

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission

Monday, December 4, 2006

7:00 p.m.

- ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Goldberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members Present: Goldberg, Koessel, Lewis, Logue, MacAllister, McDonald, Postma, Richards, Robinson
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Planning Director Peterson, Fire Chief Sigg, Admin. Assistant Hern, and Members of the Public.
- ARTICLE 2.** Chairman Goldberg led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
- ARTICLE 3.** Chairman Goldberg requested motion for approval of the December 4th agenda.
- Member Robinson motioned for approval of the agenda as presented, supported by Member McDonald. All in favor with none opposed, the motion carried.**
- ARTICLE 4.** Chairman Goldberg requested motion for approval or if there were any corrections to the November 20, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
- Being no corrections to the minutes, **Member Lewis motioned for approval of the November 20, 2006 minutes, supported by Member MacAllister.** Chairman Goldberg called to question. **All in favor with none opposed, the motion carried. November 20, 2006 Minutes approved.**
- ARTICLE 5.** **Case #06-2846: Robert Vetvick, 2315 Cascade Springs (PUBLIC HEARING)**
The Applicant is requesting an exception from the Private Street Regulations in order to split the property at 2315 Cascade Springs. The private road exception is required because the road does not meet Township standards for a private street and the Applicant does not plan to fully upgrade the road to meet those standards.
- Planning Director Peterson noted that in terms to the process for this case, the Commission holds a Public Hearing and sends a recommendation to the Township Board.
- Planning Director Peterson referred to the maps within the Commissions' packets and noted the location of the properties on Cascade Springs. He also noted the area where the Kent County

Road Commission (KCRC) stops certifying the road as a public road. He noted the paved and unpaved areas of the private section of the road and noted there is approximately 1,000-feet of private road. The Private road does not meet the Township standards of a private road for several factors:

1. Easement Width – the Township requires 66-foot wide easement and the current easement is approximately 40-foot wide.
2. Road Surface –the current surface is both paved and unpaved. Gravel is used on the unpaved portion.
3. Clear Area – this is an area that is open, not necessarily paved but an area unobstructed by trees, etc. The Township requires 28-foot clear and currently it is between 12-foot and 20-foot clear along the road.
4. The actual driving surface has a requirement of 18-foot wide and currently the road varies anywhere from 12-foot to 15-foot wide.
5. The Township is not aware of any maintenance agreement of the road and that is required. Staff included a copy of a letter submitted by the Applicant that refers to a “handshake agreement” amongst the property owners. The Township does require a formal agreement be on file.
6. Road Construction – Township standard is for 12-inches sand sub base, 6-inches of gravel, 1 ¾-inch of asphalt, with 6-inch gravel shoulder at least 2-foot wide. The current road has an unknown sub base with 6-inches of compacted gravel and 4-inches of asphalt with no shoulders.
7. Turnaround – The Township requires a turnaround for emergency vehicles whether it be an “L” turnaround or a “T” turnaround, the road does not have any.
8. Planning Director Peterson noted the stream on the site plans and indicated there is a bridge that crosses the stream. Township requirements note the bridge must meet the standards set forth by the KCRC and the Township Engineer.

Planning Director Peterson noted that when lots are split on private roads, there is the requirement to upgrade the entire road; not just a portion and the standard requires the entire road. The Applicant’s wishes are to improve essentially the area in front of their lot.

They are proposing to widen the portion in front of their property to 18-foot wide and place a “T” turnaround at the end of the road. This will bring the road closer to compliance but it still does not fully comply with Township Private Road Requirements.

The lot the Applicant is attempting to create is within an R2 Zoning District that allows for an 18,000-square foot lot with 110-foot lot width and a minimum of 100-feet of frontage on the Thornapple River. Their proposal indicates two (2) 40,000-square foot lots that are within the guidelines and similar to surrounding parcels on Cascade Springs.

The parcels have the ability to be connected to public sewer and water and the Applicant is planning to connect to both. There is a fire hydrant located west of the stream crossing.

Chief Sigg and the Township's Engineer have reviewed the site and their concern is not so much in the construction of the bridge supporting the emergency vehicles; their concern is in the area of the actual narrowness of the road and drop-offs. The Township's Engineer is also concerned with the culvert size since there has been some flooding in the area.

Staff has provided the standards for approval for an exception of the private road ordinance within the Commissions' packets.

