

**MINUTES**  
Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, August 1, 2005

**ARTICLE 1.** Secretary McDonald called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
Members Present: Koessel, Lewis, MacAllister, Logue,  
McDonald, and Richards.  
Members Absent: Goldberg, Robinson, and Postma  
Other Present: Planning Director Peterson, Planner Deem, Deputy  
Clerk Biegalle and approximately fifteen members of the public.

**ARTICLE 2.** Secretary McDonald led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ARTICLE 3.** Secretary McDonald requested motion for approval of the August  
1<sup>st</sup> agenda. **Member Lewis motioned for approval of the  
agenda, supported by Member Richards. The motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 4.** **Member Logue requested on page ten of the July 18<sup>th</sup> minutes  
in the second line down should read “the soonest construction  
could begin is in the Spring of ‘06”.**

**Member Koessel requested on page eight in the first  
paragraph, first line “she” should read Member MacAllister.**

**Member Lewis moved to accept the Minutes of the July 18,  
2005 with noted corrections, supported by Member Koessel.  
The motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 5.** **Case #05-2752: Faulk and Foster**  
(PUBLIC HEARING)  
The applicant is requesting a Type I special use permit to co-locate  
a communication antenna with a small equipment Structure at an  
existing cellular tower site.

Planning Director Peterson reviewed the request for a Type I  
special use permit by the applicant Faulk and Foster. Director  
Petersen explained the cell tower was the tower located at the  
Township Hall on Thornhills Dr. The tower was built several  
years ago by Vertical Partners. Currently there are three antennas  
on the tower. Faulk and Foster simply want to co-locate their  
antenna on the tower. Their equipment cabinet on the ground is  
within the fenced in area. Staff recommends approval of the co-  
location.

The applicant's representative Beth Streigle from Faulk and Foster was present on behalf of Centennial Cellular Operating Co. Ms. Streigle commented Director Peterson had done an excellent job in reviewing the case. Ms. Streigle explained that this equipment was identical to what had been installed at the other sites. Ms. Streigle asked the Commission if there were any questions regarding the request.

Secretary McDonald asked Planning Director Peterson if there had been any comments received regarding the request. Director Petersen stated that there had been none received.

**Member Lewis supported by Member Richards moved to open the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was opened.**

Secretary McDonald asked if any public members would like to approach the Commission. No public comments were heard.

**Member Koessel supported by Member MacAllister moved to close the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was closed.**

**Member Koessel supported by Member MacAllister motioned to approve the applicants request for a Type I special use permit to co-locate a communication antenna with a small equipment structure at an existing cellular tower site at 2865 Thornhills. The motion carried.**

## ARTICLE 6

### **Case #05-2748: Kendal Lovell (PUBLIC HEARING)**

The applicant is requesting a Type I Special Use Permit to construct a 46' x 38' accessory building.

Planner Deem reviewed the request for a Type I Special Use Permit to build an accessory building at 8205 Shadybrook Dr. An accessory building is allowed to be 832 square feet without a Special Use Permit. Planner Deem stated the parcel is 8.79 acres and is allowed three accessory buildings. Planner Deem continued to explain the location of the accessory building is approximately 183 feet from the side yard and approximately 210 feet from the front yard. An accessory building is allowed in the front yard as long as it meets minimum setback of 200 feet. The proposed height of the building is 15.5 feet to the midpoint. A building with these setbacks would be allowed to have a height of 22 feet.

Planner Deem went through the Findings of facts regarding the request for the Type I special use permit.

