

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, May 21, 2012  
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, Waalkes, Williams  
Members Absent: none  
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson and members of the public.

**ARTICLE 2.** Chairman Sperla led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Agenda. Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 4.** Approve the Minutes of the May 14, 2012 meeting.

Member McCarthy pointed out that on page 3; it was she who made the friendly amendment, not Sue Williams.

**Motion was made by Member Robinson to approve the Minutes with changes. Support by Member Waalkes. Motion carried.**

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

Chairman Sperla welcomed the visitors and explained the new procedure for public comments.

No one present wished to speak to non-agenda items.

**ARTICLE 6.** Case #12-3076 Gary and Ruth Lash

(Public Hearing)

**Property Address:** 8951 Cascade Road

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to construct a new accessory building larger than 832 sq ft.

Chairman Sperla introduced the case and then turned it over to Staff for comments.

Planner Peterson stated that the proposed building is 1,680 sq ft (32x40 plus an open 400 sq ft lean-to) and is being located in the rear yard. The open area is already calculated into the square footage of the building.

The applicant does need a variance for the building due to the proposed setback. That case is scheduled for the 6-12-12 ZBA meeting.

The building has a proposed height of 17 feet and requires a 40 foot setback. The proposed setback is 15 feet. At the proposed setback the applicant would have to reduce the building to 14 feet tall.

The property also has two other accessory buildings that would have to be removed to construct this new building. Only one accessory building is allowed on a 2.5 acre property. The garage they have is detached.

The style of building and size fits in with the agriculture character of the area, however, the building they propose is too tall. To avoid seeking a variance the applicant could either move the building to another location on the property or lower the height to stay where they want it.

Since the Staff report was written, the applicant has submitted a new site plan moving the building further away from the property line at the 40 foot setback line.

Based on the new site plan Staff is revising his recommendation. He recommends that the Special Use Permit for the building, as proposed in the new site plan at the 40 foot setback, be approved.

Chairman Sperla asked if there were any questions of Peterson.

Member Lewis asked to see the new layout where the water problem is as was described on the applicant's application.

Chairman Sperla asked how they planned to gain access to the building. Staff referred him to the applicant.

Chairman Sperla asked the applicant to come forward for questions. Applicant Gary Lash came forward.

In answer to Chairman Sperla's question about access, the applicant said there would not be a permanent drive to it. It would come off from the current driveway near the garage. He stated that the water problem is usually only in the spring and it would not affect the drive to the building.

Member Lewis wished to thank the applicant for making an adjustment in the plan to avoid the variance request. Chairman Sperla backed the statements made by Lewis.

**Member Pennington made a Motion to move into Public Hearing. Support by Member Hammond. Motion carried.**

There was no one from the public to comment on the matter.

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

Member Waalkes asked if Peterson had received any comments from neighbors. Peterson said he had not.

**Member Pennington made a Motion to approve the Special Use Permit to construct an accessory building as shown on the revised plan with the 40 foot setback, and with the condition that the existing accessory building(s) be removed. Support by Member Robinson. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 7. Discussion of possible ordinance amendments – wall signs**

Staff said changes are being proposed based on some variances that the Zoning Board has awarded over the past few months. The Zoning Board had asked the Planning Commission to look into an amendment to avoid the recurring variances for wall signs. The wall sign proposal would allow multiple wall signs, provided the wall signs did not exceed a total square footage.

Discussion followed regarding the formula for wall signs and it was explained that the calculations for the amount of signage is not proposed to change but would allow for multiple wall signs. The Planning Commission asked that the Planner set the public hearing to consider the proposal.

**ARTICLE 8. Discussion of possible ordinance amendments – fence height**

The changes to the special use section for fence height addresses the adjoining property owner approval standard as well as providing discretion to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission asked that the Planner set the public hearing to consider the proposal

**ARTICLE 9. Any other business:**

**ARTICLE 10. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to adjourn. Support by Member McCarthy. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Karen McCarthy, Secretary

Carol M. Meyer, Planning Administrative Assistant