

**AGENDA**  
**Cascade Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals**  
**Tuesday, September 08, 2015**  
**7:00 pm**  
**Cascade Library Wisner Center**  
**2870 Jacksmith Ave. SE**

- ARTICLE 1. Call the meeting to order  
Record the attendance**
- ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the flag**
- ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda**
- ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the July 14, 2015 meeting**
- ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items.  
(Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker.)**
- ARTICLE 6. Case #15:3261 Tim White / Recycling Concepts  
Public Hearing  
Property Address: 5015 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Requested Action: The applicant is requesting a variance to allow a new  
driveway off from 52<sup>nd</sup> Street that does not meet our spacing standards.**
- ARTICLE 7. Any other business**
- ARTICLE 8. Adjournment**

**\*Meeting format**

1. **Staff Presentation** *Staff report and recommendation*
2. **Project presentation-** *Applicant presentation and explanation of project*
  - a. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
    - i. *Open Public Hearing. Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker; exception may be granted by the chair for representative speakers and applicants*
    - ii. *Close public hearing*
3. **Commission discussion --** *May ask for clarification from applicant, staff or public*
4. **Commission decision - Options**
  - a. *Table the decision*
  - b. *Deny*
  - c. *Approve*
  - d. *Approve with conditions*
  - e. *Recommendation to Township Board*

**ZONING MINUTES**  
**Cascade Charter Township**  
**Zoning Board of Appeals**  
**Tuesday, July 14, 2015**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**Cascade Library Wisner Center**  
**2870 Jackson Avenue SE**

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Casey called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
Members Present: Berra, Casey, McDonald, Neal  
Members Absent: Hammond (Excused)  
Others Present: Community Development Director Steve Peterson and those listed on the sign in sheet.

**ARTICLE 2.** Chairman Casey led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

**ARTICLE 3.** Approve the Agenda.

Motion made to approve the Agenda as printed by Member McDonald. Support by Member Berra. Motion carried 4-0.

**ARTICLE 4.** Approve the Minutes of the June 09, 2015 Meeting.

Motion made by Member McDonald to approve the Minutes of the June 09, 2015 Meeting as written. Support by Member Berra. Motion carried 4-0.

**ARTICLE 5.** Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items.

No visitors present wished to speak to non-agenda items.

**ARTICLE 6.** Case #15:3250 Mike Distler

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 1989 Timber Ridge Drive**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is seeking a variance to construct a new accessory building in the front yard.

Community Development Director Peterson introduced the case. The request is for an accessory building to be constructed in the front yard of property. Director Peterson refers to aerial photos of the property. Timber Ridge is a series of private streets off of Buttrick on the west side, built 10 years ago. What is important to note, is that the front of the house to the road is defined as the front yard. Although the building requested is off to the side, it is technically defined as the front yard. That is why they are asking for a variance. The size of the building in question is just under 800 sq. ft. and does not require a special Planning Commission permit, only a building permit. Director Peterson refers to a series of aerial photos, which show a series of roads that actually go through the backside of the property, technically considered a thru lot, which means there is frontage on both sides of the property. The back of the property is set up different, as it is a wooded lot with a drop off which is why the back is not used for access.

The houses and roadways are not set up in a traditional fashion, thus causing some zoning issues different from traditional neighborhoods. Director Peterson refers to 9 past variances, 7 granted and 2 denied. The 2 variances that were denied were done so because they both had reasonable alternatives for building placement. In the opinion of Director Peterson, the exceptional issues in this case are the topography, the thru lot issue and the building itself which would be on the north side of the neighbor and in the property owners front yard. The building will be 27 feet from the northern property line, and if moved back into compliance, could be as close as 10 feet. Director Peterson would like to hear from the Applicant as to why there are no other options to justify the variance. He has recommended approval of the variance that they applied for. Director Peterson has spoken to a concerned neighbor on the north side, who responded to the Public Notice.

Chairman Casey asked the Applicant to come forward with comments.

Andrew Johnson, 10690 Bailey Drive, Lowell, of Johnson Homes came forward on behalf of the Applicant. Basically, we do not have a back yard that is level. The backyard is very steep and we cannot move the structure to the back yard. This is the best spot that is the most level for the accessory building.