1. The intended use of the building.
  - Three stall garage.
2. The proposed location, type and kind of construction, and general architectural character of the building.
  - The accessory building will be placed in the front yard and does meet all the setback requirements.
3. The size of the building in relation to the house, lot and zoning district.
  - The existing home is 4,423 square feet. The proposed accessory building is 1,748 square feet.
4. The type and kind of principal and accessory buildings and structures located on properties which are adjoining and in the general area.
  - The neighboring lots have single-family homes. The Planning Commission approved recently an accessory building of 1,200 square feet, three lots to the east.
5. The topography and vegetation in the area.
  - The property is wooded.
6. Whether the proposed building will affect the light and air circulation of any adjoining properties.
  - The proposed building will not affect the light and air circulation of the adjoining properties.
7. Whether the proposed building will adversely affect the view of any adjoining property owner or occupant.
  - The proposed building will not affect the views of the adjoining buildings.
8. Points of access to the proposed building and their relationship to adjoining properties and the view from adjacent streets.
  - There will be no new curb cut to access this building.

Planner Deem recommends the Planning Commission approve the Type I Special Use Permit request for the construction of the accessory building with the following conditions:

- 1. The building not be involved, directly or indirectly with any business, trade, occupation or profession.**
- 2. Any lighting for the building be downcast.**

Secretary McDonald asked the Planning Commission if there were any questions of staff.

Member MacAllister questioned the setback, as she was having a hard time locating it on the site plan. Planner Deem explained the site plan. Member MacAllister stated that it would be helpful to know where the front and side yard is on the plan.

The applicant, Kendall Lovell of 7501 Lime Hollow was present to address any questions.

Member Lewis stated it took him awhile to find Mr. Lovell's residence. Member Lewis was surprised it was a brand new house, and asked if the area had been cleared yet for the proposed garage.

Mr. Lovell responded it had not been cleared yet.

Member Lewis stated that it was hard to picture specifically if it was not tagged or flagged.

Mr. Lovell responded that they did not know what would happen on this special permit and did not want to take down all the trees in the area prior to approval. Mr. Lovell asked if it was an appropriate time to make a point regarding the process. Mr. Lovell stated he understood our reasoning behind having the house a certain amount complete before allowing an out building going up and agrees that there are some merits to it, but he also needs to express his point. There is a huge cost and an additional amount of work to be done separate from the building of their home. If the out building would have been allowed to be built at the same time as his home, they could have used the same contractors etc... Mr. Lovell recommended that if it came into the Commissions discussions again, he would hope that they would look at it to allow people to have their separate garage and home done all at the same time.

Member Lewis asked Mr. Lovell what the accessory building would be used for. Mr. Lovell responded it would be used for a garage. He has six children just starting their teenage years.

Member McDonald asked if there would be electricity in the garage. Mr. Lovell responded that there would be. Member McDonald asked if there would be a story above it. Mr. Lovell responded that there would not be. There would be a small storage area to store lawn furniture etc...

**Member Lewis supported by Member Koessel moved to open the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was opened.**

Secretary McDonald asked if any public members would like to approach the Commission. No public comments were heard.

**Member MacAllister supported by Member Richards moved to close the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was closed.**

**Member Lewis supported by Member MacAllister motioned to approve the applicant's request for a Type I special use permit to build a 38' x 46' accessory building at 8205 Shadybrook Dr. as submitted by staff with conditions set forth by the Planning Department.**

Secretary McDonald asked if there was any additional discussion.

Member Koessel asked for a point of clarification regarding the issue the applicant raised. Member Koessel asked if it hadn't been in our ordinance that we can't build just the accessory building without the house on the property so you couldn't build just an accessory building and build a house later, but not if you are building it in conjunction with the home? Planning Director Petersen addressed Member Koessel's question in saying that the applicant was exactly right that the home would need to be at least 50% complete. There have been a few people who have went to the Zoning Board of Appeals and did a variance and do what you suggest, and I think in most cases they have given us some kind of Performance Bond and then constructed the accessory building with the house.

**The motion carried.**

## **ARTICLE 7**

### **Case #05-2750: Jan Fair (PUBLIC HEARING)**

The applicant is requesting a Type I Special Use Permit to construct a 32' x 48' accessory building.

