good, they couldn't be seen and the air conditioning units were hidden. There was no word on the motel; the library would be asking the City Council to use the property at Main and Maple Streets to construct a library; the retirement facility that bought the Horowitz property was demolishing the building and barn; Display Pack would be bringing a site plan to the Planning Commission for the south end of their building; work on the master plan would soon be underway, continuing education would continue to be offered to commissioners. There was a lot of interest in development in the community.

C. Planning Commission Members:

Bremmer stated that four new businesses had come into town despite what had been heard that evening. These included Advance Auto Parts, the home brewing company, the retirement facility and a new business had been on the agenda that evening.

Owens thanked **Kurt Mabie** for his comments; but one of the businesses he referred to happened a while ago. He was very proud of the Planning Commission. It had done a good job meeting the needs of businesses. He would like to talk to those developers that said the City was hard to work with.

As far as the PUD restrictions were concerned, the Planning Commission used the word guidelines and there was flexibility and a lot of opportunities for people to give us flexibility when they brought in their plans.

11. REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE.

Hopkins reported on upcoming City Council agenda items.

12. REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONSULTANT.

Avantini stated **Kathleen Duffy** would be in attendance at the next Planning Commission meeting to discuss the master plan process.

13. **Motion by Foster, supported by Hopkins, to adjourn.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

The Meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Linda Christensen, City Clerk

Craig Owens, Chairperson



CIB PLANNING

Community Image Builders

August 31, 2015

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

Attention: Mr. Thad Taylor, City Manager

Subject: **Revised Site Plan Review, Cedar Springs Retail Center**, 13900 White Creek Ave. NE, located on the east side of White Creek Ave., south of 17 Mile Road, *revised* site plan dated 8/11/15.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At your request, we have completed our review of the *revised* site plan for the proposed Cedar Spring Retail Center, which will be located immediately south of the AGO mini-mart. Proposed is the construction of a 6,825 square foot multi-tenant retail building with associated parking and site improvements. The subject site is zoned HC, Highway Commercial where retail businesses are permitted by right. Drive-through windows are special land uses in this district and a separate review letter has been prepared.

The opinions in this report are based on a review of the revised 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. Dimensional Requirements. The following table indicates the dimensional requirements of the ordinance and those provided by the proposed development:

	Required	Provided	Comments
Lot Area	20,000 s.f.	87,993 s.f.	In compliance
Lot Width	100 ft.	200 ft.	In compliance

	Required	Provided	Comments
Front Yard Setbacks			
Building	40 ft.	180 ft.	In compliance
Parking	20 ft.	43 ft.	In compliance
Side Yard Setbacks			
Building	10 ft.	28 ft.	In compliance
Parking (north)	10 ft.	10 ft.	In compliance
Parking (south)	10 ft.	10 ft.	In compliance
Rear Yard Setback			
Building	40 ft.	173 ft.	In compliance
Parking	10 ft.	73 ft.	In compliance
Lot Coverage (building)	40% max.	7.8%	In compliance
Building Height	45 ft. max.	18'	In compliance

2. Drive-through Window. Although retail uses are permitted in the HC, Highway Commercial District, drive-through windows are special land uses and a separate letter has been prepared.

3. Parking. *Section 40-514, Schedule of parking requirements,* of the ordinance identifies the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development in the following table:

	Required	Provided	Comments
Parking Spaces	<p><u>Retail</u>: 1 space per each 200 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area (GFA), including barrier-free spaces. At 2,125 sq. ft. of floor area, 11 spaces are required.</p> <p><u>Restaurant A</u>: 1 space per 70 sq. ft. Usable Floor Area (UFA) plus 1 per each 3 employees. At 1,200 square feet of usable floor area (85%) and 3 employees, 16 spaces are required.</p> <p><u>Restaurant B</u>: 1 space per 70 sq. ft. Usable Floor Area (UFA) plus 1 per each 3 employees. At 3,500 square feet of usable floor area (85%) and 12 employees, 46 spaces are required.</p> <p>Total Required: 73 spaces</p>	<p>Total Provided: 75 spaces, including 3 barrier-free spaces.</p>	In compliance
Loading Spaces	<p>2,000—20,000 s.f</p> <p>Total Required: 1 space</p>	1 space	In compliance

4. Sidewalks. *Section Sec. 40-464, Sidewalks*, requires that “All developments shall provide sidewalks...on both sides of all public and private streets and roads.” With the property across the street, the City allowed deferral of the sidewalk until future connections are made on abutting sites. A form of financial or other guarantee will be needed to ensure that this does take place.

