

## **MINUTES**

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, March 21, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Waalkes called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.  
Members Present: Katsma, Lewis, Mead, Pennington, Rissi, Robinson, Sperla, Waalkes Williams  
Members Absent: All were present.  
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 Lewis to approve the Agenda. Support by Member Pennington. Motion carried 9-0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the February 01, 2016 meeting.**

**Motion by Member Sperla to approve the minutes of the February 01, 2016 meeting with the correction to Member Waalkes name. Support by Member Mead. Motion carried 9-0.**

**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 a non-agenda item.

**ARTICLE 6. Coast to Coast Passenger Rail Presentation and Update**

Director Peterson introduced Liz Callin, Michigan Environmental Council as the presenter. Ms. Callin stated that the Michigan Environmental Council has been studying the ridership potential and costs associated with operating rail service between Michigan's major cities: Detroit, Lansing and Grand Rapids. The study included the analysis of both 79 mph and 110 mph trains. The study has shown that the 79 mph train would initially require less capital outlay but would need subsidies for operational expenses. The ROI for the 110 mph train would be much greater and would be self-supporting and potentially generate a profit.

Route Options are still being considered but three potential routes have been identified. More study would be required to determine station locations along the route. Technology options or train types were studied as well as the ridership

associated with each type of train. The study determined that ridership and profits for each route increased substantially based on speed and frequency of the trains.

While the rail infrastructure is present, it is not conducive to the high rate of speed and would require upgrades for speed, safety and comfort.

Metro Airport has an interest in using the rail as well for commuter traffic as this railway would link the three major airports which could lead to public-private partnership opportunities.

The next step in the process moving forward is to conduct a full feasibility study, which will include environmental impact analysis, an implementation plan and a review of public-private partnership options.

Member Mead stated that he is assuming that if there is an ownership flip, a large part of your revenue side of it is from revenue from the additional users. Ms. Callin stated that there is a component of the operating surplus that takes that into account and those revenues from the shared rail have been considered in the revenue figures.

Member Waalkes asked if other areas in the country have gone through this process that you are modeling your numbers structure. Ms. Callin stated they are more closely modeling the Norfolk Southern purchase in Michigan.

Member Katsma asked how consistent the subsidies are for projects of this nature. Ms. Callin stated that in Michigan it has been fairly consistent.

Ms. Callin thanked the Township for their support and will continue to provide updates as the study moves along.

**ARTICLE 7. Case #16-3297 Cascade Township  
Access Management Regulations Discussion**

Director Peterson presented the case. This was on our work plan for the year. This is not scheduled for a public hearing. Basically what we are discussing is driveway spacing for non-residential uses. There are some commercial uses in residential zones where these rules will apply. Examples would be churches, schools, bed and breakfasts and transitional uses. We do not apply the driveway spacing restrictions to homes. Access Management driveway spacing is based on the map in our Zoning Ordinance not the posted speed limit. We have very little influence on the speed limits set on the road. ZBA has granted a few variances to our driveway spacing ordinance on 52<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Our Zoning Ordinance provides many different classifications of our roads: highway, arterial streets, collector roads and local roads. I would like to essentially drop the speed limit driveway spacing requirements and use the type of road to determine driveway spacing.

Member Mead asked if 52<sup>nd</sup> Street is what is motivating this discussion. Director Peterson stated that the variances we issued put this item on our radar, but it also makes sense given our new Complete Streets policy.

Member Rissi stated that we are a little vulnerable using speed limits. I can see where it can make an applicant upset that we are using something that we have no control over. Member Sperla stated that sight distance and curves and all safety considerations should be taken into account as well. Maybe a civil engineer should be involved. Member Waalkes stated that the Road Commission has jurisdiction over all the roads and approval would also come from the Road Commission. Member Waalkes stated that the Road Commission reviews all driveway permits before allowing the driveway to be completed.

Member Mead asked what the benefit is by going above and beyond what the Road Commission requires. Director Peterson stated that we are already above and beyond the Road Commission requirements. It is fair to say that for years the goal has been to move people as fast as possible. This minimized the number of curb cuts that have been allowed. Sometimes we do not want to facilitate faster speeds. Member Sperla stated that one of the goals is to make the Village pedestrian and business friendly and we need to have a design that works well for all types of transportation.

Director Peterson indicated he would provide an ordinance recommendation for review as well as work with a transportation planner prior to coming back to the Planning Commission.

**ARTICLE 8. Case #16-3298 Cascade Township  
Food Truck Regulations**

Director Peterson presented the case. This topic was on our work plan for the year as well. Right now we do not specifically allow Food Trucks within the Township. This currently falls under Section 4.18 of our Zoning Ordinance. If you want to come into the Township you have to apply for a variance. The idea is to make it more business friendly. We could add Food Trucks within a subsection for Section 4.18. This would allow for a food truck the same way we

allow for a tent sale. My thought is that this would be a conservative way to allow for food trucks.

Member Waalkes asked if section 2e would prohibit an establishment that serves alcohol from having a food truck. Director Peterson stated that they could have the food truck to sell food but could not sell alcohol.

Member Sperla asked where we envision having food trucks. Director Peterson stated that there has been interest within the Village and along 28<sup>th</sup> Street in the parking lot of the strip malls for events. Certainly with some of the businesses that have had tent sales to be able to offer food as well. Member Sperla asked if we would get some pushback from the local food purveyors. Director Peterson stated that this is addressed in the 72 hour time limit. This limits food trucks to events not general business. Member Sperla asked if we should have an Advisory Hearing to determine if the business owners are on board with the plan. Director Peterson stated that this was an option.

Member Rissi stated that as of right now we don't have any restrictions and I can't imagine why local businesses would be upset at us being more restrictive of food trucks. Director Peterson stated that right now we would require a variance procedure. Member Rissi stated that the new definition states "mobile food unit which is temporarily stored on a privately owned lot where food items are to be sold to the general public." In reading that, I was wondering if it should say temporarily parked not stored to denote the time is short lived.

Member Mead stated that Food Truck is the name used but a lot of people are using trailers instead of an actual truck. Also, we see more of a mobile lunch truck and the truck goes to various sites throughout the day. I think we need to take these into consideration as well. There are almost two separate entities here. Director Peterson stated that currently the use of food trucks is not permitted. The mobile food unit verbiage would take care of the trailer.

Member Waalkes stated that Section 2.b has been stricken. Why do we not need it? Director Peterson stated that in the Village the requirement of 25' setbacks would limit the use of all food trucks and tents.

Member Sperla asked if a site plan was part of the permit process. Director Peterson stated that they would have to apply and provide a location of where they will be set up.

Member Katsma asked if a truck could pull up in any parking lot and sell from it. Director Peterson stated that it would have to have owners' permission to be in a parking lot.

Director Peterson indicated that he would clean up the language and would facilitate a meeting with business owners to get their input.

**ARTICLE 9. Any other business**

There was no new business.

**ARTICLE 10. Adjournment**

**Motion made by Member Mead to Adjourn. Support by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Aaron Mead, Secretary  
Ann Seykora/Julie Kutchins – Planning Administrative Assistant