

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, April 29, 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, Robinson, excused.
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson and approximately 120 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 March 4, 2013 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Waalkes to approve the Minutes. Support by Member Lewis. 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 #12-3107 Capital Telecom LLC
(from the table of September 24, 2012)**

Property Address: 5050 Kendrick Street SE

Requested Action: Construct new cell tower

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

Planner Peterson stated that we had been waiting for our Consultant to finish collecting and analyzing data from the applicant. This is for the cell phone tower being proposed at Kendrick and Patterson. (Patterson South of the airport, just north of 52nd Street). We did not have all the information for the engineer to analyze. Andy is here tonight if you have any questions.

I did talk to the airport engineer just a couple days ago and again, they were fine with it. He did just ask that the applicant refresh with him since it's been a little while, but other than that we are requesting approval as they requested.

Chairman Sperla asked if there were any questions of Steve. Member Lewis asked if Andy got all the information as was requested. Planner Peterson responded that he did.

Member Waalkes requested if there was indication that there was room for two or three platforms on this particular location so there would be room for future growth. Planner Peterson responded that this was correct. There is room for future growth on the tower as well as on the ground.

Chairman Sperla asked if there were any more questions. Since there were no questions the applicant was asked to come forward and speak to the issue if he would like.

Lewis requested we remove from the table. Pennington seconded. All in favor.

Ralph Winegarden from Faulk and Foster on behalf of the applicant. I also have with me Mike Mooney who is director of site development for the applicant. As staff mentioned you had a lot of this information in your packet and are familiar with it. This site location is basically driven by Verizon's needs and we did fully evaluate the other location down the street as requested by your consultant and also provided him with the maps demonstrating Verizon's needs. If you would like to go in depth on the maps or exhibits or particulars of the design I can do that as well.

Chairman Sperla asked if there were any other questions. There was quite a bit of material that did come to us this time and a lot of the questions we had last time about using another site have been answered. Any other questions or letters from neighbors of the public on this? Peterson responded that we did not. It is understood that this is an industrial area just south of the airport and there are no homes nearby.

Member Waalkes motioned to approve the special use permit for Capital Telecom LLC to construct this new cell phone tower at 5050 Kendrick Street SE. Supported by Mead. Motion carried unanimously.

ARTICLE 7. Case #13-3119 Sable Valley

Public Hearing

Property Address: 1790 Buttrick Ave.

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

Peterson reported that this site is located on the East side of Buttrick, just North of Bolt Avenue a little south of Grand River Drive. A seven unit planned development is proposed. The Basic Plan Review was back in early March and we did ask the applicant to go thru and follow up on some items. They have done that and this plan really reflects that.

The only changes from that plan and this plan were the inclusion of the detention pond in their open space. We have been trying to do that a little more often now to try and protect some of that storm water design so it doesn't get altered in any way when homes get built.

This is in an R-1 Single Family zoned area. It is Master Planned the same. There are not any projects that would get triggered in our Capital Improvement Plan as a result of this. Doing the PUD method does require a component of open space depending on the amount of open space dictates the lot size. They have chosen the 25% open space. This basically gets them to a minimum of 40,000 sq. ft. lots. You will notice again that some of the lots, 4, 5, & 6 are under that in order to accommodate the detention pond. In the original plan they would meet that with the detention pond as part of the lots. That is why we always look for the test plan to tell us how many lots you can really develop there. The areas around this project vary anywhere from 4.5 acres to about ¼ of an acre with house sizes averaging about 2,200 sq. ft. They are proposing 2,220 – 2,400 sq ft. homes above grade with their price point in the high \$200,000's to low \$300,000's which is probably right in the range for this particular neighborhood.

This site will be utilizing a private street on the south side of the development. This hasn't changed since you saw the basic plan. This has been reviewed and approved by the Road Commission. The design of the private street does meet our requirements.

Using septic and wells has also been reviewed by the Health Department.

As we would with any residential development within Cascade Township, we require a disclosure statement about the airport in the Master Deed and we put this into the PUD Ordinance. Our storm water agreement gets put in the PUD Ordinance as well.