The Township Board has granted several exceptions over the years, but every exception has included some improvement to a non-conforming road. Staff and the Fire Department view the Applicant's proposal to widen the road in front of their parcel and install the turnaround is a good first step to improving the private road. One added item for consideration is the improvement of the crossing so the culvert can be improved and road widened over the stream.

Staff's recommendation is to widen the road along the Applicant's frontage and provide a turnaround at the end of the paved road. Staff also recommends the Applicant be required to install an improved stream crossing within the next five (5) years. This should be enough time for the property owners to save for this improvement. In order to ensure that this improvement will be done, Staff recommends that the owners on the road enter into a permanent maintenance agreement that would also have a provision for the establishment of a Special Assessment District if the bridge improvement were not completed in five (5) years.

Chairman Goldberg asked if the Fire Chief is asking for guard rails along the stream crossing noting the Chief's report indicates there is one (1) foot of room for their equipment to drive on with a six (6) foot drop on one side. Planning Director Peterson said that depends on what the Commission feels is appropriate. If the

Commission feels the current narrowness of the road is acceptable, then adding guardrails may be acceptable. If the Commission requests the entire road be widened, then guardrails may not be needed. Chairman Goldberg asked if the proposal was to not only widen the paved portion itself but to also widen the portion at the crossing? Planning Director Peterson said that is staff suggestion if the culvert is fixed to also widen the stream crossing. Chairman Goldberg clarified the suggestion is to widen it out to 18-foot wide in the paved portion along with at the crossing and Planning Director Peterson confirmed that is correct.

Member McDonald asked Staff regarding the cost; Staff received an estimate from the Township Engineer of \$18,000 to fix the culvert. Our suggestions was to give them some time to get it fixed but that if it was not fixed after that time a Special Assessment District could be established. Has the Applicant indicated that he would bring it up to standard prior to the five (5) years or has that not been determined yet? Planning Director Peterson said that he has not spoken with the Applicant regarding that, the Applicant submitted in their report that they would do their frontage. Member McDonald said that he has driven through the area and it is very narrow after the crossing. He clarified that the procedure then, is if the Applicant does nothing and the Planning Commission approves the case, then the burden would fall on the Special Assessment District that the Township would develop and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member Lewis asked Staff that if this were to go into a Special Assessment, then the Township would also have the opportunity to bring the entire portion of Cascade Springs up to code and have it widened? Planning Director Peterson stated that is correct. Member Lewis noted that if the project were to fall into a Special Assessment that the road should be upgraded to code entirely and may provide incentive to the Applicant to ensure the crossing is done. Planning Director Peterson referred to the site map noting vacant properties that may have potential development in the future. Staff's reasoning is for the Applicant to make the improvements listed now and for the rest of the improvements to take place when the vacant land develops. He noted the Planning Commission could make the recommendation of upgrading the entire road to the Township Board.

Member Logue asked for clarification from Staff if they are proposing, at this time, to upgrade the entire street or just up to the proposed site? Planning Director Peterson said the standard is to upgrade the entire road; Staff is recommending adding onto what

the Applicant is proposing. Staff's additions are the culvert crossing and the maintenance agreement. Chairman Goldberg's understanding of Staff's recommendation is to try to keep the expense in proportion to the size of the development, noting the one lot would be split into two (2) lots and a development of this size could sustain the cost for upgrading the recommended proportions being discussed. As other properties are developed, they would also share in the cost of upgrading the road.

Member McDonald asked who owns the property where the culvert is? Planning Director Peterson believes the way the road was done, the segment belongs to another parcel and is not sure who it is. Member McDonald noted that living on the river is very quaint and is a beautiful area. He assumes the neighbors love this property and have maintained it out of their goodwill. He is curious if not only upgrading the portion at 2315 but also the culvert and questioned who currently owns that? Planning Director Peterson said that the Township is not sure who is the owner. Chairman Goldberg noted that when developments are done, often the lot line runs to the center of the road and there is an easement that runs in favor of all the lot owners and allows for the road to be placed on a portion of each of the lots. In this case, the road is an actual parcel with its own number and own right and there is an easement there and the original developer of the tracks continue to retain ownership of the fee of the road as its own lot. This makes it less clear as to who owns it and maintains it. Member McDonald said that to be honest, the Township is not sure who owns that and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct and added that it is the burden of the Applicant that he comply with whatever conditions to get an exception. If they receive an exception, the Commission can recommend some sort of an improvement and the Township Board agrees with that, they have to make that happen. If that means they need to negotiate with a property owner, etc. Member McDonald said he understood and said the burden, however, my fall upon the Special Assessment if nothing is done thus the burden would fall on multiple owners and is just clarifying ownership.