Planner Deem reviewed the request for a Type I Special Use Permit to build a 32' x 48' accessory building at 8255 45<sup>th</sup> St. An accessory building is allowed to be 832 square feet by right without a Special Use Permit. The parcel is 7.44 acres. A parcel this size is allowed three accessory buildings. The proposed location of the accessory building is approximately 49.0 feet from the side yard and approximately 55.5 feet from the rear yard. The proposed height of the building is 17.6 feet to the midpoint. A building with these setbacks would be allowed to have a height of 18 feet. Planner Deem noted that there is an existing barn on this

property that is nonconforming to the Zoning Ordinance. This building will have to be removed due to its current condition. The removal of the building may occur after the construction of the new building, however a bond will be needed to cover the cost of the Township removing the barn.

Planner Deem went through the Findings of facts regarding the request for the Type I special use permit.

1. The intended use of the building.
  - Storage barn replacing an existing barn.
2. The proposed location, type and kind of construction, and general architectural character of the building
  - The accessory building will be placed in the rear yard. The building will have steel siding and a shingle roof.
3. The size of the building in relation to the house, lot and zoning district.
  - The existing home is 1,894 square feet with a 528 square foot attached garage. The proposed accessory building is 1,536 square feet and is replacing an existing barn.
4. The type and kind of principal and accessory buildings and structures located on properties which are adjoining and in the general area.
  - The neighboring lots have single-family homes. There are few accessory buildings in this neighborhood.
5. The topography and vegetation in the area.
  - The property slopes down away from the front yard with an approximate twenty foot elevation change.
6. Whether the proposed building will affect the light and air circulation of any adjoining properties.
  - The proposed building will not affect the light and air circulation of the adjoining properties.
7. Whether the proposed building will adversely affect the view of any adjoining property owner or occupant.
  - The proposed building will not affect the views of the adjoining buildings.
8. Points of access to the proposed building and their relationship to adjoining properties and the view from adjacent streets.
  - There will be no new curb cut to access this building.

Planner Deem recommends the Planning Commission approve the Special Use request for the construction of the accessory building with the following conditions:

1. **The building not be involved, directly or indirectly with any business, trade, occupation or profession.**
2. **Any lighting for the building be downcast.**

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Minutes of August 1, 2005

**3. The existing barn is to be removed before a building permit is awarded or post a bond for the removal of the building after the new building is complete.**

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any questions of staff.

Member Lewis stated the comment was made that there were few accessory buildings in the neighborhood, are they of this size?

Planner Deem responded that there were none this size, although this lot is larger than most of the neighboring lots.

Member Lewis stated that the barn was pretty close to the neighbors lot line. Planner Deem agreed and noted that would not be allowed today and that is one of the conditions on why it needs to be removed. The new accessory building would be set back as far as he stated it would need to be, 49 feet from the side yard.

Member McDonald addressed Planner Deem regarding his statement that it “would not affect the views”. It doesn’t block any views, but is it visible from other locations.

Planner Deem stated that he would imagine it would be visible by the other location, but no more so than other accessory buildings.

Member McDonald asked if it was heavily wooded so that it would block some view of the building.

Planner Deem stated that he would have to say “no”; you are still going to be able to see the building.

Member MacAllister asked if the proposed building fits in with the architectural character of the neighborhood. Member MacAllister noted the proposed accessory building was going to have steel siding not wood. Planner Deem concurred the proposed accessory building was going to be constructed of steel siding. Planner Deem stated that he did not have an opinion one way or another if the building fit in with the architectural character of the neighborhood.

Member Koessel asked Planner Deem if there were two drives currently. One of the plans shows a drive that seems to be located just to the west of the home, then the other one shows the drive way to the back part of the property and not to the north. Member Koessel asked if any of the Planning Commission members had made a stop at the property. Which driveway is the existing one?

Member Lewis stated that we could ask the applicant.

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any other questions for staff.

The applicant, Jan Fair of 8255 45<sup>th</sup> St., was present for questions. Mr. Fair stated he could address several concerns and questions brought up by the Commission members. The question regarding the architectural character to the house, the existing barn is vertical wood sided which is the same as the steel siding. The house is also sided with vertical wood. The roof pitch selected is also the same as the house. The ridgeline would also be the same. The intent is to have it look very nice and color to be of complimentary color to the house.

