

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, September 14, 2015  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Vice Chairman Waalkes called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.  
Members Present: Hammond, Lewis, Mead, Rissi, Robinson, Sperla, Waalkes, Williams  
Members Absent: Pennington (Excused)  
Others Present: Community Development Director, Steve Peterson, and others listed on the sign in sheet.

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.**

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.**

**Motion by Member Mead to approve the Agenda. Support by Member Hammond. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the August 17, 2015 meeting.**

**Motion by Member Lewis to approve the minutes of the August 17, 2015 meeting as written. Support by Member Rissi. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items (Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker.)**

No one wished to speak on non-agenda items.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #15-3256 Robert Harmon**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 4150 Cherry Lane**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the construction of an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft.**

Director Peterson presented the case. This is located in the agricultural zone. The Applicant is requesting approval for a 1,532 sq. ft. accessory building in their rear yard. The nearest property line is 60' away. This would allow for up to a 22' tall building. They are proposing a 16' tall metal sided building with asphalt shingles. In my opinion it is in the character of the area. The property itself is just shy of eight (8) acres and the house is 3,100 sq. ft. The size of the building would not be out of character for the area. Given the setbacks and the area this is located in, it did not trigger any other concerns that we would typically look for in a building of this size. My recommendation is that you approve the Special Use

Permit with our normal conditions that it cannot be used for living space or to run a business.

Member Lewis asked if this was the third accessory building on the property. Director Peterson stated that this was correct and with eight (8) acres the maximum allowed is three.

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Robert Harmon, 4150 Cherry Lane came forward as the Applicant.

Member Sperla asked the Applicant the square footage of the other buildings on the property. The Applicant stated that the accessory building was small and brought in on a truck and is used for lawn equipment storage.

Member Lewis asked what the new accessory building would be used for. The Applicant stated that it would be used for storage. Member Rissi asked if there would be electric or heat in the building. The Applicant stated it was strictly for storage.

Member Rissi asked if there was an additional structure on the property. The Applicant stated that there was a carport next to the garage.

**Member Lewis made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8-0.**

No one wished to speak at the Public Hearing.

**Member Rissi made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Support by Member Hammond. Motion carried 8-0.**

**Member Mead made a motion to approve Case 15:3256 to allow an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft. with the conditions that it is not used as living space or to run a business. Support by Member Sperla. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #15-3257 Jeff Shull**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 7500 Buttrick Park Drive SE**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the construction of an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft.**

Director Peterson presented the case. This is located at the north end of the Township between Buttrick and Thornapple River Drive. The site is approximately 3 acres in the R-1 Zoning District. The Applicant is proposing a 1,440 sq. ft. building, 16' tall with proposed setbacks of 40' to the nearest property line which would allow up to an 18' tall building. There is another small accessory building on the property which makes this the last allowable building on the property. The property is a little over (3) three acres and the house itself is about 3,600 sq. ft. Taking into consideration the size of the house and property the 1,400 sq. ft. building is not out of character for others that we have done. I recommend approval of the Special Use Permit with our normal conditions that it cannot be used for living space or to run a business.

I did hear from a couple neighbors but for informational purposes and did not hear any comments one way or the other.

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Jeff Shull, 7500 Buttrick came forward as the Applicant for any questions.

Member Rissi asked if there would be any plumbing, heating or electrical to the building. The Applicant stated that there would be electricity but no plumbing or heating.

**Member Rissi made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Support by Member Lewis. Motion carried 8-0.**

No one wished to speak at the Public Hearing.

**Member Rissi made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8-0.**

**Member Rissi made a motion to approve the Special Use Permit for Case 15:3256 to allow an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft. with the conditions that it is not used as living space or to run a business. Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 8. Case #15-3260 Jay Nehls**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 3100 Foxfire Lane**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the construction of an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft.**