Member MacAllister asked if the Fire Department found the "T" an acceptable accommodation? Planning Director Peterson said the hammerhead/"T" that is designed meets the Township's standard.

Member Koessel asked Fire Chief Sigg if the Fire Department has run a fire truck over the streaming crossing. Fire Chief Sigg said he is not sure if they have or not. Member Koessel asked if the

Fire Department could get a truck in there now and Fire Chief Sigg said they could. Member Koessel noted there used to be a turnaround at the far end of the road that is now gone and the trucks could pull into a driveway or something to turnaround, Fire Chief Sigg said they could do so, yes.

Chairman Goldberg invited the Applicant to speak to the Commission. Applicant Robert Vetvick, 2175 Winding Oak Trail, said there was a house at the end of the road that had cement trucks crossing the stream without any problems in turning around.

What he would like to do with the property is build two (2) 2,000-square foot ranch homes on the parcels. The Applicant plans to hook both homes up to the water and sewer; one home will have approximately 120-feet of river frontage and the other will have 350-feet on the channel. He said there is an existing home on the property and that will be torn down, the boathouse will remain.

Applicant Vetvick noted that the improvements to the road include the hammerhead "T" and take that out to Spillman Creek coming in. They do not plan to change the existing driveway that enters the property and, as he said, they will be removing the existing 100-year old house and building something new for themselves.

Chairman Goldberg asked the Applicant his comments regarding the discussion the Commission has had regarding the culvert and the crossing? Applicant Vetvick said regarding the culvert, he has not priced that project and approximately \$20,000.00 seems right. He said it would probably be more than that because of the DNR's involvement because of the creek but for what this project is proposing is adding one (1) additional residence and that should not increase the amount of traffic by much. He has been using the same road for four (4) years to access the property and it has been adequate. Applicant Vetvick noted that the cost for removing the current house is approximately \$20,000.00 to \$25,000.00, add the culvert into the cost plus the hammerhead "T", the project starts to get into diminishing returns and too expensive for the project.

Member McDonald asked the Applicant if he currently lives in the house and Applicant Vetvick said he does not; he lives by Knapp's Corner. Member McDonald asked the Applicant if he has spoken with the neighbors regarding this project. Applicant Vetvick said he has only spoken with Dave Keyser but no one else.

Member Lewis asked Staff if the neighbors were notified of the Public Hearing and Planning Director Peterson said they have

been. Member Lewis asked the area that was notified and Planning Director Peterson said the notices were sent to those within a 300-foot radius and approximately sixteen (16) notices were mailed. Member McDonald noted that he drove the area and saw a neighbor walking and questioned her if he was looking at the right property, as he could not see the address numbers clearly in the dark and snow. In further discussion with the neighbor, she was not aware, nor received a notice of the Public Hearing regarding the property. Planning Director Peterson said notices were mailed to the neighbors. He did receive a phone call from one neighbor who did not receive a notice and was told about the Public Hearing by a neighbor; Staff mailed another notice to the resident. Planning Director Peterson everyone on the private road section should have received a notice.

Chairman Goldberg requested a motion to open the Public Hearing. **Member Lewis motioned to open the Public Hearing, supported by Member Richards. All in favor with none opposed, the Public Hearing for Case # 06-2846 was opened.**

Steve Plakmeyer, 2410 Cascade Springs SE, purchased his property in 2003. He has not heard a lot of what the Applicant is trying to do and finds it interesting that someone who does not live in the neighborhood wants to come in and change it and has concerns. Mr. Plakmeyer indicated that he is the “owner” of the private road parcel.

He is concerned over the discussion of a Special Assessment being developed because one property owner splits his lot. The Special Assessment would involve all of those on the street and does not believe it is fair to the other residents to be held responsible for a project someone else is doing to their own property and they do not come through on their agreement.

Mr. Plakmeyer also noted the bridge over the stream is narrow and he does use it a lot. If the Commission allows road improvements to the extent they are being discussed tonight; that would have a significant impact on some of the residents since this road is the only road they are able to access their property.