Member Lewis asked about a dumpster, are you already in the process of taking the old barn down? Mr. Fair responded that he was emptying the contents of the barn.

Mr. Fair addressed the driveway stating that in the satellite view it doesn't show up, because it has become grassed over. There was a gravel drive and a ramp to the second story of the barn, which still exists there. It is hard packed gravel but the grass has persisted in growing up. It is my intention to take the ramp to the second barn down and the barn will be demolished and the grade will be pushed back over to resume the natural grade of the property from front to back.

Mr. Fair physically showed the Commission members where the driveway is.

Member MacAllister asked if he would be extending his current driveway to get access to the new barn. Mr. Fair responded that he would be extending the driveway.

Secretary McDonald asked what the primary use of the new barn would be. Mr. Fair responded that he has several boats and tractors that he maintains.

Member Koessel questioned the 55 feet off of the side lot line. Mr. Fair stated the house is located 180 feet from the side lot line. Member Koessel noted that Mr. Fair's house was way back from the eastern property line. Mr. Fair physically reviewed the site plan with Member Koessel.

Member MacAllister asked if Mr. Fair was going to have plumbing and mechanical etc...in the barn. Mr. Fair responded they were



only going to have electrical.

**Member Lewis supported by Member MacAllister moved to open the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was opened.**

Secretary McDonald addressed Planner Deem if there had been any comments regarding the request.

Planner Deem noted a letter had been received from Jim and Jean Buist from 8239 45<sup>th</sup> St. The letter suggested the barn be put further back on the lot and not close to the road as shown on the plan. Secondly, not in favor of him building another building until the current barn is torn down. They feel the old barn is a terrible eye sore.

John Vanderveen who lives right next to the barn. The barn is a mess. Mr. Vanderveen presented an old picture of the barn and the current state of the barn. Mr. Vanderveen requested that the barn be torn down prior to a permit be given to build the new barn.

Secretary McDonald reiterated to Mr. VanderVeen that staff had recommended the old barn be torn down or a performance bond be received by the Township prior to the building permit be issued. Secretary McDonald asked Mr. VanderVeen if this was satisfactory. Mr. VanderVeen stated that the barn would need to be taken down "all the way" and haul it away with a time limit on it.

Member MacAllister addressed Mr. VanderVeen regarding the architectural character of the barn with the neighborhood. Mr. VanderVeen was not concerned about the architectural character of the barn; his concerns were with the removal of the old barn.

Frederic Wolf of 8385 45<sup>th</sup> St., whose property is directly east of the property in question. Mr. Wolf stated that the old barn needs to be removed and is very much in favor of replacing it. Doesn't feel it is right to take away someone's right to store equipment. Mr. Wolf felt the set back was fine because of a very steep ravine. Mr. Wolfe recommends that a permit be given.

Robert Greenhoe of 8316 45<sup>th</sup> St., whose property is across the street and slightly to the east. Mr. Greenhoe stated the proposed building is quite a bit shorter than the current building and would actually have far less effect on anybody's site line of what is there. Mr. Greenhoe would agree that the existing barn needs to come

down, being that is part of what the original recommendation was he does not have a problem with it. He believes that we should allow Mr. Fair to proceed with the new barn.

Member Lewis asked Mr. Fair how long had he been at the above stated address. Mr. Fair responded he had been at the address for 25 years.

**Member MacAllister supported by Member Koessel moved to close the public hearing. The motion carried and the public hearing was closed.**

Member MacAllister stated that she had a hard time supporting the difference in the character; obviously it doesn't seem to be an issue with the neighbors but this is a factor we are looking at she is a little bit "fuzzy" on how that weighs. The new barn is not as nice as what was there.

Member Richards noted that the old barn did look very nice many years ago, but I don't think he is required to match the old barn. The old barn might have been prettier, but we didn't see a picture of the house, so we don't know what it looks like compared to the house. I feel he has a large enough piece of property and it appears that the neighbors are all in agreement.

