

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, July 15, 2013
7:00 P.M.

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

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 Pennington. Motion carried 8-0

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the July 01, 2013 meeting.

Motion was made by Member McCarthy to approve the Minutes. Support by Member Mead. Motion carried by vote 8-0.

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

There was no one wishing to speak on non-agenda items.

ARTICLE 6. Case #13-3137 – John Slagboom

Property Address: 5210 52nd Street

Requested Action: Site plan approval for new self-storage building.

Planner Peterson stated this site was originally approved in 2002. They are asking for approval to build a small storage facility in the rear of the site. The addition is over 5,000 square feet which requires site plan approval. It is very straightforward and the Township Engineer has taken a look at it from a storm water perspective. The site was designed to accommodate this addition. We are asking that they stay in compliance with their DEQ permit and that we get verification that the retention pond was built according to the original plan. I recommend approval with those conditions.

Chairman Sperla requested if the Applicant had any comments.

Don DeGroot with Exel Engineering, represented the applicant. He stated he had nothing further to add but would take questions.

Member Lewis asked why he was not building a larger building to anticipate increased business.

Mr. DeGroot stated that the applicant was building what he felt necessary for his current business.

Member Lewis asked if Mr. DeGroot would be getting the information on the Retention Pond.

Mr. DeGroot stated that they are currently working on the field work to measure the volume of the retention pond to verify that is built per plan. We will get the results to Steve as soon as they are determined.

Member Mead asked the condition of the pond and if it looked acceptable. Mr. DeGroot said that we will make comment to that when we have the results available.

Member McCarthy asked if the building was for business use or as a lease out self storage unit.

Mr. DeGroot stated it will be a lease out self storage unit. Chairman Sperla asked if it was a 24 hour staffed facility. Mr. DeGroot stated it was not.

Chairman asked for a motion. **Member Lewis made a motion for the request for site plan approval for the self storage building be approved with the two conditions in the staff report. Supported by Member Robinson. Motion passed 8-0.**

ARTICLE 7. Case #13-3139 – Redwood Apartment Complex

Property Address: 5901 28th Street

Requested Action: Rezone approximately 15 acres to PUD to allow for 89 unit Apartment project.

Planner Peterson stated that this is a basic plan review. It is not a public hearing.

When Wal-Mart did the addition the storm water and sewer were planned and accommodated for this project. This area is zoned office. Master Plan Community Residential allows for multi- family type developments with up to 6 units per acre which is what they are proposing. There is a landscape buffer proposed. There is a difference in grade between the two areas. There is another property zoned office immediately to the west of this that is not part of this project. The area is accessed by Charlevoix Woods Court which is a private street off of 28th. Our private street ordinance talks about number of units

before a 2nd access is required. The development currently has more than 19 units per road. This is something we will need to look into. The Fire Chief will need to take a look at the plans before approval. It will be served by sewer and water as was planned for with the Wal-Mart project. The retention pond will need to be reviewed by the Drain Commission but all of this was accommodated with the Wal-Mart Project. The landscaping plans are shown and we do require lights in our residential areas and we will need to know the plans and impacts of the lights. The Master Plan does not encourage private roads but there is not a public road to access this area. We will probably have to allow a private road and will need to get a Road Maintenance Plan from the developer. Sidewalk and Pedestrian Crossings should be discussed. Currently there are no sidewalks connecting this area.

Member Sperla asked if there was any reason why they couldn't build up the berm in the flat area and simulate the other higher area.

Planner Peterson stated that it would be grading on the residential property to the North but a smaller berm may be possible. The units are one story.

Member Sperla stated that we need to be aware of the lighting so that we are not infringing on the current residence with bright lights.

Member Lewis stated that there was another development not far from this one that was successful and should be very similar to this project. Do they have sidewalks in this development? How many units?

Planner Peterson stated that project had approximately 36 apartments and has been converted to condos. There is a striped shoulder to the strip mall in lieu of a sidewalk.

Chairman Sperla requested the applicant come forward with comments.

