

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, March 4, 2013  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
Members Present: Hammond, Lewis, Mead, Pennington, Robinson, Sperla,  
Waalkes , Williams  
Members Absent: McCarthy, excused.  
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson and approximately 25 people  
in the audience.

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

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

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Agenda. Support by  
Member Waalkes. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the January 22, 2013 meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Pennington to approve the Minutes. Support by  
Member Meade. Motion carried.**

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

Chairman Sperla asked if anyone wished to speak to a non-agenda item. None of  
the visitors present spoke to a non-agenda item.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #13-3120 5570 28<sup>th</sup> St. SE LLC**

**Property Address:** 5570 28<sup>th</sup> St. SE

**Requested Action:** Site Plan Approval for construction of a new 6,000 sq ft.  
building.

After introducing the case, Chairman Sperla asked Planner Peterson to come  
forward for staff comments.

Peterson stated that the request is Site Plan Approval in order to construct a new  
6,000 sq ft building. The plan is to remove the existing gas station building to  
accommodate the new building.

They have indicated that the building could be used for a mix between retail and  
restaurant. There were a couple of variances for setbacks, bufferyards and sign  
setback and the site plan shown is consistent with those approvals. It is

requested that the applicant be required to submit a \$5,000.00 landscape bond for the project.

Currently there is not access to the rear service drive and a meeting between the applicant and property owner has not resulted in access to the easement. It has been requested that the applicant be required to allow for access to the easement as soon as the adjoining property owner either allows for, or is required to allow access. The document for the agreement would need to be recorded.

The applicant will need to submit a revised lighting plan due to the lighting levels being higher than normal. The DDA director and Township Fire Department have reviewed and approved the plans. The Township Engineer has reviewed the plans and is recommending approval. It was noted that there are a couple of engineering issues that need to be fixed on the plan. There was a concern raised regarding the maintenance of the underground detention system. Peterson suggested that a condition be added requiring the developer to clean the sumps out every year and provide an annual report to the township to ensure it happens.

Kevin Eidson, 226 Quimby Grand Rapids, MI representing the owner showed the location of the sign and parking area. He mentioned that there has not been an agreement reached regarding the easement status with the owner south of the property.

Chairman Sperla asked if the soil could accept water from the underground detention. Kevin Eidson said that the water was not permitted to leach into the soil. The underground detention system would be a containment area only.

**Member Lewis motioned to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. Supported by Mead. Motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #13-3119 Sable Valley**

**Property Address:** 1790 Buttrick Ave.

**Requested Action:** Rezone approximately 8 acres to PUD to allow for 7 Site Condominium units.

Peterson reported that the applicant is requesting a Basic Plan Review in order to rezone approximately 8 acres for a Site Condominium Planned Unit Development called Sable Valley. The rezoning request is for 7 single-family site condo units. Currently the property is zoned R1, single-family, and is Master Planned the same. The applicant provided a test plan showing how the property

could be developed with 7 lots that use 25% open space with a minimum of 40,000 sq ft per lot.

The plan they have submitted reduced the amount of the open space to about 23 ½%. There currently is an open space around the perimeter of the site.

John Bitely from Sable Developing mentioned that there currently is a berm and landscaping to help screen the house that is located south of his new road. They are willing to put something on the site plan before the public hearing, if required by the township.

The development is proposed to have private wells and septic. This will have to be approved by the KCHD. The closest public sewer/water system is approximately 1 mile away.

There have been some issues regarding storm water in this area. The Township Engineer will need to look at the storm water system and approve the plan prior the public hearing. The developer will also have to enter into an agreement for maintenance of the storm water system. The detention pond on the site is included on lots 5 and 6. There have been attempts in the past to remove items like this from the lots to avoid any issues in the future. It is not desired that the detention pond be moved to the proposed open space, but it may be worthwhile to reduce the size of the lots 5 and 6, creating more open space around the existing detention pond location.

Peterson mentioned the desire to see what the developer is planning in regards to house size and value, and to have it be consistent with the existing homes in the neighborhood. The current home value in the area is approximately \$263,000 with an average square footage of 2,200.

The township has requested that the following information be submitted before the public hearing:

1. Review and approval by KCRC for street names and drive locations.
2. Plans indicating the private roads meet our design standards.
3. Approval from the Township Engineer.
4. Increase the open space to include the area around the detention pond.
5. Have the plans reviewed by the KCHD for their comments on the suitability of the property for well and septic and if any special provisions should be considered due to the poor filtering capacity.
6. Size and price points of homes.
7. Location and type of street trees.