Director Peterson presented the case. This is on the eastern side of the Township off of 28<sup>th</sup> Street and Foxfire Lane which is a private street running south off of 28<sup>th</sup> Street. The site is almost five acres, zoned Agricultural. The accessory building being proposed is almost 1,600 sq. ft. The location of the building is 90' from the closest property line which would allow up to a 22' building and they are proposing an 18' tall building. The building proposed is in the side yard as the road curves. The building would be steel siding with asphalt shingles. This is a pretty heavily wooded area on five (5) acres with the house measuring about 4,000 sq. ft. The size itself fits in with the area. I did have a couple neighbors stop in for information and the Applicant reached an agreement to make a couple minor modifications to satisfy one neighbor. The site is heavily wooded but it is deciduous trees. The Applicant agreed to plant evergreens along the back to help shield the neighbor to the east. The Applicant also agreed to lower the walls of the building from 15' to 13' feet and to increase the pitch of the roof to accommodate his own necessities while also compromising with the neighbor to the east. I am recommending approval of the Special Use Permit with our normal conditions that it cannot be used for living space or to run a business, and they add the 5-6 evergreens to the rear of the building and lower the walls of the building at least two feet from 15' to 13'.

Member Lewis asked if they changed the size of the building. Director Peterson stated that the foot print remained the same but the height of the walls changed as did the peak of the roof.

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Jay Nehls, 3100 Foxfire Lane came forward as the Applicant. The Applicant stated that Director Peterson did a great job summarizing the compromises that were made between my neighbor and myself.

Member Hammond asked if they were using scissor trusses to accommodate the roof peak. The Applicant stated this was correct.

Member Lewis stated that he congratulates the Applicant for being proactive with his neighbor.

**Member Mead made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Support by Member Hammond. Motion carried 8-0.**

No one wished to speak at the Public Hearing.

**Member Sperla made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Support by Member Lewis. Motion carried 8-0.**

**Member Mead made a motion to approve the Special Use Permit for Case 15:3256 to allow an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft. with the conditions that it is not used as living space or to run a business, no less than 5 evergreens planted along the side and lowering the exterior walls a minimum of two feet to approximately 13' in height. Support by Member Rissi. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 9. Case #15-3262 Robert Grooters Development**

**Property Address: 4957 Kraft Avenue SE**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting Site Plan Approval for new warehouse facility.**

Director Peterson presented the case. The area we are looking at is Kraft Avenue where it dead ends into the airport, north of 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. The airport is to the north, to the north and east is the airport viewing area and to the south is 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. When we dealt with the development of the properties to the south of this, this building was actually shown on those plans. In between the buildings is a conservation and wetlands area. What they are proposing now is a 337,000 sq. ft. warehouse building. They do eventually plan to extend this development going west. This is the first phase of this project and it is in the Meadowbrooke PUD Zoning District and it meets those requirements.

They did give us a landscaping plan that does a nice job of landscaping the area along Kraft Avenue. Given the fact that they will be expanding to the west and with the airport to the north and the conservation area to the south it did not make sense to add additional landscaping in the area. I feel their proposal is adequate based on the circumstances.

The Applicant submitted a lighting plan to which I have requested some minor adjustments.

Access to the sight is off of Kraft Avenue and requires a Road Commission permit and they are currently in discussion and it does not look like there will be any issues. The fire department has reviewed the plans and had routine items but nothing that changes the site plan.

When the area to the south was developed there was concern by the airport and the FAA with the retention ponds attracting birds. Those items will need to be addressed and the comments from the airport and the FAA are in the packets.

The Township Engineer needs to review and approve the plans. This project will be a little more complicated with the airport and how the water will be treated at the wetlands. Essentially we believe it can all be addressed to everyone's satisfaction in regards to storm water. They have already received their soil erosion permit and they have started some site prep work which is certainly permitted.

The Meadowbrooke Review Board has reviewed the project and we are still waiting for their comments. I recommend approval for their Site Plan for their new warehouse building contingent on the following:

- \$5,000 Landscape Bond
- Approval of the curb cut
- Compliance with the Airport letter
- Compliance with the Engineering letter
- Approval of the Meadowbrooke Review Board

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Mike Kelly, Wolverine Building Group, came forward on behalf of the Applicant.

Member Mead asked why they were choosing wall lighting as opposed to the standard parking lot lights. The Applicant stated that they have never used light poles for snow removal purposes. They have always been able to achieve the light levels needed without using the standard poles.