John Lateliere, Development Director, for Redwood Acquisitions. I am joined by Richard Batt also from Redwood Acquisitions. Redwood Acquisitions is a developer of single story ranch style apartments. We have 3,000 units in the Ohio area. We are a 22 year old company looking to expand into Michigan. We build the same unit, 2 bedrooms, 2 baths, 1300 sq ft. with a two car garage. We are at 98% occupancy. No basements, slab on grate. This serves predominately an aging population so all units are FHA and ADA accessible. The plan we have for this site is low density to make it feel like a neighborhood for our residents. Exterior unit has an upgraded carriage garage door to dress up the front. Stone is used on the front with lap siding and shake siding treatment above the eave line. Different siding colors are used to give the units an identity. Rent will be \$1200 to \$1400. We perform background and credit checks on all of our residents to

maintain our 98% occupancy. Management of our developments include a fulltime on site manager and maintenance superintendent. We pay full tax bills. We provide maintenance on our private roads.

The parcel is approximately 15 acres we are requesting it be re-zoned from Office to PUD. The Master Plan calls for it to be Community Residential for 6 units to an acre. I believe this is in keeping with the Master Plan. The plan is to keep the grade as natural as possible to keep the neighborhood feel and to maintain the vegetation as much as possible. We have a larger setback than is required. We have 110 trees that are either existing or to be added. The buffer is greater than required. The main entrance will have two full time employees with residence on site. 24 ft. wide private streets are planned which exceeds the requirements of the Township. We heard from residents in the area on their concerns for the looped street and whether a T -intersection would be allowed. All units are lit with carriage lights attached to garage with auto sensors. We do not use additional poles within the development unless it is necessary for security.

The berm has two options. One is to level the area and the other is to increase vegetation as a screen. We feel a tree line of Evergreens and additional landscaping would be the better option.

Mr. Lateulere stated that they have already met with the surrounding property owners and that the meeting was cordial but there is a recognition that it is zoned as office and this is less impactful and is in keeping with the Township Master Plan. I felt the meeting went better than we expected. I walked the property with the resident most impacted by the loop drive. He requested if there was a way to do a T- intersection to reduce the impact of vehicles.

Member Mead asked if there would be a community building in the development.

Mr. Lateulere stated that no, this brings our age demographic down and our market is primarily the aging population.

Member Mead stated that the plan shows that there is a 2 car garage. Is parking allowed on streets? Are sidewalks going to be included in the plan?

Mr. Lateulere stated that we do not permit on street parking as the garage is 2 car and the driveway is a minimum of 20 feet which allows 2 additional cars and we do not permit on street parking. It is policed by our Manager and Maintenance Supervisor. We do provide additional parking throughout the development for overflow parking.

Sidewalks are not a part of the plan as our streets are 24 feet wide and allow residents to walk along the edge of the road. Sidewalks in the winter are difficult to maintain and the roads will be maintained to allow for residents to walk in the winter.

Mr. Lateulere stated that they do contract independent companies to maintain the landscaping and plowing in the winter.

Member Lewis asked if each resident would have a flowering tree in the front yard as the plan shows.

Mr. Lateulere stated that each resident will have a low growth ornamental tree that will provide a screen at eye level into perpetuity.

Member Lewis asked if the apartments qualified for government subsidies.

Mr. Lateulere Stated that they do not as this is not their business plan.

Member Lewis asked if the Maintenance Supervisor lived on site.

Mr. Lateulere stated that there is an onsite Property Manager and an onsite Maintenance Supervisor in residence.

Mr. Lateulere stated that all units are FHA and ADA approved. There are no barriers. All showers are blocked so that that hand rails can be installed to accommodate the population as it ages.

Member Lewis asked if the units were handicap accessible.

Mr. Lateulere stated units had 32 inch clearance for wheelchair accessibility. The units are designed specifically for the aging population.

Chairman Sperla asked if the perimeter could sustain a walking path or sidewalk for use by the residents.

Mr. Lateulere stated that the most logical place for a sidewalk would be the North side of the development along the mailboxes and retention pond to open it up for East /West travel.

Member Mead stated that there are a number of businesses that could be accessed by foot and is there any way a connection could be made?

Planner Peterson stated that we have not required any other business to do this and the area is pretty built out without any neighborhood connections.

Member Lewis stated his feeling on private roads leading onto Kraft where all the potholes have not been maintained. It seems this will be one of your major entrances/exits and how will this impact the residents.

Mr. Lateulere stated that if this road is not maintained the residents will use Charlevoix instead. The reason we like private roads is so that we can maintain them ourselves to make sure they are well maintained. We use concrete streets and driveways which is a superior product.

Mr. Batt stated that they put aside a portion of their rent every month toward maintenance as we remain involved in the operations beyond the building phase.

Member Hammond stated that he encouraged the developer to consider sidewalks as an amenity to the residents.