**Member McDonald made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Second by Member Berra. Motion passes 4-0.**

Chairman Casey asked anyone with comments to come forward.

Clifford B. Tholen, 1957 Timber Ridge Drive, came forward. We are the property immediately to the north of the Applicant. We have a concern about the Findings of Fact that there were exceptional or extraordinary conditions or circumstances about this lot. The lot does slope but most of the lots in our neighborhood are rolling or have terraced terrain in them and all of the lots are heavily wooded. It is very apparent when you are buying property and this neighborhood has been this way for 20 years. We don't feel like there is anything extraordinary. That is the way the lots are when you purchased them. The other finding of fact that it will not be injurious to the neighborhood. The neighborhood is heavily wooded and we have never taken a tree down for landscaping purposes. We have been very careful to preserve the wooded nature of our property and our neighborhood. We feel like this type of structure will detract from that. This will be a large structure of 28' x 28' and given the way the lots are designed, this structure will be visible from every room in our house. Our view will be obstructed or injured or damaged by this kind of a structure. We are concerned about this and the impact this is going to have on the neighborhood. This is the first such request of this type in our neighborhood and I am afraid it will set a precedence. Chapter 17.03 1.7 of the Township Ordinance states "will the proposed building adversely affect or be injurious to the view of any adjoining property owner or occupant." Our house is well back into the property and this will affect the bordering of our front yard. The neighborhood has always been very conscience and protective of the trees and I ask that you not approve this variance.

Member McDonald stated that the Township Ordinances are in place so that we have standards to allow for the most beautiful areas that we can in the Township. Some of the Ordinances are kind of general in meaning that it cannot be injurious to the

neighbors. I could paint my house orange and by the Ordinance I am entitled to do so, but my neighbors may find it injurious. There is subjectivity that comes into this as well. We try to have the Ordinances such that they are reasonable and consistent. The Applicant legally by Ordinance could build this structure and just put it further back so that it is then deemed to be in the side yard and not even require the Variance. If the Applicant chooses to do this it will be even closer to your property. The resident is within the Ordinance to build a structure that is legal, we cannot stop them from doing that. We have tried to entertain tree ordinances but they do not work. It becomes the task of the Homeowners Association to put in place rules within their Associations but we cannot dictate those. My point is, we look at the Finding of Fact, precedence and when there are exceptional findings. Now, if we do not grant the variance, the Applicant can slide the building slightly back and closer to your property line and not require the variance and can legally build the structure. I would ask how close you are to the property line as the structure will be 27' off the property line.

Mr. Tholen stated that they were approximately 20' from the property line. Member McDonald asked if there were trees between the structure and his home as the area is heavily wooded. Mr. Tholen stated that there will be trees between the structure and our views. Member McDonald stated that the Zoning Commission could force the Applicant to push the structure further back but we cannot prevent him from building a structure.

Mr. Tholen stated that a member of the Association would like to speak that may influence the Zoning Boards Decision. Member McDonald stated that the Township cannot dictate to an Association what their bylaws are.

Megan Magyar, 1847 Timber Ridge Drive SE, came forward as the President of the Timber Ridge Homeowners Association. In regards what Mr. Tholen stated, our Association is in the process or rewriting some of its bylaws. In the cul-de-sac next door to the Distler's, they have very strict bylaw codes that they must follow. The cul-de-sac that the Distler's live in is not so strict but we are intending to merge the two Associations. When they merge there will be a bylaw written about accessory buildings or structures be built on property. This concerns me that this could be approved before the bylaws are rewritten and approved or denied in September it could set a precedence.

Chairman Casey asked Director Peterson to clarify the Townships stance on Homeowner's Association.

Director Peterson stated that while we can appreciate the timing of the project, we do not get in the business of enforcing Homeowners Association bylaws. Our granting a permit does not have any bearing on what the Association may want to do. I understand that if this building is built and you change your bylaws it could be an issue for you.

Megan Magyar stated that we must follow the Ordinance but we can also make the rules stricter in our Association. Director Peterson stated that this was correct but we do not enforce them. We can still approve the variance and then it is up to the Homeowner's Association to enforce their deed restrictions.