Planning Director Peterson stated that the Commission has approved other metal buildings. The character of those areas have been more rural areas of the Township. I would probably lump this area into that kind of character.

Member MacAllister stated that her point was not the fact that we are trying to replace it identically, but what is the architectural characteristic. It is the sloped roof, and the vertical siding or is it the wood siding.

**Member Koessel supported by Member Lewis motioned to approve the applicant's request for a Type I Special Use Permit to construct a 32' x 48' accessory building at 8255 45<sup>th</sup> St. with the following conditions:**

- 1. The building not be involved, directly or indirectly with any business, trade, occupation or profession.**
- 2. Any lighting for the building be downcast.**
- 3. The existing barn is to be removed and taken away before construction of the accessory building begins.**

**The motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 8.**

**Case #05-2747: Koetje Builders and Developers**

Requested Action: Rezone approximately 40 acres to PUD to allow for 31 Site Condominium units.

Planning Director Peterson stated the applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review in order to rezone approximately 40 acres for a Site Condominium Planned Unit Development called Oak Harbor preserve. This rezoning request is for 31 single-family site condo units. The location of the property is bordered by Little Harbor subdivision to its west, 48<sup>th</sup> St. to the south and I96 to the east and wrapped around to the north.

Planning Director Peterson stated that the 31 lots are in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance. The open space areas are mainly located along the road frontages. This is consistent with our Master Plan.

Planning Director Peterson noted that the development will be utilizing private streets. The developer will need to comply with our private street ordinance as well as the KCRC for the names of the streets. The location of the curb cuts off from 48<sup>th</sup> and Buttrick will also need to be approved by the KCRC. Director Petersen stated that he would like the Planning Commission to discuss the paving of Buttrick. Most times we have required developers to pave a road when they do something like this.

Planning Director Peterson also mentioned that the development is within water and sewer service boundary, although it is quite a distance away from the utility. Therefore, it would be served by well and septic.

Planning Director Peterson noted that the Kent County Soil Survey shows the soils in this area are generally sandy. Also, according to the Soil Survey, the soils in this area may have poor filtering capacity for the septic tanks.

Planning Director Peterson stated that the developers have submitted plans to the fire department and they are reviewing them at this time. The developer has not indicated the use of gates for this project. Any gates will need to be approved by the Fire Department. The Township Engineer will need to approve the stormwater plan prior to the public hearing. As we have done with other our most recent subdivisions, the developer will have to enter into an agreement for maintenance of the stormwater system.

Planning Director Peterson noted the applicant has not indicated the location of light poles or street trees in the development. Our subdivision ordinance requires both of them in every subdivision. No sidewalks are planned for the project, and would not connect to any planned or future pathways.

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any questions for staff.

Member MacAllister asked about future plans for septic and sewer.

Planning Director explained that it is within the water and sewer utility boundary (using the master plan map Peterson showed the members the boundaries). But the closest utility is still quite a distance away. It is probably not very likely that it would ever happen. Would recommend an agreement be written up that if and when it ever came out here they would agree to do a Special Assessment District and basically the owners would already be a "yes" vote. That has done in the past.

Member MacAllister said it looks like there are about twenty homes on the dead-end. What is the maximum?

Planning Director Peterson stated that twenty is the maximum number of homes on a dead-end. Peterson stated that there are actually only nineteen. The developers dead-end stub is in compliance with our rule.

Secretary McDonald asked about the poor filtering capacity. If there was poor filtering, what is the potential for run-off into the river or some tributary that could run into the river.

Planning Director Peterson stated that he didn't know. He would leave that to the Health Department. One of Director Peterson thoughts was to have it written into the deed restrictions bylaws that their systems be pumped every three years. If there is an issue. Cascade Township has never done that before.

Secretary McDonald inquired whether or not Planning Director Peterson would recommend the Special Assessment as a condition.

Planning Director Peterson stated that he felt it certainly was a good idea. He did not feel it was very likely that they would get it out there.

Secretary McDonald asked what the distance was on Buttrick that we would require the Developer to pave.

