



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

Tuesday, June 7, 2016

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	Excused
Mr. Clint Conley	Present
Ms. Sherri Foster	Present
Mr. Jerry Hall	Present
Mr. Perry Hopkins	Present
Mr. Mark Laws	Present
Mr. Craig Owens, Chairperson	Present

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

4. **Motion by Bray, supported by Atchison, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 3, 2016.**

VOTE: 8 – 0, Motion Carried.

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

VOTE: 8 – 0, Motion Carried.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Duane McIntyre gave an update on the library construction project stating it had been narrowed down to two building contractors. Two other projects, Nicki & Co. and The Brook were in process, he said.

Sarah McKinnon and **Kim Anderson** addressed Commissioners regarding a proposed dog grooming salon that currently was not allowed in the downtown business area per the City's Zoning Ordinance.

7. There were no scheduled public hearings.

8. There was no new business.

9. OLD BUSINESS.

A. Site Plan Review for Advanced Hydrovac, Inc. 13329 White Creek Ave.

1. **Avantini** reviewed his review letter dated June 3, 2016. **(attached Item A)**
The applicant planned to construct a 14,400-square-foot facility to house truck bays for vacuum trucks, an office, mechanical room and restrooms. The applicant had met building requirements with the exception of the lot split which had not been legally split by previous owners. The applicant had filed for a variance to allow the split and to provide a shared access with the parent parcel. He recommended approval with conditions. The engineer had also provided a review letter. **(attached Item B)**

Motion by Hall, supported by Atchison, to approve the site plan with the following conditions:

1. **approval of a variance for the lot split from the Zoning Board of Appeals and filing of an access easement agreement with a shared entry drive and approval of the City Attorney prior to filing with the County.**
2. **submission of a revised site plan that satisfactorily addressed the detail items identified in the review letter dated June 3, 2016 for administrative review and approval.**
3. **Planning Commission acceptance of the proposed building materials.**
4. **review and approval from other applicable departments and agencies.**

VOTE: 8 – 0, Motion Carried.

10. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.

A. There was no correspondence.

B. Staff Comments.

1. Interim City Manager **Barb Vanduren** introduced herself to Commissioners.

C. There were no comments from Planning Commissioners.

11. REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE.

Hall stated the Council would be conducting a second round of interviews for the city manager position.

12. REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONSULTANT.

Avantini stated that the Table of Uses in the City's Zoning Ordinance did not address pet grooming; but it seemed to be a use that fit into the Central Business area. As there was another pet grooming business already established in the

Central Business District he did not see a problem with allowing another pet grooming establishment. He suggested that pet grooming be added as an amendment when it comes time to look at zoning amendments. The proposed pet grooming business, however, would need an occupancy permit. He reported edits to the Master Plan were just about done and it would be on the July Planning Commission agenda.

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

VOTE: 8 – 0, Motion Carried.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Linda Christensen, City Clerk

Craig Owens, Chairperson

ITEM A



CIB PLANNING

Community Image Builders

June 3, 2016

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

Attention: Ms. Linda Branyan, City Clerk/Interim, City Manager

Subject: **Revised Site Plan Review, Advanced Hydrovac**, 13328 White Creek Ave., NE, located on the east side of White Creek Ave., north of 16 Mile Road, site plan dated 4/28/16.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At your request, we have completed our *revised* review of the site plan for Advanced Hydrovac to construct a 14,400 square foot, one-story building to house truck bays for vacuum trucks, an office, mechanical room, and restrooms. Proposed site improvements include: a new curb cut onto White Creek Ave.; a paved driveway; eleven (11) parking spaces including one (1) barrier-free; a "yard area" to the rear of the building; landscaping; a detention basin; and a septic system. The subject site is zoned I-1, Industrial where light industrial uses and outside storage for this use are permitted by right.

