

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday, December 5, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Waalkes called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
Members Present: Waalkes, Katsma, Lewis, Mead, Pennington, Rissi, Robinson, Sperla and Williams  
Members Absent: Rissi (absent through Article 5)  
Others Present: Community Development Director, Steve Peterson and those listed on the sign in sheet.

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.**

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

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 14, 2016 Meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Sperla to approve the Minutes as presented. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 8 to 0.**

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

No visitors who were present wished to speak about non-agenda items.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #16:3329 Spees**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 6010 28<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a preliminary approval to amend the existing P.U.D. to allow for two fast food restaurants.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting preliminary approval in order to develop two fast food restaurants (Taco Bell and Freddy's Steakburger) along 28<sup>th</sup> Street.

The property has been the subject of a couple different plans that have been approved. The last plan approved was in 2007 and included a large retail strip along 28<sup>th</sup>, as well as an office in the rear of the parcel. Since the last plan was approved, the Township has changed some of the underlying zoning in the area. In 2010, the Centennial Park Overlay zoning district was created. In short, the new district allowed for more development in the park by allowing more than just offices. The current plan has been reviewed by the Centennial Park Association who provided some comments. No issues were identified by the Association but they will need to approve the signage plans before they can get a sign permit.

Applicant is showing the ability to develop three buildings on the site. Two restaurants up front and an office in the rear. The underlying zone allows for as many as 4 lots/buildings.

Applicant is providing 91 parking spaces. Parking for the two restaurants requires 90 spaces. They have provided for pedestrian access, which is a goal of the Centennial Park Overlay, as well as Master Plan.

The Township Engineer has reviewed and approved the plans. The storm water design for the site includes a detention pond that is being built to accommodate the future building in the rear of the site.

The Applicant has provided the alternative site plans that were developed. Director Peterson reviewed them and it was his evaluation that the current site plan is not that different from the originally approved P.U.D. plans. A single user site plan seems to leave the site underdeveloped which was something that the Centennial Park study also identified.

Signage has been developed to show slightly additional wall signage than what the Township allows. Freddy's proposes 100 sq. ft. of wall signage and Taco Bell proposes 108 sq. ft. They are both allowed 100 sq. ft. in total. They are also showing a pylon sign out front to accommodate the entire site. This sign is proposed at 135 sq. ft. with 280 feet of frontage they would be allowed a 56 sq. ft. pylon sign. Director Peterson feels the wall signage is fine but does not see a reason to allow triple the amount of pylon signage. 125 sq. ft. is the max for anyone so even if the Commission allowed for a bigger pylon sign, it could not be more than 125 sq. ft. Director Peterson suggested allowing up to a 70 sq. ft. pylon and reducing the height to no more than 15 feet tall and be setback at least 25 feet. This would allow all three users to have 23 sq. ft. on the pylon and reduces the height to ½ of what is allowed.

Director Peterson recommends approval of the plan. If approved, a P.U.D. Ordinance amendment would be written for the Commission's review and recommendation to the Township Board.

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

Mr. James VandenBerge, architect for Developer, came forward to discuss signage, stormwater, and landscape plans and answered questions posed by the Commission regarding traffic and elevation.

Discussion followed.

**Motion was made by Member Robinson to open the public hearing. Supported by Member Sperla. Motion carried 9-0.**

No one came forward.

**Motion was made by Member Sperla to close the public hearing. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9-0.**

**Motion was made by Member Sperla to approve plan with a condition that monument signage be limited to 70 sq. ft. for all three businesses and pylon sign be no more than 15 feet in height with a setback of at least 25 feet. The wall signs can stay as planned. Supported by Member Robinson. Motion carried 8-1.**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #16:3348 Edward Rose/Meadowbrooke P.U.D. Amendments**

**Property Address: 5794 Broadmoor Avenue & 5201 60<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting basic plan review to amend the Meadowbrooke P.U.D. to allow for multifamily residential and commercial development.

Director Peterson stated that Applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review in order to amend the existing Planned Unit Development. The amendment is needed because they would like to add a residential use to the development.

Applicant's proposal is to add 492 apartments to the P.U.D. They are also reserving approximately 37 acres for commercial retail uses. Although the retail is already permitted in the P.U.D., the residential use is not, thus the need for the amendment.