The only outstanding item that was left after the last meeting was some discussion with the neighbors. The neighbor in particular, right on the corner of the new street, is concerned about screening. The developer did meet with the neighbor and they did work out a plan to basically line that lot with 20 new 6-8 ft Spruce trees to help with the screening. I know that was one of the items we asked them to follow thru on.

I listed for you the standards for the PUD rezoning and indicated that in my opinion they have met those and recommend that you forward a positive recommendation to the Board for this PUD re-zoning .

The township Engineer did ask for a little bit of information in regards to the detention pond. This is one of their storm water outlets and he needed some further information. Pretty minor in terms of what they were asking for and then the standard requirements of the Airport recognition statement, soil erosion and the storm water agreement.

I suggested we collect a \$10,000 Bond for the row of landscaping to make sure that gets done as well. If you recommend approval tonight it would come back to you with the PUD ordinance to put all that into writing. You would then forward a recommendation to the board that would then be brought to the next public hearing.

Chairman Sperla asked for questions.

Member asked: Who would maintain the open space around the detention pond? Peterson responded the Association would be responsible for that area.

Member asked: Did we study their Master Deed and bylaws to make sure that they've got maintenance of this pond included as part of that process. Peterson responded that we do review their Master Deed to make sure nothing conflicts with the Township ordinance. In terms of the Storm Water, the PUD Ordinance will have that.

Member asked: So we will see that as part of the Ordinance at the next meeting? Peterson responded. Yes, that is pretty standard language for us.

Member Waalkes asked: For chief Sigg, the new T-type turnaround, is that okay to use instead of a circle cul-de-sac? Chief Sigg responded that it would not be an issue. Peterson stated that we offer four different types of turnarounds and this is one that is approved.

Chairman Sperla Requested Applicant comes forward.

John Bitely, Sable Developing addressed some of the questions that were brought up.

Chairman Sperla asked if he had anything to add to what Steve presented? Bitely responded that as Peterson stated, he had met with the neighbors and if you could see your way to move quickly, I could have the trees in yet this Spring. The neighbors have also agreed to keep them watered but I do not plant them too late in the year or we may have problems with keeping them alive.

Member stated that other than this one neighbor, have you had anyone express disappointment or dissatisfaction with what you are proposing? Bitely responded that probably the biggest challenge is unit 7. They would like to see that a little bit further away from their street but there is minimal room. I have agreed to try to place that as best as possible subject to a buyer or client. There is a nice existing tree line through there that will also help this process.

Member Lewis motioned to approve the request for a public hearing. Supported by Mead. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Sperla asked residents to come forward that wanted to be heard on this project.

Joe Grochowalski, the original parcel was my Mother's property and I represent with my sister who is the executor of the estate, also on behalf of my other 4 brothers and 6 sisters. We would encourage you to approve the project. My mother passed away a little over a year ago and this has been a long process.

Gilbert Schroeter , 7940 Shady Brook, a resident that Sable has not talked with. His property is the third lot in. I was not aware of any of this was proceeding. The letter only went to about three people in our development. I am upset being here as a resident of Cascade over 35 years that we are putting in stand-alone condos' in that area. I thought that you wanted to have family homes not the condo type situation. I have seen even in our development that you say it will all be in bylaws, but nobody follows thru on bylaws. I got a retention pond right behind my property when I got my grandkids they would flow around, who know where they might go. I have difficulty with more access to Buttrick. I have been there long enough to see 2 fatalities on that little curve. Because of the first fatality, that's where you folks put up the original arrows. You end up with more traffic, construction and problems. Even though you did something on Grand River and knocked down that hill, it's still not enough in that area. People don't stop: they go right thru the stop sign. We have bikers that don't use the bike path and it's already dangerous. I am not pleased with this development.