The opinions in this report are based on a review of the site plan submitted by the applicant, conformance to City plans and ordinance standards, and discussions at the May Planning Commission meeting. 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	40,000 s.f.	s.f.	In compliance
Lot Width	100 ft.	100 + ft.	In compliance

	Required	Provided	Comments
Front Yard Setbacks (White Creek Ave.)			
Building	40 ft.	65 ft.	In compliance
Parking	20 ft.	64 ft.	In compliance
Rear Yard Setbacks			
Building	40 ft.	40+ ft.	In compliance
Parking	10 ft.	10+ ft.	In compliance
Side Yard Setbacks			
Building	20 ft.	20+ ft.	In compliance
Parking (north)	10 ft.	10+ ft.	In compliance
Parking (south)	10 ft.	10+ ft.	In compliance
Lot Coverage (building)	40%	Approx. 21%	In compliance
Building Height	35 ft.	Applicant indicates this will be met	In compliance

2. Lot Split. As was discussed at the previous meeting, the subject parcel was never legally split under City ordinance by previous owners. The applicants have applied for a variance to allow the split and will provide shared access with the parent parcel having frontage to the south. Site plan approval must therefore be conditioned upon approval of the variance by the ZBA, which should be conditioned upon the submission and recording of an access easement agreement and corresponding plan for a shared entryway. This agreement will have to be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney prior to filing with the County Register of Deeds.

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	1 space per each 2 employees or 1 space per 2,000 s.f. UFA. 14,400 s.f. x 85% = 12,240 s.f. /2,000. Total Required: 6 spaces	Total Provided:11 spaces, including 1 barrier-free space.	In compliance

4. Gravel Yard Area. Section 40-513(C)(6), *Parking Lot Application and Design* requires that “all parking spaces, shall be hard surfaced with a pavement having an asphalt or concrete binder.” The email submitted with the revised site plan indicates that the “yard area has been modified to include asphalt pavement and curbing.” Although the note indicates these revisions, the site plan continues to have the note “Gravel Yard Area” to the rear of the building and must be revised. The applicant has indicated that the rear yard will be paved.

5. Curbing. *Section 40-513(C)(6), Parking Lot Application and Design* requires that "A raised or rolled concrete curb at least six inches in height shall be installed with the construction of all driveways, parking lots, access lanes and other vehicle maneuvering areas to prevent motor vehicle conflicts with abutting landscape areas, sidewalks, streets, buildings or adjoining property." The north side of the entry drive indicates the use of a concrete curb and gutter while the south side of the drive indicates the use of a "Gravel Shoulder". The Planning Commission indicated at the last meeting that one side only can have a curb to allow for proper snow removal during the winter months.

6. 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 building is setback a considerable distance from the road, this is an industrial-type building, and the overhead doors will not be visible from White Creek Ave. As such, the Planning Commission indicated that the proposed building materials will meet the above standard given the distance from the road.

7. Mechanical Unit Screening. The applicant has indicated that the ground-mounted mechanical units will be screened.

8. 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 approval of the site plan for Advanced Hydrovac, conditioned upon the following items:**

1. Approval of a variance for the lot split from the ZBA and filing of an access easement agreement with a shared entry drive, for review and approval of the City Attorney prior to filing with the County;
2. Submission of a revised site plan that satisfactorily addresses the detail items identified in this letter, for administrative review and approval;
3. Planning Commission acceptance of curbing along one side of the entry drive;
4. Planning Commission acceptance of the proposed building materials; and
5. Review and approval from other applicable departments and agencies.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING, INC.



Carmine P. Avantini, AICP
President

ITEM B



April 29, 2016
Project No. G160270

Ms. Linda Christensen
City of Cedar Springs
66 South Main Street
Cedar Springs, MI 49319-0310

Re: 13328 White Creek Avenue
Advanced Hydrovac
Site Plan Review

Dear Linda:

Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. has reviewed the site plan for the Advanced Hydrovac site dated April 28, 2016, to be located at 13328 White Creek Avenue as submitted by Callen Engineering, Inc. The revised site plan document was received in our office by email on April 28, 2016, in Adobe® format. It is our understanding the site plan will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at the May 2016 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 11-space parking lot with a single, two-way drive opening on White Creek Avenue.
- Construction of a 14,400-square-foot building which includes offices and garages for equipment.
- A large paved area east of the proposed building for vehicle turning and potential storage.
- Construction of a two bay detention basin with a restricted release that outlets to the county right of way ditch on White Creek Avenue.
- Construction of a well for domestic water service.
- Construction of a septic system and drain field.
- 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. The site is located in storm Zone A which requires infiltration of runoff if the soil conditions are conducive to infiltration. The applicant has not provided soils information for us to evaluate whether infiltration is possible. The applicant has indicated that soil testing is expected within the next few days at which point we can review the information and determine whether they can meet Storm Zone A requirements.