With the addition of the residential use, some pedestrian connections should also occur. While they do have some internal sidewalks planned for the apartment phase, we should see that continue to and along the frontage of M-37 and 60<sup>th</sup> Street. This would provide a connection to the commercial uses, but also the areas beyond. Caledonia Township is proposing a sidewalk along Kraft Avenue to connect Davenport to 60<sup>th</sup> Street. No parks or playgrounds are being proposed. Rather than amenities in the development, a connection for pedestrians through the project and continued to areas on M-37 and 60<sup>th</sup> Street would be a better investment and would be consistent the Township's Master Plan.

The developer should provide a traffic impact statement that provides some analysis of the projected traffic and any needed improvements that are as a result of the development. The study should also provide an evaluation for the proposed location of the access to M-37 and 60<sup>th</sup> Street. And what type, if any, for additional access to 60<sup>th</sup> Street or M-37. The plan includes public roads connecting 52<sup>nd</sup> Street to 60<sup>th</sup> and M-37. The rest of the internal drives will be private. We will need approval from the Kent County Road Commission and plans showing that they meet our standards.

Given the larger road right-of-way and to facilitate good access management, it may make sense to allow the commercial building closer to the road than our typical commercial setbacks. Director Peterson suggested allowing them close enough to place parking in the rear.

The development will be served by public utilities and sewer and water will be provided by the City of Grand Rapids. Some issues remain for the developer to figure out. The

servicing of the commercial area with sewer and water needs to be addressed, as it could have an impact on how the apartment phase is completed.

The development will need to be reviewed and approved by the Township engineer before proceeding.

There are no plans yet for the commercial portion of the project. That would come in later. However, it would be nice to see some renderings now to incorporate the proposed setbacks in the ordinance, as it would be easier to allow for some exceptions now. Otherwise, we will need to adopt some setbacks without knowing how it will be developed.

Some consideration should also be given to the adjacent residential uses. Additional landscaping or storm water detention system located in the area could be used to provide some additional buffer. If possible, a vehicular connection to the adjacent lots may also be in order to help facilitate the redevelopment of the adjacent residential properties in the future.

A signage plan should be provided to show how they would tie in both phases of the project. Any exceptions to the sign ordinance would be much easier to deal with during this phase of the approval process than it would be later once developed. Some consideration to a larger monument type sign similar to the one at I-96 and 28<sup>th</sup> Street might in order given that this is a main entry point into the Township.

This plan will need to be reviewed by the Meadowbrooke Association.

Before proceeding to the Preliminary Development Plan review (Public Hearing), Director Peterson recommends the Planning Commission address the following:

1. Traffic study;
2. Proposed commercial building setbacks;
3. Approval from the Township engineer;
4. Signage plan;
5. Incorporate sidewalks along 60<sup>th</sup> and M-37 to connect project within and to adjacent uses; and
6. Consideration for buffering and connection to the current residential uses on 60<sup>th</sup> Street.

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

Ms. Kirsten Rimes, of Edward Rose, came forward and gave a presentation of the project, let the Commission know that a traffic study was due any day and answered any questions posed the Commission.

Discussion followed mostly concerning rental costs, rental clients, parking, sanitary/sewer, and wetlands delineations.

No action was required at this time by the Commission.

**ARTICLE 8. Case #16:3330 Cascade Lodging – Meijer PUD Amendments**

**Property Address: 5411 28<sup>th</sup> Street Court.**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting preliminary approval to amend the existing PUD to allow for a new hotel.

Director Peterson stated that at the public hearing held on September 19, 2016, the Planning Commission awarded preliminary approval of the site plan and instructed staff to write the P.U.D. amendment for the project. The Applicant has reviewed the P.U.D. Ordinance changes and has agreed with the language.

Director Peterson recommended that the Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Township Board for approval of the P.U.D. amendment and revised site plan. The Township Board will then hold an additional public hearing to consider your recommendation.

**Motion was made by Member Sperla to support recommendation to the Township Board for approval of the P.U.D. amendment and revised site plan. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9-0.**

**ARTICLE 9. Any other business.**

No other business was presented.

Next meeting of the Planning Commission will be January 9, 2016.

**ARTICLE 10. Adjournment.**

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to adjourn. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Scott Rissi, Secretary