



- PARK TOWNSHIP

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
October 5, 2010**

**DRAFT COPY**

Present: LeeAnne Jachim, Bill Cole, Ed de Vries, Steve Schaftenaar, Joseph Lampen, Bob Ellis, Dan Martin, attorney and Andy Bowman, Planning Consultant

Absent: Nicki Arendshorst (in audience)

Joe Lampen Vice-Chair, called the special meeting of the Park Township Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by Jachim and supported by Cole to approve the agenda as presented.

**VOTE**

Motion carried: 6-0

**MOTION**

A motion was made by Ellis and supported by Cole to approve the minutes for the August 17, 2010 regular meeting as presented.

**VOTE**

Motion carried: 6-0

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dan Mitchell, 2433 Michigan Walk, spoke regarding Point West I (PW1). He stated that he wanted to comment on the process, not on the content of the PW1 application. He asked the planning commission (PC) to be sure to look at what a sensible, “allowable” density for the project should be.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**Item #1 PUD Preliminary – Pt. West I, LLC – 2365 S. Shore Dr.**

Lampen clarified that this is a work session. There will be a presentation by the applicant and then there will be a discussion among the PC members.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by de Vries and supported by Jachim to remove the item from the table.

**VOTE**

Motion carried: 6-0

Mark Harmsen, agent representing the applicant, introduced Jim Reminga and Greg Raad as part of the design team. He gave a summary of what has happened since February when they were last before the PC. He stated that they took their project to some national planners, ultimately choosing Tracy Cross & Associates from Chicago. They asked them to start fresh with a new design, which they did over the next two months. They did not come up with a site plan, but rather an analysis. That analysis was given to Nederveld Associates. The team also spoke more extensively with the neighbors through focus groups, meetings and walk-throughs. He stated that the purpose of the meeting tonight was to give an initial look at the concept. The applicant would then come back to complete their PUD preliminary at a subsequent meeting.

Reminga, Crossroads Ventures LLC, gave a slide presentation summarizing the history and natural features of the area. He stated that similar resorts in the country were looked at and they took a long look at Seaside in Florida. He stated that the proposed project would have the following changes from their initial proposal: The road would be moved east to create a common element along the Lake Macatawa waterfront. The road from the hill would have better egress. There would be a much better separation between pedestrians and vehicles. The hillside building would be scaled back. In the large central area commonly known as "the green" there would be a service and parking access area in the middle of the single family units; all of the garages would be in the middle with the house fronts facing out all around. The number of units would be reduced to forty-eight (48), down from sixty-nine (69) with even distribution throughout the property. Most of the structures would be detached single-family houses. This would be a site condominium. Sites would be sold separately. Each building would have unique architecture. Two or three sites could be purchased for building a larger structure. The hillside building would be made into two five-unit buildings. They would be five stories high. The height would be the current height (55') of the steel frame. The first level would be parking (no anticipated grade changes). Above that there would be three levels of residential units. The fifth level would be built to enable some of the residents to have a place to enjoy the view of Lake Michigan. There would be approximately twenty-four (24) single-family sites of approximately 33' x 90' with a building envelope of 24' x 60'. Two larger buildings are planned for the west end. They would be built with three stories within the thirty-five foot (35') height limit. The scale of those buildings would not be much bigger than some of the existing cottages. If there is no market for those two buildings, the space could be used for five sites. The buildings would contain six (6) units per building. The total proposed number of units of forty-eight (48) would make the density 5.8 units/acre. The existing thirty-six (36) parking places would be displaced by houses, so there would be less traffic. He diagramed the existing fire suppression/hydrant system and how they would augment that with more hydrants and with the newer building materials and practices and fire suppression systems.

Lampen clarified that the applicant is looking for some initial feedback.

Bowman stated that the plan has to stand up to the review criteria. The PC will need to continue looking at the review standards when the revised plan is submitted.

Ellis asked what might be the minimum number of units that might ultimately be built.

Reminga stated that that would be a hard number to pin down, but it could be reduced to as low as 38-43 units.

Lampen asked what the west buildings would look like.

Reminga stated that there would be three 1,000 square-foot units on the ground floor. The two upper floors would contain three stacked units.

Cole asked about the parking garage in the hillside unit.

Reminga stated that it would be at existing grade.

Cole asked about the marina.

There was no response to this question.

Cole asked about water runoff, particularly between the new houses.

Greg Raad, Nederveld Associates, stated that there would be a storm system.

Schaftenaar asked about setbacks for the structures. He asked if building envelopes would be submitted for all of the units.

Raad stated that they would be submitting building envelopes.

Schaftenaar again asked about the boat slips.

Harmsen stated that they don't want to be in the marina business, but they do want to provide boat slips to the owners. He stated that their focus has not yet been on boat slips, but they will be figuring out those details. He stated that they do have adequate parking for boat slips and also a large riparian footprint. The slips would most likely be pushed to the north and/or south of the green space on the waterfront.

Schaftenaar reminded the applicant that boat slips would increase traffic.

Cole asked how many parking spaces are in the north lot.

Harmsen stated that they would have 70-80 spaces if they were allowed to make them 9'x18'.

Cole asked if that was the number of slips that they were considering.

Harmsen stated that it was.

Cole asked about ownership of the slips.

Harmsen stated that he doesn't know if they would sell or lease the slips. Not every potential owner would be a boater. Most likely the "left-over" boat slips would be made available to non-owners. There are expenses related to having boat slips; dock-master, summer employees, etc.

Cole asked about access to the lighthouse.

Harmsen stated that the access would remain the same. Parking would be provided for four vehicles with a one-hour pass to place on their dashboard. These spaces would be within the gate.

There was a discussion on lot or site orientation, pedestrian walkways, parking spaces, lot and site sizes, options, etc.

Ellis asked about the community building.

Reminga stated that they are not sure of the details yet, but it would be in the location shown and would be approximately 1,600 square feet.

Schaftenaar asked if a potential owner would be allowed to build a multi-family unit if they bought two or three sites.

Harmsen stated that they would be restricted to single-family structures.

Reminga clarified that the PUD would limit the maximum density or total number of units.

Harmsen stated that they would control the bulk of each structure. They don't want to see four monstrous houses on this entire property. They also would control construction by restricting who is allowed to be a builder there.

Lampen asked if they had any rationale for their density figure.

Harmsen stated that it is a matter of covering their fixed costs while still keeping this a high class development.

Ellis stated that he felt that the PC needs to look at everything and reevaluate the density to see if the prior density figure given by the PC still makes sense.

Bowman stated that there are a lot of issues to study. Does the revised design support the proposed density?

Lampen clarified that the formal feedback will be done after an official submittal.

Bowman clarified that proposed density is close enough to that offered by the township in February that most likely a rationale could be found to support the proposed density.

A brief discussion ensued.

Cole asked if the neighbors had anything to say about the narrowness of the sites.

Reminga stated that they do have to look at that before they complete their submittal.

Ellis reviewed the issues that were brought up in February and stated that he felt this was moving in a positive direction even though there were still issues to be resolved.

De Vries asked for clarification on fire-sprinkling the units.

Harmsen stated that they would all be fire-sprinkled.

Ellis stated that he wants the new plan run by the Park Township Fire Chief.

#### **MOTION**

A motion was made by Cole and supported by Jachim to table the item.

#### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 6-0

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

#### **MOTION**

A motion was made by Cole and supported by Jachim to adjourn at 8:47 p.m.

#### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 6-0

Sandy Brodie  
Recording Secretary