5. Drive Lanes and Parking Behind Building. The applicant has revised the plans to remove potential conflicts, with all traffic flowing in a one-way direction. The City engineering consultant, Michael Berrevoets, mentioned in his letter the need for proper one-way signage to ensure that traffic flows in the proper direction. The only remaining question we have for the Planning Commission is whether the striped island should be curbed. This would help protect the light poles and keep vehicles in the parking spaces from extending beyond the striped and into the drive lane.

6. Landscaping. *Section 40-447, Landscaping requirements*, of the ordinance, lists the landscaping requirements that are summarized in the following table:

	Required	Provided	Comment
Front Greenbelt 40-447(g)(1)	A greenbelt of 10 feet wide measured from the property line and 1 deciduous canopy, ornamental, or evergreen tree for every 10 feet of road frontage and ten shrubs per 50 linear feet of property. 20 trees plus 40 shrubs are required. (200 ft.)	A 40 ft. wide strip, 2 deciduous tree and 41 shrubs are provided.	Although the proper number of shrubs are provided, 18 additional trees are required along the front greenbelt. Recognizing that this area is not large enough to accommodate all of this landscaping, the applicant has added 3 additional Pear trees, at our request. In compliance with PC approval.
Side Yard Greenbelt (North Property Line) 40-447(d)	A greenbelt of 10 feet wide measured from the property line with a privacy fence and canopy or ornamental trees on 30-foot centers with an allotment of three shrubs per 30 feet of buffer strip. A 10 ft. strip, 15 trees, and 44 shrubs are required (440 ft.).	A 10 ft. strip, 3 deciduous and 24 shrubs are provided.	The side yard along the north property line abuts both existing vegetation and the rear yard for commercial businesses along 17 Mile Road. Although the proposed landscaping does not meet ordinance requirements, it should meet the intent of this standard. In compliance with PC approval.
Side Yard Greenbelt (South Property Line) 40-447(d)	A greenbelt of 10 feet wide measured from the property line with a privacy fence and canopy or ornamental trees on 30-foot centers with an allotment of three shrubs per 30 feet of buffer strip. A 10 ft. strip, 15 trees, and 44 shrubs	A 10 ft. landscape strip, 3 ornamental trees and 24 shrubs are provided.	As with the north property line, the side yard abuts a site with existing vegetation. Although the proposed landscaping does not

	Required	Provided	Comment
	are required (440 ft.).		meet ordinance requirements, it should meet the intent of this standard. In compliance with PC approval.
Rear Yard Greenbelt (North Property Line) 40-447(d)	A greenbelt of 10 feet wide measured from the property line with a privacy fence and canopy or ornamental trees on 30-foot centers with an allotment of three shrubs per 30 feet of buffer strip. A 10 ft. strip, 7 trees, and 20 shrubs are required (200 ft.).	A 74 ft. strip, 0 trees and 0 shrubs are provided.	The rear parking lot is setback 73 feet from the property line and vegetation exists so the applicant has asked that the rear property line buffer be waived. In compliance with PC approval.
Parking Lot Landscaping 40-447(f)	1 canopy tree and 3 shrubs per 5 parking spaces at 75 spaces. 15 canopy trees and 45 shrubs are required.	7 trees and 38 shrubs are provided.	Although the required number of shrubs have not been provided in the parking lot islands, the shrubs located around the building can count towards meeting this requirement. We are also of the opinion that additional parking lot trees are not needed, since the only possible location would be the rear parking lot, which is not visible from the road. In compliance with PC approval.

7. Building Materials. Per Section 40-463(2)(b)&(c), *Nonresidential design requirements*, of the ordinance, “Buildings shall be constructed of quality materials that are characteristic of the state such as earth-toned brick, wood, native stone or other high-quality products approved by the city” and “Other materials such as smooth-faced or decorative concrete block, dryvit, or prefabricated steel panels should only be used as accents and not dominate the building exterior of the structure.” The proposed elevations indicate the use of cement board (Hardy Plank) and stone veneer for the front and side elevations. This treatment meets the intent of the above ordinance material requirements. The rear elevation will utilize a pre-finished metal wall panel. We recognize that the rear elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way and the foundation landscaping will soften the appearance of the long wall. The treatment for the rear elevation is therefore acceptable, with Planning Commission approval.

8. Lighting Plan. A complete lighting plan has been submitted and the parking lot appears to be adequately illuminated by the building- and pole-mounted light fixtures. The only locations dropping below .5 foot candles are the outer edges of the parking lot at the east side of the site.