Shirley Hoch, 8053 Ginger Brook Ct. My property is the largest at 4.7 acres. Lot 18 of the County Brook Plat. I was not notified of this at all . This is my first notification. My neighbor is with me tonight and she did not receive notice either. I am concerned with the traffic on Buttrick, the retention pond and mosquitoes. I have a creek running through my property and I wonder what the pond will do to my creek. We just had the largest flood ever and I had standing water. What will this pond do? I am mostly upset that I was not notified. I have the largest property and was not notified.

Member Lewis asked: Can you be more specific as to where you are in relation to the units on the map?

Hoch responded that she is on lot 18. I am concerned about the size of the development and the number of cars that will be using the road. I was not expecting this number of houses being built. I am not prepared to talk as I did not know this was in the works.

Planner Peterson was asked if notices were sent.

Peterson responded by saying that this is the public hearing so the notices received were the first notice to go out. They are sent out two weeks prior to the public hearing.

Planner Peterson stated for clarification: these are site condo's which are single family homes. The common areas will be owned by an association, the lots themselves will be owned by the individual homeowner like any other subdivision.

Member Pennington motioned to close the public hearing. Supported by Lewis. Motion carried unanimously. Public hearing closed.

Member Lewis motioned to approve the re-zoning of the 8 acres of the PUD to allow site condominiums. Supported by Waalkes. Approved with the conditions that were stipulated in the materials presented to us by staff. The PUD will be forwarded to the Board and they will have a final public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Lewis requested that the residents be informed of future meetings. Peterson responded that they would be included in future mailings. 28 homes received present notice of meeting.

ARTICLE 8. Case #13-3124 Meadowood Development

Public Hearing

Property Address: 3361 Charlevoix Dr.

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

Member Hammond made notice that he is a resident of the Condo Association that is directly affected by the decisions made and ask the Board to a vote as to procedure as I have a potential conflict of Interest. Chairman Sperla responded by saying his firm has represented the developer in the past.

Lewis stated that Sperla represented the developer in past but not on current issue. He requested two separate votes for Hammond and Serla. Lewis motioned that Hammond be excused from the meeting to avoid conflict of interest. Waalkes supported the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Lewis motioned that Sperla not be granted conflict of interest. Mead supported the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Planner Peterson presented the request.

Area 1 – near the Golf Ridge Condo’s where they have proposed eleven - Ten unit apartment buildings. They do have a clubhouse with swimming pool as well.

Area 2 -Where the clubhouse currently is today with the tennis courts and play ground area. That would remain along with the restaurant catering operation. They also show a future phase 2 of this area which is an additional 13 Ten unit apartment buildings.

Area 3 – Single family site, originally proposed as a duplex. Then you have a couple little green areas where they are signifying some open spaces that is being set aside. One being added to the Heathmoor condos and one to the existing house that is here.

Area 4 – Area around the Meadowood Trails development. When we first saw this there were 2 new roads coming in on both sides of Meadowood Trails with 6 units but now all of the green area is going to be open space for the Meadowood trails development with the area identified as number 10 as a new single family development site.

Area 5 – Corner bound by I-96 and Thornapple River Dr. Identified as possible single family building site

Area 6- has frontage along Thornapple River Drive, another single family building site

Area 7 - is where the current lawn service is located. This was approved years ago by the township for them to have their yard maintenance facility for the golf course. The lawn care business should be eliminated.

Area 8 - (hole number 2) These are four single family lots with green area set aside as open space. Original plan had 8 lots with private road. New plan calls for four lots with shared drive/roadway.

Area 13 - Single family home site. Remainder of green area dedicated as open space to the different condo associations.

The corner of Thornhills and Tahoe is proposed as a daycare. Originally it was set as commercial offices and multi-family. Commercial offices are not happening. Daycare is allowed in residential area with Special Use Permit.

Area 17 & 18 19 single family lots with a small area of open space.

Area 20 and 21 as open space getting back to Charlevoix .

Their proposed development has the possibility for as many as 252 new units in the development. Currently Centennial Park has 272 units. So this would essentially double the size of Centennial Park. Centennial Park now is zoned as part of the Centennial Park PUD and is probably the first PUD's in the area. At that time we did not write a PUD Ordinance like we do today so it is difficult to determine what is and is not permitted in Centennial Park. So essentially we have said Centennial Park is built out from the original development.

