

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission

Monday, October 4, 2010

7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Waalkes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
Members Present: Lewis, Logue, McCarthy, Pennington, Robinson, Sperla, Waalkes, Williams  
Members Absent: Hammond (excused)  
Others Present: Planning Director Peterson, Members of the Public

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

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the Agenda for the October 4, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting.**  
Chairman Waalkes made an announcement that Article # 7 would be moved up (the Watermark portion of Any Other Business) to the first thing that would be covered. Article 5 and 6 would shift down to move Article 7 up. Chairman Waalkes requested a motion for the approval of the adjusted Agenda.

**Motion was made by Member Lewis and supported by Member Sperla to approve the Agenda as adjusted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the September 13, 2010 Meeting.**  
Chairman Waalkes asked if there were any corrections or additions to the September 13, 2010 Minutes and requested a motion for approval.

**Motion was made by Member Pennington and supported by Member McCarthy to approve the September 13, 2010 Minutes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 5. Review of revised elevation plans for Watermark Fitness/office building. Case #08-2960**  
Planning Director Peterson reviewed the elevation plan that had been previously approved. There are modifications from the original plan and I'm asking that you approve the revised elevation plan, noting that it isn't the same as approved. I don't find anything wrong with this plan. It is high quality. The materials, square footage, and footprint are all the same. The most drastic change is the rear elevation. One other change; on the new Site Plan, because they are not going to have an elevator in the building there is one handicapped space out toward the side facing the golf course. Originally there was no parking in that area.

Member Lewis complimented the Planner for bringing this Case back to them. He appreciated being made aware of the changes. Member Lewis stated that he would support any motion made to approve what is done.

**Motion was made by Member Lewis and supported by Member Robinson to adopt the new set of plans, replacing the one that was presented in the past.**

Member Logue requested a reason for the change. Applicant representative Steve

Plakmeyer responded by saying that the tenants in the building had changed. Wayne Visbeen was the original Architect for the applicant. Wayne originally planned on going into this building, but because of circumstances beyond his control, he decided not to do it. The Architect was changed to Jeff Visser who designed the Watermark Country Club. He wanted to have his own drawings, so the design changed a little. It will look like the Club House. It will have a high quality look and feel. The footprint is identical. It has taken awhile because we wanted to make sure we had a fully occupied building. Member Lewis asked about the parking lot. Mr. Plakmeyer replied that it is under construction right now and it is going quite well. Completion is expected in the next couple weeks.

**Having had a Motion and Support the Motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 6: Case #10-3003 Mike Koenes**

**Property Address:** 5100 Patterson Ave.

**Requested Action:** Site Plan Review for a 4,320 square foot addition to the existing Building.

Planning Director Peterson reviewed that Koenes Auto body is doing a small expansion on Patterson Ave just north of 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. There will be a small addition on the back of the sight. It is currently parking area, so no green space being taken for this. This is about a 19% addition. Over 5% requires Site Plan Approval by you folks, otherwise it is Staff approval. Under 20% does not require any kind of additional landscaping. The plan that you have does include some new lights. If you look in your packets closely you will see a couple spots out the back that were over our five foot candles. They have already revised that plan and have submitted a new one to me, so they have already taken care of that item. Probably the biggest item worth talking about is parking. They are using some of the parking where they store some vehicles for the addition. The current parking spaces is 76. They would have about 62 with this addition. They also have about 38 spaces inside for all their bays and where they work. We have never had a parking problem over there. Both myself, the Building Inspector, and the Fire Department have reviewed it and there hasn't been any kind of parking issues. I think it is safe to assume that even with this addition, even taking up some of their parking, that the parking is still in compliance with our standards. Staff is recommending approval. They would have to have a soil erosion permit for their construction.

Chairman Waalkes asked if anyone had any questions for the Planner. Member Robinson asked, "When you mention 38 spaces inside is there a limit to that or when we approve this do we set a limit to the number of the cars they can have inside?" Planning Director Peterson replied that the Building Code would take care of that; a limit was not needed. This isn't like a normal office use where it is generating a parking space, the use itself actually is a parking space inside the building. I just wanted to point that out, in case anyone was concerned about the numbers. Member Robinson asked, from a safety or fire standpoint are they limited to how many cars they can work on inside? Planner Peterson replied that the Building Code would address that in terms of what they are doing and how they have to set up certain areas, but we don't have to worry about setting that limit.

Chairman Waalkes called for a motion to approve the site plan for the addition.

**Motion was made by Member Sperla and supported by Member Pennington to approve the applicants request for an addition to their existing building.**

Member Lewis asked if approving also included that the applicant apply for a Soil Erosion Permit.

**An amended motion was made by Sperla and supported by Pennington that they apply for a Soil Erosion Permit prior to beginning work. Motion with amendment carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 7: Village Business (B-1) Zoning District and Signs**

Work session for possible amendments to Zoning Ordinance regarding the Village Business (B-1) zoning district and signs.

Planning Director Peterson explained that he had taken the comments and discussion that had occurred in the Focus Groups in regards to the B-1 and created some proposed amendments. He will explain the proposed changes that Staff has come up with. Lynee Wells has also been working with him. No decision needs to be made tonight; just hear comments and give feedback so it can continue to be worked on. The chart that is in the packet was sent to members of the public who had signed up for the meetings. They did not receive all the chapters from the Zoning Ordinance. Member Lewis asked what a du/ac was and received an answer of dwelling units per acre. Member Lewis also asked what a "far" was. The answer was floor area ratio.