Member Mead asked if each resident would have their own curbside pick-up or would there be a central garbage pickup location.

Mr. Lateulere stated that they propose a central compactor but are currently analyzing this and do not have an answer at this time, but we do not use dumpsters.

Chairman Sperla stated that as this is a rezone so we will do a recommendation to the board. I am pleased to hear that you had the foresight to meet with the residents in advance.

Mr. Lateulere stated that he feels the residents will be their neighbors and that a good relationship is necessary to maintain.

ARTICLE 8. Case #13-3140 – Cascade Fellowship CRC

Property Address: 6655 Cascade Road SE

Requested Action: Site plan approval for addition

Member Mead asked to excuse himself from the case as he has a conflict of interest in this case. Member Lewis made a motion to excuse Member Mead. Member Robinson supported the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Planner Peterson stated that it has been 10 years since the last addition to the church. They are looking for an addition off the front of the church along with additional parking and access roads. It is something that was contemplated years ago. They have bought a couple of the properties to the south to

accommodate the new addition and parking. The storm water system will be relocated onto a new portion of their property. There are some DEQ requirements that will have to be met for the stream and they have applied for the permits. They will be hooking in to sewer and water and have done some preliminary work. The Township Engineer has taken a look at the project and the storm water system is being built to accommodate our requirements and they have met those. They did have to change their lighting plan for the parking lot and they have revised it to meet our requirements. The Fire Chief has also looked at the plans. We did put three conditions to attach to the recommendation for approval: The Soil Erosion Permit, compliance with their DEQ permit and to provide us with an as built plan so that when the pond is built for storm water that it was built as approved.

Chairman Sperla stated that he has a concern for the creek. The Township Engineer stated that this is a better system for smaller events. What will occur when we have a large event?

Planner Peterson stated that they are meeting our storm water requirements.

Chairman Sperla requested that the applicant come forward with any comments.

Craig Hondorp, Site Planner and Landscape Architect with Progressive AE spoke.

The addition will be a two story addition that will add classrooms, youth center and a commons area. The existing drive will move east with a new looped drop off area. Some parking will be relocated and a new link will be created. Additional walkway connections will be made as well. Our lighting is in compliance with the Township requirements. The new basin is more of an infiltration system than what is currently on site.

The building will have two different colors of masonry and there will be lap siding in other areas relating to the current siding on the church. The roofing will relate to the current façade as well. There will be more extensive glass at the commons area to promote the inside/outside relationship and more visibility to Cascade Road.

The conditions that Planner Peterson put on the project are no surprise and those conditions are all acceptable as part of this project.

Josh Manion, Civil Engineer, Progressive AE stated the site has a detention basin that has a pipe outlet to Schoolhouse Creek. We instead want to build a storm water infiltration basin which takes advantage of the sandy soil in the area. We received good infiltration rates on our testing and we can hold up to a 100 year

storm without allowing any water into Schoolhouse Creek. If there was a 500 year flood then water would flow into Schoolhouse Creek.

Member Sperla asked what size discharge pipe would be used?

Mr. Manion stated that it would be a 24 inch discharge pipe which is what is currently in place. He stated that the discharge pipe would only be used if the water exceeded the 100 year flood stage.

Planner Peterson stated that this is in the most stringent zone for storm water.

Member Williams stated that most areas have a smaller discharge pipe and is concerned by the size of this pipe.

Planner Peterson stated that this is simply for overflow and most water will infiltrate into the soil and not be discharged.

Member McCarthy stated that the overflow rate can be adjusted if necessary.

Mr. Manion agreed with the statement and said adjustments could be made. Two infiltration tests were conducted to see how many inches per hour water soaks in, one stated 10 and the other 13 and we are using a conservative number of 4.

Member Lewis stated he wanted to congratulate the applicant on purchasing the properties and expanding their water control system. It appears that you have done a very good job in planning. I will make a motion to approve the site plan for the addition with the conditions set in the Planner's recommendations. Support by Member Pennington. Motion Carried 7-0

ARTICLE 9. Any other business

Member Lewis stated that the Applicant was not present in the first case and we do not want to set the precedent that the Applicant does not have to be present.

Planner Peterson stated that it is expected the if the Applicant in unavailable they send a representative that is able to answer all of our questions.

Article 10. Adjournment

Member Meade made motion to adjourn. Member Williams supported. Motion carried unanimously 7-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen McCarthy, Secretary

Ann T Seykora, Planning Administrative Assistant