Member Williams asked when the project would be completed. The Applicant stated that asphalt cannot be poured until May which puts estimated completion at approximately May 17, 2016.

Member Lewis stated that the intent is for warehouse only and no industrial. The Applicant stated that it could be used for industrial but the intent is for warehouse only based on the number of dock doors. Warehouse function seems to be the biggest need around the airport.

Member Sperla asked if there were any plans to fill in the conservation area or wetlands. The Applicant stated that they are not allowed to touch that area. It is a conservation area and the old growth trees and the water that is there is untouchable and to remain intact.

**Member Rissi made a motion to approve the Site Plan for Case 15:3262 for a new warehouse facility contingent on the following conditions:**

- \$5,000 Landscape Bond

- **Approval of the curb cut by KCRC**
- **Compliance with the Airport letter**
- **Compliance with the Engineering letter**
- **Approval of the Meadowbrooke Review Board**

**Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 10. Case #15-3258 Lacks Enterprises**

**Property Address: 5769 Kraft Avenue SE**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting major changes to an approved site plan approval for new warehouse/distribution facility.**

Director Peterson presented the case. It is essentially the same building, they have just moved the buildings location east. Administratively changes can be made but the scope of the changes required it to come back before the Planning Commission. The original approval was granted in May of this year. I have described this as essentially moving 1,500 feet to the east. The Site Plan still complies with all the conditions that we granted in May.

We did have them add some extra landscaping and storm water control devices because of the concern for the residential use nearby. The light concerns have also been addressed. There is no new access to the sight. The Applicant still needs to work with the Kent County Drain Commission on some storm water items and this is part of the conditions of the original plan. The Meadowbrooke Review Board did review the plan. There seems to be a little bit of confusion between Lacks and the Review Board for jurisdiction as this building crosses into Phase I and Phase II. I am recommending approval of the Site Plan with the following conditions:

- \$5,000 Landscape Bond
- Fire Department items addressed
- Compliance with Township Engineer letter
- Kent County Drain Commission approval

Member Lewis asked the buildings use. Director Peterson stated it is for warehouse distribution.

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Pat Knight, Lacks Industries, 5460 Cascade Road came forward as the Applicant. The Applicant stated the building will be a distribution center with light assembly. This is not a plating or molding operation. It will create jobs. Right

now we will bring people from our current facility but have the ability to expand to double the size.

Director Peterson stated that Approval of the Meadowbrooke Review Board should be added to the conditions for approval.

**Member Sperla made a motion to approve Case 15:3258 Lacks Enterprises' major changes to an approved site plan for a new warehouse distribution facility that includes light manufacturing with the conditions specified by staff:**

- **\$5,000 Landscape Bond**
- **Fire Department items addressed**
- **Compliance with Township Engineer letter**
- **Kent County Drain Commission approval**
- **Meadowbrooke Review Board Approval**

**Support by Member Rissi. Motion carried 8-0.**

**ARTICLE 11. Case #15-3260 Lacks Enterprises**

**Property Address: 5460 Cascade Road SE**

**Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting to amend the Golfview PUD to allow an addition to the Lacks Corporate HQ building.**

Director Peterson presented the case. This is a PUD Amendment. The Golfview PUD includes this building, the Fishbeck building to the west, the two office buildings on Cascade Road and the old Lacks manufacturing facility to the south and two additional buildings. The different phases are included in the staff report. We essentially look at the Golfview PUD as essentially a built out development. There were some tradeoffs made at the time the Golfview PUD was approved. Originally there was another 10,000 sq. ft. building proposed in the development. That was eliminated after the original developer was not able to remove a billboard that he had promised to remove on Cascade Road.

There was a cap on the total number of office space back in the old Lacks development to the south. That area has all been occupied as well or built out. We had the cap on office space to stay true to the old Cascade Road Corridor Study that talked about certain areas with the old industrial use. As you get further off the road the buildings are over 10,000 sq. ft. where the trees hide them a little more from the roadway.

There were no center turn lanes on Cascade Road at the time of the PUD and traffic was a concern and not knowing the mixed use for the area and the impact it would have on traffic.