**ARTICLE 8. Case #13-3124 Meadowood Development**

**Property Address:** 3361 Charlevoix Dr.

**Requested Action:** Basic Plan Review to amend the Centennial Park PUD.

The applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review to amend the existing Planned Unit Development. The existing PUD was done in the early 1970's and there are no regulations for the development like we have today for our PUD's. This amendment will create a PUD Ordinance. The closing of the golf course has triggered the amendment. The owners want to split up the property to allow recreational uses around the clubhouse. The amendment is a necessary process from a zoning perspective due to the fact that the community is essentially "built out".

The master plan shows this area as community residential, which allows for a mix of uses including attached housing, multifamily as well as low impact commercial use that are internal and integrated within the development. The allowed density in the community residential is 4-6 units per acre. Currently this development is at about 3 units per acre. The developer's plan proposes 25 additional residential units not including lots 1,2,17 and 18. The developer will need to provide details about what type of development is planned for areas 1,2,17 and 18 in order to calculate density.

Planning Director Peterson broke down the development areas and commented on each.

Development area 1: 9 acres for future commercial development. Peterson felt that we have plenty of office in the surrounding office park. He felt that introducing residential or a mixed use buildings would be more acceptable. There may be a need to see a market need study, or economic feasibility study to see if the area can support additional office, and to see what kind of impact it may have on the rest of the park. The developer should provide information on how the commercial uses will be internal and integrated into the development. Stand alone commercial uses may not be what was intended in the master plan. The developer responded that they felt that commercial use would be acceptable due to the fact that the property is bordered by I-96 and an existing commercial area.

Development area 2: 2.35 acres for office/neighborhood services. Combining this area with area number one for neighborhood services/high density residential seems more acceptable than office use.

Development area 3: West Michigan Caterer. The use will continue as a recreational use with associated clubhouse/caterer.

Development area 4: .32 acre lot for two unit condo. New curb cut being introduced. The size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure that it is consistent with the surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 5: 2.97 acre new road with three duplex buildings. New curb cut is very close to existing Meadowood Dr. Master plan does not want any private roads, roads should be public. The size, type and value of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure that it is consistent with the surrounding homes.

Development area 6: 20.12 acre lot of single family home. A large lot that would most likely be access from Thornapple River Dr. KCRC review should ensure if this is possible.

Development area 7: 9.13 acre lot to be combined with the existing home on Thornapple River Dr. will need approval of the homeowner.

Development area 8: 4.72 acre lot. This is the existing location for the centennial park landscaping operation. The removal of the golf course warrants discussion of the site. The developer would like to keep the building and be allowed to use as storage. The township would like the buildings to be removed and allow for a new home.

Development area 9: 3.57 acre – new road with three duplex buildings. New curb is very close to existing Meadowood Dr. Master plan does not want any new private roads, road should be public. The size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure that it is consistent with the surrounding homes. Area conflicts with existing Meadowood Trails PUD.

Development area 10: 1.27 acre lot – single family. New curb cut that uses a shared drive to access another home on lot 11. As with area 9, the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure that it is consistent with the surrounding homes. A small scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 11: .99 acre lot – single family. New curb that uses a shared drive through lot 10. Again, the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 12: 1.17 acre lot – single family. Use of shared drive through lot 13. Again ,the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 13: 1.93 acre lot – single family. New curb cut that creates a shared drive for lot 12. Again ,the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 14: .55 acre lot – single family. Again ,the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 15: .95 acre – open space given to Heathmoor Condominiums. Comments from the association, the proposed changes will result in the need for Heathmoor to amend their PUD.

Development area 16: 3.57 acre- open space given to Meadows Condominiums. The Meadows has provided their comments to the developer and the comments should be reflected on the site plan. One parcel would remain open space in area 15 and 16 would be common areas and maintenance would be the responsibility of the associations.

Development area 17: 2.16 acre lot – future office or neighborhood services or medium density residential. The township feels that we have plenty of office in the surrounding office park. We may want to see a study to see if the area can support additional office and what impact that would have on the rest of the park. Access to the site is poor and may require an easement from the Meadows Association to gain access.

Development area 18: .51 acre – property exchange between developer and the Meadows. This is being done to address the poor access issue for area 17. A smaller scale drawing will be needed to see the exact location of the proposed curb cut. Approval from association will be necessary. This area is not owned by Meadowood Assoc.

Development area 19: 1.16 acres – open space give to Meadows Condominiums. The Meadows has provided you with comments. These comments should be reflected on the site plan.