Member McDonald asked if anyone in the Association spoke to Mr. Distler regarding this matter. Ms. Magyar stated that no one has spoken to Mr. Distler but the Bylaw changes have been in process since last September and several residents have come forward to complain about the structure being proposed.

Chairman Casey stated that the Homeowners Association should have registered those complaints with the Township. Ms. Magyar stated that she is not familiar with the proceedings. Chairman Casey stated that you now have a problem in making this retroactive but that is your Associations situation.

Andrew Johnson on behalf of the Applicant, stated that he believes that the Association is set up strictly for the road maintenance. I believe that this is Meets and Bounds so we are outside an Association. We did not tie in with any Association plan or bylaws on this section of the road.

Member McDonald asked the Applicant if there was any way they could further do some plantings or vegetation.

Mike Distler, 1989 Timber Ridge Drive, the homeowner stated that he was very careful of where they placed this structure. I am very proud of my house and the neighborhood and it is one of the reasons I selected Andy Johnson as my builder because I want this structure to be of the same quality as my house and to match the existing home perfectly. I want it to look like it was always there and part of the property. The location we selected will allow trees to surround the building. It will not be particularly visible from the road due to the tree coverage. I do not feel this building will detract from the house. It will not be a steel building but rather a brick structure that will match the house. One of the reasons I bought this lot is because it was not part of an Association that would prevent me from building a structure like this. To me I think it looks better to store a utility trailer and boat inside a building rather than outside to negatively impact my neighbors.

Chairman Casey asked if The Applicant had talked to any of his neighbors. The Applicant stated that he had and both neighbors he talked to were okay with it.

Member McDonald stated that he assumes that since the Applicant likes his wooded lot that he will keep as many trees as possible. He also asked what type of trees would need to be removed. The Applicant stated that most of the trees are oak and maple.

**Member McDonald made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Second by Member Berra. Motion passes 4-0.**

Member McDonald stated that he is always concerned whenever there is some negative feedback but I have to go back to what our Ordinance says and the Findings of Fact from Staff. If we denied the variance the Applicant could simply slide the structure closer to the property line and be within the Ordinance and could still build it anyway. I feel it is a better compromise to keep the location where it is today.

**Member McDonald made a motion to approve the variance based on the Findings of Fact which demonstrates the exceptions of this case and there are similar precedence with unique lot configurations and unbuildable topography. Second by Member Berra. Motion passes 4-0.**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #15:3251 Derek Benedict**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 1961 Steketee Woods Lane**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is seeking a variance to construct a new accessory building 10 feet from the side property line. The building is required to be 40 feet from the property line.

Community Development Director Peterson introduced the case. Steketee Woods Lane is a private street running off the end of Oliver Woods. The placement of the structure is why there is a variance request. This case is different than the previous case in that the building is over 832 sq. ft. and will require a Special Use Permit from the Planning Commission. The location itself is 10' away from the side property line. As the building is taller than 14 feet it requires an extra setback. The setback they are choosing is the minimum of 10' which is the setback for a 14' tall building. I did not find any old variances that we had granted for allowing a building of this height to be so close to the property line. My recommendation is that you deny this request as there are other options in this case. I recommend they build a slightly shorter building or make a different roof line. I recommend we deny the variance.

Member Berra asked if anyone had commented on the Public Hearing notice. Director Peterson stated that a few people had inquired but no comment for or against the project.

Member McDonald asked Director Peterson what the intentions were for the Ordinance to go from 10' setbacks for a 14' building to 40' setbacks for buildings between 15'-18' tall. Director Peterson stated that it was based on having a wide enough lot to accommodate such a large building. Director Peterson stated that we wanted buildings to move further away from the property line when they get taller.

Chairman Casey asked the Applicant to come forward with comments.