Centennial Park is seen as a mixed development use currently and the Master Plan recognizes this and we put it into a category called community residential. This tells us density for this area would be 4-6 units per acre. Which is a little bit more than what Centennial Park is today. So again, if it is 272 units today, that's about 90 acres that does not include the golf course about 3 units to acre. When you add the units you add about 43 acres which is 3.9 per acre which is well within the guidance of the Master Plan.

The Master Plan talks about single family and multi-family in this area. Cascade Township doesn't have a lot of multi-family residences in the township. We have had other projects in the past but they were not in the right area. The Master Plan identified about a half dozen locations where multi-family projects can be developed and Centennial Park is one of them.

After the basic plan review we identified a number of items that the applicant needed to address prior to proceeding. One is the review by the city of GR for

utilities. These utilities would be public sewer and water. The developer did get the information that the sewer does have the capacity. The applicant will need to provide more information to the city so they can complete their review.

A Traffic Impact Statement was done by Progressive Engineering. They did not find any traffic improvements needed. They did note two items concerning the difficulty viewing both North and South at Tahoe and Thornhills due to landscaping and topography.

The KCRC has reviewed approved the proposed driveway locations. They did want the daycare drive on Tahoe as far west as possible. The adjustment has been made.

The Wet Lands Assessment has been completed. MDEQ will need to provide comments.

Phase 1 Environmental Assessment appeared to be within normal specifications. One item of note is that it must be set up for municipal water supply.

Test Plans for Lots 11-14 has been completed.

Signs need to be removed immediately along the highway. Developer has agreed.

Type and size of the proposed single family residential units have been indicated at 2,000 sq ft. This is in line with the rest of the area. We do not have the floor plans for the apartments so we are not sure of the size.

Area 1 - Phase 1 of the apartment project. We require a second means of access with more than 19 units. This has been accomplished. The retention pond is existing which they are revising to control storm water for the development.

Area 2 – Existing clubhouse facility. A second means of access will be provided. Phase 2 of the apartment building is included in this area and secondary access will be provided. Storm water information for this area has not been provided has not been reviewed in this area.

Building Envelopes are shown on the plans. Site 5 is a difficult lot and requires a private road unlike the driveway that is currently on plan as it serves more than one residence. As it is currently designed this lot is unbuildable.

The area described as hole #2 shows examples of houses that will fit on the sites. The engineer has questions on the water retention area as he has not received all the information he needs to ensure that the detention system works.

Area 16, 17, 18 shows the typical building envelope.

The daycare location at the corner of Thornhills and Tahoe would come back as a Special Use Permit in the future. It would be advisable to get easements for future paths/walk along the frontage as well as to cut the hill along Thornhills to improve visibility looking south on Thornhills.

We do not have the floor plans for the apartments and these would be helpful to see that they are consistent with the current development.

Walkways should be built along with the apartments on Charlevoix to connect to the work the DDA is doing.

The township master plan indicates that these types of development should have public roads rather than private roads and if we decide that public roads are needed it can significantly change the plans. If we deviate from the Master Plan we should have the developer demonstrate how they are going to ensure that the road is built to our standards and what mechanism they will have to ensure long term maintenance.

This type of project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the master plan. While several details need to be worked out, the concept is sound. Staff would prefer to not approve the project at this point until the details of the project are more refined but I am in support of the concept. I would suggest that the following details be provided before the planning commission makes a recommendation.

1. Public Utilities. The Township Engineer and City of GR must approve the design as a public utility system.
2. Road design details. Planning Commission must decide if we are going to allow private roads.
3. Phase II of the apartments needs to be shown as a future of fully engineered.
4. Storm water approval from the township engineer.
5. Review from MDEQ regarding the development plan of the wetlands.
6. Easements for pathways on Tahoe and Thornhills
7. 7 foot sidewalk on Charlevoix in front of the apartments
8. Floor plans for apartments
9. Proposed selling price of all units.
10. Proposed deed restrictions for all units.
11. Eliminate the lawn care business on Thornapple River Drive
12. Eliminate lot 5 as a buildable lot.

