

**MINUTES**  
Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, October 17, 2011  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Waalkes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
Members Present: Hammond, Lewis, Logue, McCarthy, Pennington, Robinson, Sperla, Waalkes, Williams  
Members Absent: None  
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson

**ARTICLE 2.** Chairman Waalkes led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

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

**Motion was made by Member Lewis and support by Member Pennington to approve the Agenda. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the October 3, 2011 Meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Minutes as presented. Support by Member Sperla. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 5. Case #11-3047 Kraft and 28<sup>th</sup> St Associates LLC  
(Public Hearing)**

**Address: 5595 28<sup>th</sup> St**

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting an amendment to the existing PUD to reconfigure the approved PUD plan.

**PLEASE NOTE: THE APPLICANT HAS WITHDRAWN THIS REQUEST.**

**Member Pennington made a Motion to open Public Hearing. Support by Member McCarthy. Motion carried.**

Peterson stated that a few people had called with questions.

**Member McCarthy made a Motion to close Public Hearing. Support by Member Sperla. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 6: Case #11-3051 6303 Twenty-Eighth LLC**

**Address: 6303 28<sup>th</sup> St**

**Requested Action:** Site Plan Review for an approximate 6,000 sq ft addition.

Chairman Waalkes introduced the case by stating the requested action, and then commented that this building was previously used by Nextel. He followed by asking the Planner to present the case.

Peterson explained that the applicant is requesting site plan approval to construct a small addition to the south side of the existing building. They had to go before the Zoning Board for a few variances before coming here.

The building is about 23,000 sq ft. The addition is about 6,000 sq ft for a total of about 29,000 sq ft. They haven't really identified any specific uses but in general, there will be a mix of office and retail. There is plenty of parking, even after they remove some of the parking spaces to install new landscape islands.

The Township Engineer has reviewed the site and has expressed concern for the stormwater system. Most of this concern is due to a lack of information provided by the applicant.

The Fire Chief has also reviewed and approved the plan.

No new access is planned as part of this project, but there is a new cross access planned with the properties to the east and west. The applicant will have to provide a recorded agreement to allow the connections to the east and west approved by the Township prior to being recorded.

They have not shown any lighting for the project. Any parking lot lights, building lighting, or decorative lighting will need to be reviewed prior to being installed.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

1. Site Plan is approved by the Township Engineer without any major modifications to the site plan.
2. Compliance with the comments from the Fire Chief.
3. Any lighting will need to be approved by the Township.
4. Provide a cross access agreement for Township review prior to recording.

Chairman Waalkes asked if anyone had questions for the Planner.

Member Sperla asked if Peterson could describe what the stormwater system consisted of now. Peterson said it is a series of catch basins that take it back to part of a regional detention pond, collects it in their catch basins, and runs it out to the north.

Chairman Waalkes asked if the applicant wanted to add any additional information.

Harry Wierenga was present for Fleis & Vandenbrink. He introduced Bob Dykstra as the general manager of the LLC. He explained issues regarding the storm drainage and solutions.

There has been some discussion on lighting. Some lighting will remain, some will be new.

Proposed landscaping was explained, particularly in the front of the building.

Member Lewis asked what their plan is for the sign that is there at the present time. The applicant stated that it hasn't been determined yet.

Member Hammond said he was struggling with the whole discussion around stormwater drainage. He said the applicant's explanation is vague when the applicant should be coming to the Board with more detailed information. The applicant said they were waiting for various results; it's a timing issue.

Member Sperla asked when they would be returning with final plans. The applicant was hopeful that they would be ready for the next Planning meeting.

The Planner clarified that normally they wouldn't be coming back with final plans unless plan changes are significant.

Chairman Waalkes said that the issue is whether or not the Members are confident enough that the conditions of our approval will be worked out without directly seeing final plans. Waalkes went on to say that they were to approve the site plan as it is shown, if desired.

Member Williams asked the Planner if it was typical to start demolition before getting approval. Peterson said it is not typical, but it is not prohibited.

The applicant explained that the building is not affecting any of the variance requirements or setbacks.

Member Hammond said he would like a fifth condition added: That the applicant return at the next meeting with storm water drainage results, calculations present, and do a presentation for the Members. He feels there are a lot of missing details that they are getting forced into.

There was discussion about tabling the case.

Member Logue asked if the site, as it currently is, meets the Stormwater Drainage Ordinance. The Planner answered that the site, as it is today, does not, but that they are going through the process now to ensure that it will. There was further discussion.

Member Robinson said he supports Member Hammond in his concerns over the stormwater situation.

Chairman Waalkes said that they would either need to approve it or table it. If tabled, the next meeting would be on November 14. Waalkes added that he would support approving the plan because has faith in the Township Engineer(s) and their ability as a company. Member Pennington had earlier expressed the same belief. Waalkes added that in theory it should work, it's just specifics that need to be nailed down.

Member Sperla said he would like to have some criteria in terms of what the Township Engineer is looking at.

Member Pennington stated that he can appreciate the hesitancy of some of the other Planning Commission Members as there are details that need to be worked out. The applicant said if what is shown here doesn't work they can very simply add another leaching basin to get more capture on site. It's not a complicated system, I don't think, that requires a great deal of effort to bring it into compliance

**Member Pennington made a Motion to approve the site plan as presented with the comments made by Staff. Support by Member Lewis.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Robinson, No**

**Lewis, Yes**

**Williams, Yes**

**Pennington, Yes**

**Waalkes, Yes**

**Sperla, No**

**McCarthy, Yes**

**Hammond, No**

**Logue, Yes**

**Motion carried, 6 - 3.**

**ARTICLE 7: Any other business:**

**ARTICLE 8: Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to adjourn. Support by Member Sperla. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Al Pennington, Secretary

Carol M. Meyer, Planning Administrative Assistant