Derek Benedict, 1961 Steketee Woods Lane came forward as the Applicant. I am applying for this with the understanding that 10' may be asking a bit much. The building is a foot and a quarter over the allowable height. There is a bit of a limitation of the house and the patio. I cannot go much further but if it could be approved with a 20' setback, there may be a bit of play and I could move the structure. I was going for the best case scenario. I am willing to concede a little bit there. Due to the topography of the lot it does not allow for an easy way to get in and out of the building. I do have signatures from the neighbors to the north and south stating they are okay with the structure. The purpose of the building is for storage of classic cars and an ultra-light.

Member McDonald stated is that the Zoning Commission does not have a problem with

the structure and what it will be used for but we do not want to set a precedence by allowing the structure to be built so close to the property line. There are options for you to adjust the project without setting precedence.

Chairman Casey asked if the Applicant was willing to move the structure or if there were other design options that would get him closer to compliance. The Applicant stated the he has a utility trailer that requires a certain height to the building in order to store the trailer inside the building. In trying to keep the house as similar to the house as possible the roof pitch really cannot be adjusted.

**Member McDonald made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Second by Member Berra. Motion passes 4-0.**

Chairman Casey asked anyone with comments to come forward.

Brett Bielski, 1005 Waltham, owns the property next the Mr. Distler to the south. Derek was proactive in talking to the neighbors before he built. The building is quite large and it was not what my wife and I were expecting to have next to us in the wooded area. That being said, Mike has a lot of toys and he needs to have storage for them. I guess I understand the precedent but if he is willing to move it back another 10 feet we think it's a fair concession.

Member McDonald stated that this isn't a matter of design or use, it's a matter of precedence. There are no real exceptions to make this unique without setting a precedence.

Chairman Casey stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals can only grant the minimum variance required.

**Member McDonald made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Second by Member Berra. Motion passes 4-0.**

Member McDonald stated that the back of the lot has topography that would not allow the structure to the rear of the property. That being said, if the height of the building was lowered by a foot and a quarter, they would not need to be here. Director Peterson stated that this is correct. Director Peterson stated that if the Applicant is willing to move the structure back another 10' feet to 20' feet it would be acceptable.

Member McDonald asked if it was possible to move the structure back 10'. The Applicant stated that the patio could be shortened to allow room for movement. Any more than 10' would be difficult with the pool filter and patio. The Applicant stated that the roof line may be lower than I thought if we continue the roof further. Director Peterson stated that the height measurements would not change unless you went from 10' walls to 8' walls or changed the roof pitch or a combination of the two.

Member McDonald stated that we would be willing to make an exception if you would have a larger setback. The Applicant stated that he would be willing to change to a 20' setback.

**Member McDonald made a motion to approve the variance with conditions. The conditions required being a 20' setback from the side property line, building height set at no higher than 15.25' and that the project goes before the Planning Commission for a Special Use Permit for the size of the building. Support by Member Berra. Motion Passed 4-0.**

**ARTICLE 8. Any other business.**

**ARTICLE 9. Adjournment**

**Motion by Member Berra to adjourn the meeting. Support by Member McDonald. Motion Passed 4-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Seykora/Julie Kutchins  
Planning Administrative Assistant

**DRAFT**

STAFF REPORT: Case # 15-3261  
REPORT DATE: August 25, 2015  
PREPARED FOR: Cascade Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals  
MEETING DATE: September 9, 2015  
PREPARED BY: Steve Peterson, Community Development Director

APPLICANT:  
Tim White  
Recycling Concepts  
5015 52<sup>nd</sup> St  
Grand Rapids MI 49512

STATUS  
OF APPLICANT: Owner

REQUESTED ACTION: The applicant is requesting a variance to allow a new driveway off from 52<sup>nd</sup> St that does not meet our spacing standards.

EXISTING ZONING OF  
SUBJECT PARCEL(S): I

GENERAL LOCATION: North side of 52<sup>nd</sup> St between Kraft Ave and Patterson Ave.

PARCEL SIZE: 4.5 Acres

EXISTING LAND USE  
ON THE PROPERTY: Industrial

ADJACENT AREA  
LAND USES: Industrial

ZONING ON  
ADJOINING PARCELS: N, S, W - Industrial  
E – PUD 77

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

1. The applicant is requesting approval from the ZBA to allow for the construction of a new driveway in order improve the flow of truck traffic on site.
2. This is an administrative site plan and will not require approval from the Planning Commission.