Once these items are provided, the planning commission can meet again to review the project and provide a recommendation to the TB.

Chairman Sperla asked if there were any questions of Planner Peterson.

Member Mead asked if there was a defined anticipated use for the developer for the Landscape business. Peterson stated that the developer would like to keep it as such.

Member Mead asked if a liquor license would be needed to continue the catering business at the clubhouse and what is the plan for it. Peterson stated this is a separate issue.

Member Waalkes asked if site 5 or 6 requires an easement for the driveway. Planner Peterson feels that site 5 requires a private street as it has more than one residence accessing.

Chairman Sperla requested applicant to come forward.

Applicant is Chris Beckering, authorized agent for Meadowood Development. Rick Pulaski of Nederveld who has been working on the engineering for our master plan and Matt Zimmerman from Varnum who is our legal counsel.

Beckering stated that he believes they have an answer to all of Peterson's requirements. My request is that as we can provide substantial answers and concerns to your questions, that you recommend to move forward to develop the ordinance language.

The plan we are proposing meets the Master Plan and density projections. This plan preserves a total of 85 acres of green space.

We have support of the associations: Heathmoor, Meadows, Gatehouse, Meadowood Trails and Golfridge.

Utilities: Rick stated they have been in contact with GR and there is plenty of capacity in the sanitary sewer system for both sewer and water.

Wetlands: We did get a wetlands study by Kingman Environmental. The ponds that are in orange are greater than 500 ft from a lake or stream and is not something that needs a MDEQ permit. We are confident that we have a good plan that has been created in conjunction with the Environmental study.

There are no contaminants at the site and we will work within the expectations of any building site.

Area 1- we have a revised site plan which I feel will eliminate any concerns.

Area 2 – Clubhouse is currently on lease, he intends to purchase. Phase II was shown to prevent confusion for future plans. At this time there is no intent to build the apartments in Phase II.

The two buffer areas around site 3 (a single family lot) are new and have been added.

The primary area of concern accessing Charlevoix has gone from 12 units to 3 or 4. We would like to propose an either /or option. One being a single family unit as shown and the other being a duplex similar to existing sites. We ask for this because Heathmoor would like to reserve this as open space and would purchase the land. Meadowood has a right of first refusal on this land. All of 4, 4a and 4b is being conveyed to Meadowood Trails as per a purchase agreement and will remain open space.

Site 5 and 6 is being requested as a shared private drive and not a private road. By running the property line along the existing property line similar to 12a and 12b it meets the requirements of a shared driveway.

Site 7- the building has been used for over 25 years and we request a special use permit to continue this operation. This is a planned unit development and we have worked hard to make a plan that works for everyone.

Lots 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b have a signed purchase offer from a resident of Heathmoor Condo Association.

The green area around hole 2 is a new conveyance preserving some mature landscaping. 12c green space is to preserve the view of the Gatehouse homeowners.

14 and 15 are being conveyed to the different associations to be cared for as open space as they see fit.

The property line has been moved between 15 & 18 as requested by Mr. Clark to make a larger walking area. This allows Meadows to preserve pedestrian access thru the open space.

Area 19 -the back property line has been adjusted to alleviate that concern.

All of hole 6 is being left as open space being conveyed to Meadows and Gatehouse. The conveyance agreements on the open spaces has been made available. It will also be shown on the deed restrictions.

12c area has a new site plan which will work better with Golfridge being in the middle. New plan has fewer curb cuts and works with existing driveways. We will correct their sagging storm sewers as well as upgrading and resurfacing their roads. We will allow access to club house and pool to residents. The area in the middle is existing Golfridge Drive. There would be just driveways; not public roads to the apartments with a private utility system. GR is open to this. This plan was voted on by Golfridge Assoc.; they approved. We are looking at high end apartments. Apartment layouts are now available and presented. Unit mix would include:

- 1 bdrm. from 700-950 sq ft. Renting at \$1,100-\$1,400/month
- 2 bdrm. From 950-1400 sq ft Renting at \$1,400-\$1,800/month
- 3 brdm From 1400-1600 sq ft Renting at \$1,800-\$2,300/month

Area 2 continues as existing use but addressing the underlying zoning.