9. Dumpster Enclosure. The revised submission indicates that the dumpster enclosure will be constructed of concrete block painted to match the building. The ordinance requires that the enclosure be constructed with materials to match the building. Since that is not possible, we recommend the use of color-integrated, decorative concrete block with a color that matches the building. Painted block is not allowed, due to increased long-term maintenance.

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

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon this review, **we recommend site plan approval for the Cedar Springs Retail Center,** conditioned upon the following:

1. Special Land Use approval;
2. Planning Commission approval of the sidewalk deferral, identified under item #4 above;
3. The addition of one-way signage in the rear parking lot to ensure that traffic flows in the proper direction;
4. That the striped island to the rear of the building is curbed;
5. Acceptance of the landscape plan under item #6 above;
6. The dumpster enclosure must be constructed of color-integrated, decorative concrete block with a color that matches the building; and
7. Review and approval of the other applicable departments and agencies.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING



Carmine P. Avantini, AICP

ITEM B



August 28, 2015
Project No. G150529

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

Re: 13900 White Creek Avenue
Site Plan Review

Dear Thad:

Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. has reviewed the site plan of the Cedar Springs Retail Center to be located at 13900 White Creek Avenue dated August 26, 2015, as submitted by Williams & Works. The site plan was received in our office on August 27, 2015, as an Adobe® format document by email. It is our understanding that the site plan will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at the September 8, 2015 meeting.

The applicant has proposed improvements to the existing vacant lot located at the address referenced above. The proposed site work includes the following:

- Construction of the 75-space parking lot with a single, two-way drive opening on White Creek Avenue.
- Construction of a 6,825-square-foot building including a drive-thru window on the north side.
- Construction of an underground storm water detention system with a restricted release outlet and storm sewer system for parking lot drainage.
- Construction of a 6-inch fire protection line and 2-inch domestic water service line.
- Construction of a sanitary sewer pump station with a force main discharge to the existing sanitary sewer.
- Landscaping, including trees and shrubs along the White Creek frontage and trees around the infiltration basin.
- 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 site improvements include new impervious area with the parking lot and building. Since the site is not within the City boundaries, there is not an established Storm Zone associated with the parcel. The applicant has proposed to comply with Storm Zone B requirements. This is appropriate given the conditions of the site and the lack of a definitive storm zone for the parcel. (We looked on Solon Township's website to see if there might be a Storm Water Ordinance there but we were not able to find anything.)

1. The site storm sewer system will capture runoff from the paved areas and the building downspouts. The applicant provided system sizing calculations and designed the system for the 10-year rain event. The calculations have been reviewed and appear acceptable based on the information provided.



Flood Control Requirements

2. The applicant has proposed an underground detention system with an open bottom surrounded by stone to meet the flood control requirements of the SWO. The underground detention basin was sized to accommodate the volume of runoff for the 25-year rain event as required by the ordinance for Storm Zone B. The design includes an outlet control structure with a standpipe and orifices sized to restrict the discharge rate. The orifices are sized appropriately to be less than the maximum allowable release rate of 0.13 cubic feet per second (cfs) per acre. Drainage calculations for the sizing of the basin were provided for review. The calculations were reviewed and appear to comply with the SWO requirements for flood control.

Bank Erosion Control Requirements

3. The SWO Storm Zone B requires the storm water runoff shall not exceed the capacity of the downstream conveyance system. Storm Zone A is more restrictive and limits the rate of release to 0.05 cfs/acre for the 2-year storm event. The applicant has chosen to comply with the more restrictive requirements of Storm Zone A and has limited the release rate to less than 0.05 cfs/acre for the 2-year rain event. The parcel predominantly slopes down to the south east and the outlet for the detention system is to a gentle grade where runoff from the site currently discharges. The applicant's approach to satisfying the Bank Erosion Control requirements is acceptable.

Water Quality Control Requirements

4. The SWO requires that the first 0.5-inch of runoff be detained for 24-hours to allow settling of contaminants or silt. The applicant has included an isolator row in the underground system to hold the first flush volume and release it slowly through a small diameter (1 inch) orifice in the outlet control structure standpipe. This is an acceptable means of detaining the first flush volume of water for the 24-hour period.

Overall, with the information provided, the storm sewer system and underground detention system are acceptable for approval at this time. It should be noted that underground detention system has an open bottom which will likely allow some amount of infiltration into the soils during smaller rain events.