3. The variance they are seeking would allow a new driveway less than 300 feet from a driveway on the same side of the road.
4. They have submitted a drawing showing that the new drive would be located 210 feet away from the neighbors drive at 4985 52nd St.
5. Our driveway spacing standards are as follows:

<b>Table 19-A: Minimum Driveway Spacing</b>	
<b>Legal Driving Speed Limit Spacing on the Public Road Which Adjoins or Abuts the Proposed Driveway (MPH)**</b>	<b>Minimum Feet*</b>
30 or Less	100
35	160
40	210
45 or Over	300
<p><i>**These traffic speeds are based upon the limits posted in Cascade Charter Township on the effective date of this zoning ordinance amendment (see Appendix - "B"). Should the posted speed limit change on a public road in the Township, it is intended that the minimum spacing requirement effective on the adoption date of this amendment would remain in force, unless amended at a later date by the Township Board.</i></p> <p><i>* These spacings are based on average vehicle acceleration and deceleration rates and are considered necessary to maintain safe traffic operation. The spacing is measured from centerline of the proposed driveway to the centerline of the nearest existing driveways or the edge of the right-of-way or easement of the nearest intersecting private or public street in either direction. See Figure 19-1.</i></p>	

6. 52<sup>nd</sup> St is listed in our zoning ordinance as a 45 mph street. The speed limit is not posted by the KCRC.
7. The ZBA can grant a variance but may only go down to the next level of spacing, which means it could not be less than 210 feet. They are asking for a separation of 210 feet.
8. The driveway location requirements have been in our zoning ordinance for years and have served us well for access management.
9. We have granted driveway spacing exceptions in the past. Usually that is in exchange for a reduction in turning movements. In other words the drive would be limited to "right only" or "right in-right out".
10. We also granted a variance to DJ landscaping just north of this site. In exchange they agreed to close their drive and share with the neighbor when the

neighboring property developed. We also recently granted a variance at 5380 52<sup>nd</sup> St with a spacing of 250 feet.

11. Before the Zoning Board of Appeals can grant a variance, it must be assured that the request meets all of the findings of fact listed in the table below:

<b><i>Findings of Fact</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>
That there are exceptional or extraordinary conditions or circumstances that are inherent to the property in question and that do not apply generally to the other nearby properties in the same zoning district.	They are also trying to coordinate this project with the KCRC reconstruction of 52 <sup>nd</sup> St. nothing exceptional exists regarding the property other than the need to improve traffic flow around the site.
That the exceptional or extraordinary conditions or circumstances are not the result of actions of the applicant taken subsequent to the adoption of this Ordinance (any action taken by an applicant pursuant to lawfully adopted regulations preceding this Ordinance will not be considered self-created)	The situation is the result of actions taken by the applicant rather than something unique about the site.
That such variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure.	The property can still be used without the variance. They are asking to simply go down to our next separation requirement of 210 feet.
That the granting of the variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.	We have granted a couple other variances in the neighborhood, however they had different circumstances. Given the speed of the street is posted at 45 mph and the fact that it's an "industrial" road that does not lend itself to other type of traffic, going down to 210 feet of separation would not seem to cause any harm to others in the area or public.
That the condition or situation of the specific piece of property, or the intended use of the property, for which the variance is sought is not of so general or recurrent nature as to make it more reasonable and practical to amend the Zoning Ordinance.	It might be a good time to look at our spacing standards in our ordinance to see if they are still appropriate in this area.
The Zoning Board of Appeals shall further find that the reasons set forth in application justify the granting of the variance, and that it is the minimum variance that will make possible the	This is the maximum amount of a variance the Ordinance permits the ZBA to grant.

reasonable use of the land, building or structure.	
--	--

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff Recommends Approval of the variance to allow the 210 foot spacing provide they are able to obtain a permit from the KCRC for the new driveway. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission study our driveway separation standards in this area.