Planning Director Peterson stated that we would only require that they pave the entrance. Not to do the entire road. It would only be around a couple hundred feet.

Member Lewis asked if our ordinance gives some consideration if the developer would bury the pipes for future water and sewer rather than wait until it does come thru?

Planning Director Peterson stated that we have done a few of those. They have dry utilities. The challenge to that is that you have to engineer the entire system to know how to put the utilities in.

Secretary McDonald invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Dan Schaafsma from Latitude Engineering was present to represent Koetje Builders and Developers. Mr. Schaafsma thanked Planning Director Petersen for his overview. Some of the things Mr. Schaafsma addressed:

- 48<sup>th</sup> St. a much safer road now with the reconstruction.
- Set backs will all be meet. Front yard set back might vary a little bit.
- Natural no disturb areas. There is a path going thru the property currently and will be upkept.

Member Lewis asked about site preparation guarantees as far as how much will haul out.

Mr. Schaafsma said that they were not anticipating “hauling” that much out.

Planning Director Peterson suggested that the developer provide some calculations to our engineer to show what they need to take off or bring in to make this site work.

Member Lewis stated that he would like to see it before the public hearing.

Member Lewis stated that the close proximity to the highway, it is proposed earth scape burms. How high are they going to be.

Mr. Schaafsma responded that initially they would be eight feet, but need to look into the contour of the area and where the houses are going to sit on the site. It is kind of a win-win for both.

Member Lewis also asked that they have a better definition of that at the public hearing.

Member Logue asked what the targeted home to be constructed in the development.

Mr. Koetje responded that they probably would be 1600-1800 sq. ft. Ranch and 2200-2600 sq. ft. 2-story. These would be selling for (with the lots) very high 200,000 to 400,000/450,000.

Member Koessel inquired about whether the developer is proposing any street lighting.

Mr. Schaafsma stated that it has been discussed briefly. If allowed, they would like to have it. It is in the ordinance and they would like to abide by it.

Member Koessel asked if there were any identification signs for the development, either on 48<sup>th</sup> St. or Buttrick.

Mr. Schaafsma stated they would probably have something on 48<sup>th</sup> St. with landscaping.

Planning Director Peterson stated that our sign ordinance would allow them to have a sign at both entrances.

Secretary McDonald asked if there was a time limit for the signs.

Planning Director Peterson stated that there was not.

Member Koessel asked if there had been any discussion with the Health Department about whether it will perk acceptably.

Mr. Schaafsma stated he would contact the Health Department tomorrow. They have borings that have been done on this property for the last twenty years.

Member Logue asked if there were going to be any sidewalks.

Mr. Schàafsma stated that there would be none since it would be a private road and a dead-end street.

Member McDonald stated that he was not "quite clear" on the lighting. Are you in favor of no lighting, minimum lighting or maximum lighting?

Mr. Schaafsma stated that he was sure it would more towards the minimal standard.

Member Lewis asked if there would be “Condo type” agreements with the owners as far as street plowing or anything else out there.

Mr. Schaafsma stated that it was part of the site condo documents.

Secretary McDonald stated that before the development gets finally approved, he is sensing that the Commission will ask the developer to participate in a Special Assessment District (regarding water and sewer boundary).

Secretary McDonald reviewed some suggestions made by the Planning Commission that should be addressed prior to the public hearing:

- Calculations for site work
- Drawing and/or concrete resolution as to the proposed burming...a definition would be helpful.
- Let us know about paving of roads.
- Show fixtures for any proposed lighting

Planning Director Peterson stated that the next step after the developer provides us with the above mentioned items, a public hearing would be scheduled.

## **ARTICLE 9**

### **Case #05-2751: USR Corp**

Site Plan Approval for the car rental site at Ford International Airport.

Planner Deem stated the applicant is seeking approval to build four rental car buildings on Airport property.

Planner Deem reviewed the action the Township Board took on June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004 when a Type II Special Land Use Permit was granted with two conditions. The first condition is that the Planning Commission was to review the site plan for this property. The second was that there would not be any car sales on this site. The proposed plan is for four car rental sites with the possibility for two more car rentals at a future date. The future sites will need site plan approval from the Planning Commission before they can be developed. Also, in compliance with the Special Land Use conditions, there will be no car sales on site.