In the meantime, we require that a site plan be submitted for review that can meet the Storm Zone B requirements.



Flood Control Requirements

1. The applicant has proposed a two bay detention basin with a 12-inch sewer and a 4-inch reducer to restrict flow to the maximum allowed based on the acreage of the developed site. The applicant has provided calculations that support the sizing of the basin. The detention basin sizing is based on the 100-year rain event which exceeds Zone B requirements. In general, the calculations provided are acceptable; however, there are a few minor items that need to be corrected in order for the system to function as designed.
 - a. Plan Sheet C2.0 indicates the elevation of the 12-inch flared end section is 840.97 feet. The bottom of the basin is at an elevation of 840.00 feet. The storm sewer will need to be extended further east and have an invert elevation of 840.00 otherwise the last foot of the basin would not drain.
 - b. Downspouts for the building are not indicated. We want to make sure the downspouts or pitch of the roof will shed the runoff to the detention basin. Roof runoff should not be directed to the neighboring parcels to west or south.
 - c. The paved area east of the proposed building is surrounded by a concrete curb and gutter. The applicant will need to add a dub down curb at the low point in the east curb line to allow the runoff to enter the detention basin. The drawings show this same concept at the curve in the driveway; that just needs to be done further to the south as well.
 - d. As previously mentioned, the detention basin consists of two separate bays. The one to the west is intended to be a treatment forebay with a 2-inch diameter pipe connecting it to the easterly bay. The applicant is utilizing the volume of both bays for flood control however there is no positive connection between the west and east bays other than the 2-inch pipe below the flood volume elevation. In a large rain event the west bay will overflow into the easterly bay. That is acceptable provided there is a spillway or pipe connecting the two bays. A spillway at a specified elevation (possibly 841.9) with surrounding contours above that elevation to provide freeboard would be acceptable. We just need to make sure the full storage volume of the two bays can be utilized without an overflow out of the designed basin.

Bank Erosion Control Requirements

2. 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 not addressed this requirement specifically in their calculations. We performed some quick calculations and with the runoff entering the treatment forebay first it appears the 2-inch diameter outlet from that forebay will limit the flow and satisfy the Zone A requirements for bank erosion control.

Water Quality Control Requirements

3. 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 a treatment forebay with the 2-inch outlet that satisfies the water quality control requirements.

Overall, with the information provided, the storm sewer system can meet Zone B requirements with the corrections noted under Flood Control Requirements above. At this time we still prefer to see the site meet Zone A requirements depending on the results of the soil testing. We recommend the Planning Commission conditionally approve the storm system design under the following conditions:

- The applicant provide soil testing results for our review when they are available. If the existing soils are conducive to infiltration then a system will be designed to meet Storm Zone A requirements without impacting other elements of the site design. In other words, only the storm system would change and the building location, paved area, landscaping, drives, etc., would not change.



Ms. Linda Christensen
Page 3
April 29, 2016

- If the soils are not conducive to infiltration then the applicant will address the items noted above to satisfy the Zone B requirements.

In no case should the applicant be allowed to proceed before we have the opportunity to review the storm system design and provide an approval to the City Manager.

Utilities

4. City utilities are not readily available in this area and the site plan indicates the site will be served by a private well and septic system. Both of these will need approval of the Kent County Health Department (KCHD). KCHD approval of these systems is critical to the development of the property. We suggest the applicant receive approval prior to beginning any site development.

Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Controls

5. Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control (SESC) measures are shown on Sheet C2.0. The applicant will need to obtain a SESC permit from the KCRC prior to beginning any earth change activities.
 - a. The applicant should check their keying system is calling out the correct SESC measures. Some places indicate that S53 is to be used and I believe they intend for silt fence to be used (S51).
 - b. The SESC plan should include mulch blanket on any slopes 1 on 3 or steeper.

Miscellaneous Items

6. 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.

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, well, and septic permits from the KCHD.

In addition, the applicant has not fully met the Storm Water Ordinance Requirements and needs to submit information outlined above for review and approval prior to proceeding.

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

Sincerely,

FISHBECK, THOMPSON, CARR & HUBER, INC.

Michael L. Berrevoets, PE

jc2

By email

cc: Mr. Carmine Avantini, AICP, CIB Planning