Attachments:           Application  
                                  Site Plan



UNNAMED

UNNAMED



# Cascade Charter Township

2865 Thornhills SE Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546-7192

## PLANNING & ZONING APPLICATION

**APPLICANT:** Name: Dan Vos Construction Co. - Joe Geelhoed

Address: 6160 E. Fulton, PO Box 189, Ada, MI 49301

Telephone: 616-425-2871 Email: joeg@danvoscc.com

Facsimile: 616-676-2435

**OWNER\*:** Name: Recycling Concepts - Tim White

Address: 5015 - 52nd Street, SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49512

Telephone: 616-942-8888 Email: timw@recyclingconceptsmi.com

Facsimile: \_\_\_\_\_

(\* If different from the Applicant)

Nature of the Request: (Please check the appropriate box or boxes)

<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Appeal	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Site Plan Review
<input type="checkbox"/> Deferred Parking	<input type="checkbox"/> P.U.D. - Rezoning*
<input type="checkbox"/> P.U.D. -Site Condominium	<input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning
<input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Review*	<input type="checkbox"/> Sign Variance
<input type="checkbox"/> Special Use Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Plat Review
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zoning Variance	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

\* - Requires an initial submission of 5 copies of the completed site plan.

**BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR REQUEST\*\*:** \_\_\_\_\_

Locate a 2nd driveway on west side of property to be able to separate car traffic from truck traffic. 3 truck-car accidents in the past few months emphasizes the life-safety concerns. Driveway would need to be located at 210 ft from the next drive west on Hammco property.

(\*\*Use Attachments if Necessary)

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY\*\*:** \_\_\_\_\_

PART OF SWFRL 1/4 COM 822.0 FT 90D 00M 00S E ALONG S SEC LINE FROM SW COR OF SEC TH N 0D 26M 24S W 414.0 FT TH 90D 00M 00S W 64.83 FT TH N 0D 36M 24S W 136.0 FT TO N LINE OF S 550 FT SWFRL 1/4 TH 90D 00M 00S E ALONG SD N LINE 454.35 FT TO W LINE OF E 1050 FT OF SWFRL 1/4 TH S 0D 11M 51S W ALONG SD W LINE 549.97 FT TO S SEC LINE TH 90D 00M 00S W ALONG S SEC LINE 381.80 FT TO BEG \* SEC 30 T6N R10W 5.07 AC.

(\*\*Use Attachments if Necessary)

PERMANENT PARCEL (TAX) NUMBER: 41-19- 30-300-037

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5015 - 52nd Street SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49512

PRESENT USE OF THE PROPERTY: Process and handle industrial recycled materials.

NAME(S) & ADDRESS(ES) OF ALL OTHER PERSONS, CORPORATIONS, OR FIRMS HAVING A LEGAL OR EQUITABLE INTEREST IN THE PROPERTY:

<u>Name(s)</u>	<u>Address(es)</u>
Bridget H. Rockwell	Same as above
John DeWitt	Same as above

**SIGNATURES**

I (we) the undersigned certify that the information contained on this application form and the required documents attached hereto are to the best of my (our) knowledge true and accurate. I (we) also agree to reimburse the Cascade Charter Township for all costs, including consultant costs, to review this request in a timely manner. I (we) understand that these costs may also include administrative reviews which may occur after the Township has taken action on my (our) request.

I (we) the undersigned also acknowledge that the proposed project does not violate any known property restrictions ( i.e. plat restrictions, deed restrictions, covenants, etc.)

\* Tim White  
Owner - Print or Type Name

John DeWitt  
Applicant - Print or Type Name

(If different from Applicant)  
[Signature] 8-10-15  
\* Owner's Signature & Date  
(If different from Applicant)

[Signature]  
Applicant's Signature & Date

\*\*\*\*

**PLEASE ATTACH ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS NOTED IN THE PROCESS**

**REVIEW SHEET - THANK YOU**

Revised 03/26/02

# Recycling Concepts 5015 - 52nd Street



Copyright © 2009 - 2015 County of Kent, Michigan. All rights reserved



### Kent County Geospatial Service

DISCLAIMER: This map does not represent a legal document. Kent County Michigan makes no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding accuracy, completeness or usefulness of information presented. Users of this information assume all liability for its fitness for a particular use.

PROPOSED DR  
RECYCLING CO