Planner Deem noted the site plan meets the requirements for setbacks, landscaping, parking, and ingress/egress.

Planner Deem stated the plan has been reviewed by the Fire Department. They have asked that:

- The address be visible from Pederson Court.
- Key boxes are to be installed on each rental building.

The applicant has agreed to this. Also, the Township Engineer has reviewed the plan and made comments to the applicant.

**Planner Deem stated staff recommends that the Planning Commission Approve the site plan with the following items to be handed in before a building permit can be issued:**

- **A soil erosion control permit be obtained.**
- **A landscaping bond for \$20,000.**
- **A lighting plan that meets Township Ordinance of max of 5.0 foot candles.**
- **Approval from the Township Engineer.**

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any questions for staff.

Member Richards asked if they developed the buildings and leased them to different car rental companies. Are they new car rental companies or are they existing and moving to the new location.

Planner Deem stated that they were existing car rental companies.

Member Lewis stated he was curious about the key boxes the Fire Department. Do they require that of all buildings?

Planner Deem explained the key boxes would be for the gates, which separate the storage of their rental cars in the rear of the building from the public parking in the front of the building. The keys are to enable the Fire Department to have accessibility all the way around the building.

Member MacAllister asked what the regulation for parking. Do we not have to provide landscape islands.

Planner Deem stated that they were provided for the public parking. Behind the gate is storage/inventory.

Secretary McDonald invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Paul Scripsema from URS Corporation explained that this was one of the first steps in the Master Plan at the airport where the ultimate goal is to expand the parking. This is required to move the existing car rental companies.



Mr. Scripsema addressed some of the concerns brought up by the Commission.

- Why so much asphalt?  
It is a storage facility...it is their business. The storage does come and go as the demand rises.
- Landscaping?  
There will be landscaping heavily along Pederson Ave., to screen those cars from major traffic on Patterson Ave.
- Site Lighting  
Will address with the Planning Department
- Site Drainage  
All goes off site to an existing Airport drainage system.

Member Koessel asked about the capacity that's currently there regarding the rental.

Mr. Scripsema responded that each rental car company averages about an acre and a half and their buildings are about 3,000 sq. ft. The new sites are three acres and the buildings are 4,200 sq. ft.

Member MacAllister asked about the monument sign on the plans. Where is that located.

Mr. Scripsema stated it was mounted about 10 feet off the set-back.

Member MacAllister asked what corner.

Mr. Scripsema noted it would be on the first drive, actually there will be one on each corner, identifying each one.

**Member Lewis supported by Member Richards motioned to approve the request to build four rental car buildings on Ford International Airport property with the conditions recommended by staff.**

Secretary McDonald asked if there was any discussion.

Member MacAllister stated that it had not been talked about and had been brought up previously was the sales of cars.

Planning Director Peterson stated sales were not allowed.

**The motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 10.**

Any Other Business  
Proposed Capital Improvement Plan

Planning Director Peterson reviewed the CIP document with the Commission. Director Peterson reminded the members that this was their planning/budgeting tool for items over \$10,000. It has to be an anticipated /adopted proponent of the Master Plan. After the resolution is approved by the Commission it goes to the Township Board for their consideration.

Planning Director Peterson recommended the Commission approve the document as presented by the committee.

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any questions of staff.

Member MacAllister asked about 28<sup>th</sup> St. sidewalks. North side all the way down??

Planning Director Peterson stated that meant north side all the way down to where they are now to Kraft.

Member MacAllister asked "not to Patterson?"

Planning Director Peterson stated if you look in the DDA schedule, you see sidewalks north side of 28<sup>th</sup> St. that is planned for 2006. That would also include the landscaping ...and then Thornhills to Charlevoix, that would be both sides of the road. That is scheduled for 2009 including sidewalks on the south side including all the street scape improvements.