Utilities

5. The site plan indicates a 6-inch fire protection line will be connected to the existing 16-inch water main located at across White Creek Avenue near the north property line. A 2-inch domestic service will be tapped on the 6-inch fire protection line near the right-of-way (ROW) and include a curb stop. Both the 6-inch fire protection line and the 2-inch domestic service will be routed to the east side of the building. In this area, White Creek Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the Kent County Road Commission (KCRC). The applicant is indicating that White Creek Avenue will be open cut to make the water main connection. They will need to obtain a permit for that work from the KCRC.
6. The nearest existing sanitary sewer is located in the southeast corner of 17-Mile Road and White Creek Avenue. That sanitary sewer is also not deep enough to provide gravity sanitary flow to the proposed development. The applicant is proposing a pump station to collect the sanitary flow and discharge through a force main to the existing sanitary sewer. This is a potentially acceptable solution; however, there are a few items to note.
 - a. The proposed pump station must be owned and maintained by the property owner.
 - b. The force main shall also be owned and maintained by the applicant from the point of discharge into the existing City system back to the pump station.



- c. The drawings do not show the force main location once it leaves the parcel. It is assumed it will run parallel to White Creek Avenue on the east side of the road to the existing sanitary manhole.
 - The applicant will need to indicate where the proposed force main will be located.
 - If the force main is intended to be located within the KCRC ROW they will need to obtain permission for its placement. Privately owned utilities within the ROW are not typically acceptable to the KCRC.
 - If the applicant proposes to route the force main on private property through the adjacent parcel to the north they must obtain an easement from that property owner.
- d. The drawings indicate a 1,000 gallon grease trap is proposed for the restaurant portion of the building. This must be maintained by the owner to prevent grease from being discharged to the City system.
- e. If, in the future, the City chooses to provide a public pump station, gravity sewer and force main to serve this area we would recommend the applicant be required to connect to the public system at that time and pay any assessments associated with the public provided system.

Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Controls

7. Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control (SESC) measures are shown on Sheet 3. The applicant will need to obtain a SESC permit from the KCRC prior to beginning any earth change activities.
 - a. We recommend the applicant consider temporary silt fence to be placed along the front of the parcel adjacent to White Creek Avenue. There is a small area that looks like it will be disturbed and it drains towards the roadway.
 - b. The drawing shows temporary silt fence along the west and south west sides of the property with the underground detention system discharge pipe being above the silt fence. Our concern is the silt fence may be compromised from the concentrated flow during a large rain event; while the site is under construction. The applicant should review ways to mitigate that potential exposure.
 - c. The underground detention system isolator row should be cleaned after the site is stabilized. There are areas of temporarily exposed soil surrounding the site that could carry sediment from runoff into the underground system. Our concern is the underground detention system capacity could be compromised with sediment before the site is stabilized.
 - d. The drawings show mulch blanket being placed on the 1 on 3 slope on the east side of the site. The mulch blanket needs to be monitored and maintained until there is sufficient vegetative growth to prevent erosion to neighboring sites.

Miscellaneous Items

8. White Creek Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the KCRC in this area. The applicant will need to receive approval of the KCRC for the proposed driveway location, layout, and associated roadway widening along their frontage.
9. There are two proposed retaining walls indicated on the site plan. They are located on the northeast and southeast corners of the parking lot. It appears these walls will be 5-feet tall in some locations. The applicant should consider guardrail or some type of pedestrian barrier since this is adjacent to parking lot and places where people will be driving and walking.



10. The drawing shows one-way traffic lanes to pass by the building on the north and south sides. This is a minor concern with the building potentially blocking the site lines for drivers. One way to mitigate this is to clearly mark the travel direction with signage and pavement markings.
11. Drawing 1 indicates there is an existing monitoring well located on the parcel and the note indicates it is to be protected during construction. It is not clear if there is any known soil contamination on the site. If there is potential contaminated soils the applicant is expected to handle and dispose of the material according to state and federal requirements. Additionally, any potentially contaminated groundwater that may be encountered should be disposed of in accordance with applicable requirements.

Conclusion

At this time, we are comfortable recommending conditional approval of the site plan from an engineering standpoint. The applicant will need to obtain the proper approvals from the KCRC for the work within White Creek Avenue ROW and for the SESC permit. They also need to provide additional detail regarding the force main location once it leaves their parcel and any approvals or easements required.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at 616-464-3927.

Sincerely,

FISHBECK, THOMPSON, CARR & HUBER, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael L. Berrevoets". The signature is stylized with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Michael L. Berrevoets, PE

jc2

By email

cc: Mr. Carmine Avantini, AICP - CIB Planning
Mr. Wayne Harrall - KCRC