Daycare site shows a perpetual landscape buffer agreement. Perk test came back ok. We worked closely with Meadows for the use of this site.

We have 35 acres of open space; it is consistent with the master plan in both use and density. We have the support of the surrounding associations. We are not requesting any commercial permits and just a few special use permits. We are under the density allotments in the master plan. We have a plan that provides certainty to the neighbors and township. Associations are 90% in support of the plan. We ask that you move forward with this plan.

Chairman Sperla asked for questions of the board.

Member Lewis stated his concern for the driveway for site 5 crossing over the wetlands. Beckering responded by stating that the easement they are requesting uses the same path that is currently used by golf carts, they would just widen it for auto use.

Member Meade stated that it appeared site 4 was to remain undeveloped. Beckering confirmed stating the conveyance agreement with Meadowood Trails to retain this as open space. Deed restrictions would be placed on site.

Member Meade stated that site 7 was to be understood as strictly maintenance for the golf course and if it has been used as commercial landscaping it would appear to be in violation. Beckering responded that it was never golf course exclusive.

Member Sperla stated that for the most part, all of Planner Petersons requests have been addressed. There are still a few sticking points. Are you still willing to adjust these points until we are all in agreement or is this an either/or situation. Beckering stated that they have been very transparent in the process and are willing to continue to work with the township and the residents. We are not requesting a site plan approval but rather seeking a PUD rezoning. We have provided all information that is requested. The remaining issues are more for a site plan approval.

Member Pennington moved to go into public hearing. Lewis seconded. Passed unanimously.

Lee Leprich, 6081 N. Gatehouse, stated his concern for public safety and would like to see plans for sidewalks and additional traffic lights.

Beckering responded that he understood his concerns. A traffic study was performed to address this issue. In the one area of potential concern, we made adjustments to correct the issue to change the driveway to clear the site lines. No additional stop lights will be added. Sidewalks will be added in Area 1.

Aimee Capatonos is representing her mother Dolores, 6332 Tahoe Lake SE, she stated her concerns with the Fairways 20, 21 & 15 being deeded to the Meadows Association. This will be very expensive to maintain when the new houses will have use of the open but not have to pay association dues. Would there be deed restrictions to limit future development on these sites? She asked that any liabilities, i.e. sand traps, be filled by developer. Second concern was stated for Daycare entrance on Tahoe. Traffic is already busy with busses and business and adding a daycare will seem to overwhelm the area.

Beckering stated that the deed restrictions would limit all future developments on these fairways.

Planner Peterson stated that the traffic studies that have been conducted look at peak road usage times and it has been found that Tahoe can sustain the additional traffic.

Ken Krull, 6131 N Gatehouse Drive, stated that it was his understanding that the ponds on Fairway 7 were not wetlands and could be filled in. He also requested clarification if the association had already accepted the resolution.

Beckering responded that it was possible to fill in the ponds as they are manmade. The Association accepted subject to the association taking a vote ratifying the agreement.

Doug Miller, President of Golfridge Association, 3181 Charlevoix, stated that he has been very impressed with Meadowbrook Corp. willingness to work with the Associations to create a workable plan. The Association has agreed to all of the conditions and the vote was overwhelmingly positive. We don't have a final agreement as things are still changing. We are looking forward to being good neighbors.

Jim Reed, President of Gatehouse Association, 6206 South Gatehouse Drive, clarified that the Gatehouse Association has not voted at the Association level. The Board has approved to move forward to a vote. The vote will be held June 3 at their Annual Meeting. The only provision for the association to vote on is if they want to accept the 20 acres of open space into their master deed. He stated that Meadowbrook has been very cooperative in this process.