We're talking about the B-1, the Village area. There is some added language in the Intent section. It talks about adding residential uses and allowing for mixed uses. It allows more options for people. Section 8.03 - Residential uses up to three dwelling units per acre. We currently have four or five residential developments in the village. We have Cascade Villas, Grenelefe, Thornapple Estates Subdivision. Member Sperla brought up the subject of multifamily units with his concerns. People don't own, it's taxing on the schools, it's taxing on the roads, it's taxing on the utilities because of the density. It's a transient group, it utilizes a greater share of public services than what you'd have with single family ownership. Planning Director Peterson replied that people wanted to see residential use in the village. Member Sperla went on to say that new construction; multifamily over a store may be ok. Member Lewis said that he appreciated Member Sperla's comments. He said that he would 100% agree with Member Sperla until he goes to Rockford and spends time in a viable downtown area. People there are walking around nights until dark. He believes we should be open to explore it, which we are now through the PUD'S and other methods. Residents above buildings may or may not be the answer, but in some areas it seems to work out. If it's new construction or old construction, if our goal is to make it a viable downtown area, we may need to include some more of the people living in that area. Another member commented that multifamily doesn't always mean a big apartment building and in some cases, multi family can be quite nice. Planning Director Peterson

said that we don't have a lot of vacant property where a large project could be constructed.

- Farmers market was added. It is listed under Uses Permitted By Right.
- **Chapter 8**, Section 8.04 #2 – Uses Permitted by Special Use Permit: Striking the automotive uses. The concept is to allow for the existing people to remain, but nothing new.
- Section 8.04 #10 – Residential over 3 du./ac. But less than 9 du./ac.: Same as Uses Permitted By Right, only it's up to 9 dwelling units an acre.
- Section 8.06 - Site Development Standards: offers more flexibility Schedule 8-A shows modifications to setbacks; smaller setbacks.
- Section 8.07 Parking Area Location and Screening: The graphics are updated.
- Section 8.08 Building Design: A few of these things expand on what we already have. #8, residential uses above retail or office uses have requirements for windows. #17 shows rooftop screening requirements.
- Section 8.10 Village Design Review Committee Procedure: There are new procedures and definitions.
- **Chapter 18**, The biggest change is Minimum Rear Yard Building Setbacks. Currently if a commercial district abuts a residential district they have to have a larger setback. This would change the rear yard setback from 60 feet to the new proposed 25 feet. The concept here is to remove the B1 from that requirement. You would probably have more of a building setback if you parked in the back.

Sign Ordinance – Draft Revisions. We are adding some new definitions. Single Tenant Directional signs and Multi Tenant Directional signs. (Page 3)

- Page 4: Adding a definition for a light pole sign, such as a decorative light pole in the Village.
- Page 6: The additional Sandwich Board Sign. These A-frame signs are sometimes seen outside of a Meijer, Family Fare, or D&W. They are small signs up near the entrance. Currently they are prohibited. Member Sperla asked, What if we had 20 establishments with those out in front? They are not very well made.....I wouldn't mind seeing one here or there, but if you had a string of retail establishments and you had a whole bunch of them I think it would look pretty chintzy. Planning Director Peterson replied that we don't have to make a change. Part of the discussion is recognizing what we already have. So far it has not been a problem. We are talking about signs that would be by the front door, not out by the street. We are strict on signage, and the goal is to try and find a good balance.
- Page 8: Signs Not Requiring Permits, such as light pole signs.
- Page 9: Single Tenant Directional Signs and Multi Tenant Directional Signs. Proposed: raising the directional signage for single tenant to 10 square feet and the multi tenant to 20 square feet. Still limiting them to two. Discussion was made regarding signs that show time and temperature, or of community interest; that it could change at least once an hour.

Rick Siegel, owner of Cascade Hospital for Animals had a concern regarding signs on Cascade Road. He would like either improved signage, or lower the speed limit on the

road. Could the signs change every 4 – 6 hours? He also had a concern about the height of signs, specifically in regards to his sign and the ground level.

- Page 12: Subdivision Identification Signs: The concept is a community oriented sign. A shopping Center type of identification that would first be reviewed by the Village Design Review Committee. A sign that may say, Cascade Village Shopping Center. D&W has a sign that is too large and Family Fare has one that is too small. We need something that is in between these two extremes. Jeff Hundley, agreed that competition is a factor when it comes to sizes of signs. He agrees with the concept of one sign that advertises the center with some kind of message that could be rotated amongst the tenants. Member Sperla stated that we need to be sympathetic to the businesses that are in the Village and demonstrate more flexibility so that they have a better chance of succeeding.
- Page 14: Signs Permitted in The "I" (Industrial) and "TI" Zoning Districts.

**ARTICLE 8: Any Other Business**

**ARTICLE 9. Adjournment**

Chairman Waalkes requested a motion for adjournment.

**Motion was made by Member Sperla and supported by Member Williams to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Al Pennington, Secretary

Carol M. Meyer, Planning Administrative Assistant