Member MacAllister stated her only concern was that she did not see the north side of 28<sup>th</sup> St. between Patterson and Kraft.

Planning Director Peterson stated that she would find that in the next phase in the DDA plan which goes out 20 years. This plan only goes out six years.

Member Lewis stated they had fought very hard for cemeteries this year, and felt they were taking care of the cemeteries. The parks we had a little bit of a debate regarding the soccer fields.

Member MacAllister inquired about the forced main replacement. Was that going all the way down 28<sup>th</sup> St.

Planning Director Peterson stated that it was going from Kraft to Cascade Rd. That's is basically when the Road Commission is doing resurfacing job, that is why it is in 2007.

Member Lewis asked about the item listed under the caption of Water...Burton Street Highway.

Planning Director Peterson stated that it was the Burton Street Highway Crossing. The thought is that you have some sort of loop across the highway where Burton St. goes over the highway.

**Member Lewis supported by Member MacAllister motioned to adopt the Resolution of Support to adopt the Cascade Charter Township Capital Improvement Plan for 2006-2011. The motion carried.**

Secretary McDonald asked if there was any other business.

Planner Deem stated that at the last Board meeting the Term Limits and Lighting Ordinance had been brought before the Board. Regarding the Lighting Ordinance it is being sent back to the Commission for further review. Part of the discussion was to try and work on language relating to the downcast lighting. Some of the discussion related to the ground mounted signs...the possibility of making them exempt from the ordinance. The possibility of making works of art and flagpoles exempt and how they light them. So the Board suggested it come back to the Planning Commission to work on the language a little bit.

Planner Deem suggested a sub-committee of approximately three members be appointed to work on the language. Planner Deem suggested Member Koessel be on that committee as he is the liaison to the Board.

Secretary McDonald asked if there were any other Members that would like to serve.

Member Koessel reviewed the discussion with the Board regarding the Lighting Ordinance and the issues with the ground mounted signs and flagpoles.

Member Lewis commended Member Koessel on his tough position being the liaison between the Planning Commission and the Board.

Member Lewis appreciated the fact that the Ordinance was put back with the Commission rather than changes made at the Township Board level and rammed it through.

Member Lewis, Secretary McDonald, Member Koessel and a lighting consultant from Fishbeck will make up the sub-committee to address the issues within the proposed lighting ordinance.

Members Lewis, MacAllister and Richards stated they would not be at the next regular Planning Commission meeting.

Member Koessel reviewed the discussion of the Township Board regarding the term limits ordinance. Member Koessel commended Member Lewis for his articulation on his presentation to the Board regarding the Planning Commissions position.

Member Koessel stated some of the issues discussed at the Board level included the following:

- Issues on how a supervisor may interpret the ordinance as to how it is written.
- There are not any term limits right now as he sees it (i.e., you can serve two three year terms on the PC, two three year terms on the ZBA and then you can go back on the PC for two three year terms) Member Koessel felt that flip-flopped quite a bit. It works, but not all supervisors interpret the ordinance the same way.
- Waiting period.
- Term limits for other Township Boards.

Planning Director Peterson proposed to have some suggestions for changes at the next meeting.

Member Koessel suggested that we wait for the next meeting following as there will be a lack of attendance.

Secretary McDonald asked if there was any other business.

Member Lewis vented some frustration in the site location information the Commission has been receiving from staff. Member Lewis referred to the time spent finding a location...with the information provided...to a "scavenger hunt". Member Lewis asked staff to spend more time in giving accurate/specific directions on where a specific site is.

Planning Director Peterson stated that he appreciated anybody that goes out to the sites, because that is a big help. Director Peterson

stated that in the future you will have a better map with cross streets on them.

Member Lewis stated that they have heard it before and hope that it is true this time. Member Lewis believes the applicant deserves that right to have someone come out and observe the location and understand the request.

**Motion to adjourn was made by Member MacAllister and supported by Member Richards. The motion carried.**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Tom McDonald, Secretary  
Denise M. Biegalle, Deputy Clerk