Development area 20: .39 acre lot – two unit condo.

Again ,the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 21: .45 acre lot – two unit condo. Again ,the size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 22: .83 acre lot – two unit condo.  
The size, type of materials and setbacks will need to be determined to ensure it is consistent with surrounding homes. A smaller scale drawing will be needed.

Development area 23: .83 acres open space to the Meadows Association. The Meadows has provided you with comments. These comments should be reflected on the site plan.

Development area 24: 2.34 acres of open space to the Gatehouse Association. Gatehouse Condominium Association has provided you with comments. These changes will require the amendment of the gatehouse PUD ordinance.

Development area 25: 3.17 acres of open space to the Meadows. The Meadows has provided you with comments. These comments should be reflected on the site plan.

The developer will need to include the following items prior to a public hearing:

1. Comments from the Heathmoor Associations, which they can have a letter outlining their goals in 30 to 40 days.
2. Application for Heathmoor to amend its PUD. They have 10 to 13 on board with area proposed, they can provide a document to that.
3. Application from Gatehouse to amend its PUD. They have provided a letter stating that.
4. Revise plans to incorporate comments from the Meadows Association. They will show perpetual landscaping buffer on areas 17 and 18.
5. Application from the Meadows Assoc. to amend PUD.
6. Details on type of housing, materials, size of units. They will work with the staff on this.

7. Test plans for lots 10 – 14. The developer is not planning to develop or spec build on these sites, but they can try and get test plans.
8. Scale of no more than 1" – 100'. Developer will comply.
9. Conceptual layout for the development, entire development.
10. Details on how the commercial office use will be compliant with the master plan. If office/commercial use is going to be considered, a study showing the need for this use. The developer is not planning on building, now would be a preliminary study.
11. Approval of their storm water plan from FTCH. Developer will work on that.
12. Review of new driveways by KCRC. This has already been completed. KCRC will provide report.

Rick Polaski from Nederveld, the planner and engineer for Meadowood Corporation and Chris Beckering, representative of Meadowood Development Corp. addressed some of the questions that were brought up.

- Chris addressed that Meadows Condo Association requested private roads due to most of the roads through there are private and better maintained than public roads.
- Rick confirmed that the ownership of the Development area 9 is part of Meadowood Development Corp.
- Chris stated that potential access for area 14 cannot be addressed until they have met with the owner of the wooded property, and currently the owner is not responsive.
- Regarding area 8 and the storage building, Rick stated that the developer would like to keep the buildings and be allowed to use as storage. It would be for commercial use such as small trade contractors and used as it is now by Procure as maintenance operations and landscaping.
- Development area 18 is currently not owned by Meadowood Assoc. Any curb cut added to address the poor access issue for area 17 needs to be 210 ft from Thornhills Dr. per KCRC.
- Rick suggested a medium density residential and proposed office neighborhood for area 17, with businesses such as a daycare, senior living, dental/medical clinic, drive through bank. If a landscape buffer is required, they would be happy to comply.
- For Development area 1, Rick stated that the developer felt that commercial use would be acceptable due to the fact that the property is bordered by I-96 and an existing commercial area.

- Question regarding maintenance of the open/common areas for Development area 16, and who would be responsible was addressed by Chris, that it would be the responsibility of the associations.

Chris Beckering responded to the staff concerns as follows:

- Adding more office space to the area would be a marketing issue, not a township/zoning issue.
- No specific plans have been made regarding commercial use meeting the master plan guidelines, or what type, if any commercial use would be allowed. They are taking the best guess as to what the market can bare and will draw up a plan if needed.
- The developer did not know why the signage is being revisited for the country club due to the fact that the use of the country club is unchanging. The sign by the highway they agree to remove.
- The developer is working with the association and staff to come up with a reasonable fit for the properties, in regards to the size and type of residential units. Rick Polaski stated that the developer plans to keep the architecture the same as the surrounding area.

Lewis motioned to create a subcommittee of the planning commission to study this project. Jack Lewis and Jeff Hammond will be on this sub-committee. The committee will meet with the applicant and any other necessary parties to address these issues and to identify any other items that may be necessary prior to going to a public hearing. Aaron Mead supported. Approved unanimously

**ARTICLE 9. Any other business:**

Concerns about there being no restrictions on gun range use, and conditions set for standards of gun ranges. The issue was agreed that it needed further review. Peterson indicated that he would insert this item as one of our goals for this year.

Status of the cell phone tower on Kendrick. Peterson indicated that the applicant is still working on it.

**ARTICLE 10. Adjournment**