William DeVries, 6250 Tahoe Lane, clarified that the Meadows Association did accept the trade in land but we were not voting to approve the plan. That is the Townships job. Not ours. This plan will change the whole nature of the neighborhood in drastic ways, be it traffic, overall density and lifestyle changes. I ask you to look at the project not only as a plan that meets the master plan criteria but as to how it affects the people that are most impacted by the changes.

Chuck Bennett, 3450 Charlevoix, stated that while he has a substantial investment in his home and would like to see the golf course remain, he realizes this is not feasible. He recognizes that as a land owner he has certain rights and so does Meadowbrook Development. He stated that this is the best possible plan for the golf course as no one has stepped forward to buy it as such. He stated that while he does not like the golf course closure, this is the best option as we do not own the land. He hopes the plan will be supported.

Doug Griffiths, President of Meadows Association, 6325 Greenway stated that the two unanimous votes by their association were for land swap only. Sites 15 & 20 for 18A. It is the planning Commissions duty to approve or disprove the plan. We have worked extensively with Meadowbrook Development. They have been easy to work with and very receptive. He stated that the land acquired in the trade will be common property that cannot be developed. We thank you for your ease of walking us thru this process.

Bob Kramer, President of Meadowood Trail Association, 6224 Meadowood Trails Ct SE, stated that the Association voted last Thursday to overwhelmingly accept the plan for Meadowood Trails. We signed a purchase agreement with one clarification on easements. We have to protect where we live and how we live. Each association has their own issues and ideas. We were dealt and now we need to make our own decisions.

Gil Gertz, President of Heathmoor Association, 3470 Charlevoix Dr SE, stated that while no one is happy that the golf course is gone. It was understood that it had been losing money and that this was coming. Our association did agree to support the plan. Chris has been willing to make concessions. We ask the Board to approve the plan. While no one is happy, we need to move forward.

Al Page, 3590 Charlevoix, stated that we are being asked to change the integrity of our neighborhood. The neighborhood is mostly senior now and rentals will change the demographics. It will change our lifestyles and our community.

Bob Clark, 3712 Charlevoix, I am concerned with the veracity of the condo association to tell the new owners how to keep their property. I think you should look at the hardship that can be created by this. I urge you to drive out and see how these lots are staked out.

Chairman Sperla asked for more comments. None were forthcoming.

Member Lewis moved to close the public hearing. Waalkes seconded. Unanimously passed.

Member Lewis asked if Planner Petersons list had become greater or smaller based on all the meetings. Planner Peterson responded that there are still some issues. Utilities, if signed off by the City of GR, I would like to see that. The MDEQ issue can be solved with a phone call. The list has gotten smaller but there a still some big ticket items that need to be clarified.

Member Sperla stated this was a preliminary review and they are going to come back in front of us with an Ordinance and a Final Plan to approve. If the commitments are made verbally and are not fulfilled than I would not be in favor of approving. But if we have 12 items and most have been checked off, I would hate to be putting this off longer. I would be in favor of approving the preliminary plan subject to the changes that we have talked about and that the people have been talked about and subject to your considerations.

Member Meade asked Steve the question of the easement. I am hung up on 7, which is a commercial use in the middle of a residential development. The restrictions of the single family development, it is assumed it will fit in the business envelope that is currently there.

Beckering stated the Deed has been written as such to conform to the current restrictions.

Member Meade asked the relation of private drive versus public and how to address that. Planner Peterson stated that we would have to have a perpetual level of maintenance and construction plans in place. We would have to have protections for the township written in.

Peterson state that there are a few items that are relatively large points that need to be ironed out before we approve this plan. I feel what we approve should be more definitive plans and answered in a manner that is clear with changes.

Member Lewis stated that there is always something that is new or introduced at the next meeting. We want a full proposal, complete so that we can make a judgment on the way it is going to be. I would prefer to have a complete proposal with all changes included. I think we need to table for two more weeks when we can have a completed proposal.

Member Meade requested how members were leaning toward site 7. It shouldn't be there but it has been there for years and we need to make clarifications on this site. Planner Peterson stated it could be zoned as non conforming use.

Pennington made motion to table item. Lewis seconded. Passed 5-1.

Article 9. Any other business

Article 10. Adjournment