The Master Plan identifies this area as Mixed Use which essentially is a reflection of the uses that were already present. I would describe this proposed change as not being inconsistent with the Master Plan. The addition itself is about 10,000 sq. ft. and they have done a nice job of trying to respect the Cascade Road Corridor with both the size of the addition and they have added pitched roof features to both the new building and the existing building. The new site plan is showing some additional landscaping out front to shield the parking lot from Cascade Road. They have done a pretty good job of meeting the recommendations we have in place for buildings along the Cascade Road corridor. This is just the introductory meeting but this is the time that you can give additional recommendations that you would like to require before the Public Hearing. The recommendations that Staff is requiring are:

- Site Plan information
- Address storm water
- Provide Landscaping plans
- Address comments from the Fire Chief
- Approval from the neighbor for access from Arboretum Drive to Cascade Road.

I have heard from one of the other owners in the development that would like to explore options for expansion in the Golfview PUD as well.

Member Lewis stated that one of the ordinance requirements was an owner occupancy of the building. Will that stay in place? Director Peterson stated that Lack's would occupy this building.

Member Sperla asked where the storm water that comes off this site filters too. Director Peterson stated that the development was part of the Schoolhouse Creek Watershed. Member Sperla asked which District the site was in. Director Peterson stated A District which means they have to look into infiltration vs. detention. They are aware of all of the requirements.

Member Mead asked if the Applicant had ever experienced any water problems at the site. The Applicant stated that they had not experienced any water problems.

**Vice Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.**

Mike Corby, Integrated Architecture, 4090 Lake Drive spoke on behalf of the Applicant. We wanted to explain the thinking behind the architecture. We are using hip roof forms that make it feel more campus like and from the road you are starting to reference the roof forms and the main building stays very

horizontal. We are adding a berm along Cascade Road to screen some of the parking both in the existing lot and what we are adding to the west. Our strategy is to make it look like several smaller buildings in a cluster rather than one large building. We will put some new finishes on the existing building so the new and the old are compatible. A new entry will be added and where the site drops off in the rear of the building, the juncture between the two buildings, will have a café and conferencing area.

Member Lewis asked if they were going to build a Leeds Certified building. The Applicant stated that it would be designed as a green building but will not pursue the Leeds Certification. We are using Leeds as the basis for the design of the building.

Member Mead asked if the back access was going to be an easement or a purchase. The Applicant stated they are looking into that now.

Member Sperla stated that there is a new Storm Water Ordinance and do you know how the existing storm water from this development been handled? The Applicant stated that they will be creating a retention basin in front that will still allow us to have the berm.

Vice Chairman Waalkes asked for clarification if the entire site had to be brought up to current standards or just the new construction. Director Peterson stated that the new construction would be up to current standards but they will not be required to update the entire site.

## **ARTICLE 12. Any other business**

- **YMCA signage**

We wrote into the YMCA P.U.D. Ordinance that they would need to present to the Planning Commission their wall signage package for approval. The wall sign is on the west wall facing Burton Street. The sign is an internally lit wall sign. The rest of their signs would be at the entrances: one on Burton and one on the Burton and Kraft intersection. All the signs meet the parameters of our sign ordinance in size, height and square footage. We gave them 100 sq. ft. maximum and they are at 91 sq. ft. All of their signs are under the allowance that we allowed them.

- **Construction at Cascade Recreation Park**

Vice Chairman Waalkes stated that the back entrance to the park is having work done and many residents in Forest Valley are very upset about the work being done without notification to the neighborhood. Director Peterson stated that this

is the handicap accessible entrance to the park. The entrance has always been there and is the official bike entrance to the park for the pathway system. There will be a couple of parallel parking spaces added as well as the pedestrian handicap accessible entrance.

- **Special Use Permit for Accessory Buildings**

Vice Chairman Waalkes opened the discussion to explore whether there should be changes made to the size threshold for a special use permit. Director Peterson stated that this would be added to our Work Plan for next year.

### **ARTICLE 13. Adjournment**

**Motion made by Member Sperla to Adjourn. Support by Member Mead.  
Motion carried 8-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Mead, Secretary  
Ann Seykora  
Julie Kutchins  
Planning Administrative Assistant