Member McDonald asked Mr. Plakmeyer if his concerns lie with changing the character of the area, the costs and inconveniences of the improvements that may happen. Member McDonald asked if he would be in favor of seeing the road widened and Mr. Plakmeyer said he is not in favor of widening the road.

Member Logue asked Mr. Plakmeyer if he would be in favor of organizing a road maintenance agreement? Member Logue noted that eventually the road will wear out and questioned what would be done at that point. Mr. Plakmeyer said the residents have a gentleman's agreement regarding the share in the cost of snow plowing. One of the neighbors sends a bill to the residents noting their amount for the plowing and never had a problem, he would think the same would hold true for road repair. Member Logue wondered if a maintenance agreement exists and noted that mortgage companies will not enter into an agreement unless a maintenance agreement is formally in place. Mr. Plakmeyer said he does not believe one is in place, Ralph Clayson approached him when he purchased the property and noted how the costs were handled for snow plowing and it has worked out fine.

Applicant Vetvick clarified that he is moving into one of the houses and he is not trying to make a buck with this project.

Ted Holman owns a couple of parcels, 2400 Pebblebrook and 2285 Cascade Springs, and asked for clarification as to the placement of the hammerhead. Planning Director Peterson noted near the sewer station.

Mr. Holman said he did receive his notice of the Public Hearing but stopped at the Township Offices for the details of the project.

He noted that if a Special Assessment District were developed, the details should be determined and it cannot be left open-ended. The second concern is there are some logistical constraints many may not be aware of. Mr. Holman noted the easement being discussed is actually two (2) easements: one owned by Plakmeyer that goes in front of the Vetvick property and there is a second easement across Levick, Kaiser and Alavez property that are approximately sixteen and a half (16-½) feet wide and it would be difficult to widen to eighteen (18) feet with only 16 ½-feet. Chairman Goldberg asked if that property easement is the one that owns the crossing and Mr. Holman stated that is correct. He noted Mr. Plakmeyer's easement does have adequate width to handle widening to 18-feet but he was not sure if everyone is aware of the other easement being only 16 ½-feet.

Member McDonald asked Mr. Holman if he would be opposed to widening and paving the road and Mr. Holman said the current road sets the tone for what you find back there and likes the quaintness of the area as it is now.

Ralph Clayson, 2380 Cascade Springs, has concerns regarding the possibility of a Special Assessment being developed. He does not have any economic gains to the property being split and does not feel he should be brought into part of the process.

Mr. Clayson noted that he has lived through some nightmares on that street including the construction with the sewer project some years ago and the road was closed thus denying them vehicle access to their property during parts of construction. He also stated that the utilities run through the bridge and noted a thorough engineering analysis should be done. The sewer is both a pressure and gravity feed system and said there is a 10 (ten) to 12 (twelve) inch water line the residents paid for to the lift station, plus the gas and electrical lines.

Member Lewis noted there was discussion of some flooding from the stream and asked Mr. Clayson if that was in his area. Mr. Clayson said it occurs on the other side, the east, and when there are heavy rains, the water does build up and cascade over the easement. Chairman Goldberg questioned that the homes are not being flooded, just the easement and Mr. Clayson said that is correct but believes the water did come within a foot or two (2) of one house's foundation.

Member McDonald asked Mr. Clayson that he does not want to see the road improvement, the bridge widened, etc. that is more of an issue than splitting the lot? Member McDonald noted that what is being attempted this evening is a lot split but the lot split cannot occur unless road upgrades are made. He asked Mr. Clayson if it was fair to say that it is not the lot split that is the issue but the road width and potential payment for that, is it the lot split, is it both? Mr. Clayson said that he is not opposed to the lot split but is opposed to that if there is any type of improvement made to the easement, that should be warranted to the Developer and not to the other residents that live in that area. Chairman Goldberg also noted he heard Mr. Clayson say that he was not in favor of the inconveniences of the construction and Mr. Clayson believes the bridge construction would be major.

Ted Swanson, 2370 Cascade Springs, said he has lived there for twenty-six (26) years and walks the neighborhood every morning and noted the horrible condition of the public part of the road. He also noted that no one informed the residents of when the lift station was put in and asked why the City of Grand Rapids does not assist with some of the changes to the road since the residents have been the ones who have plowed it.

Applicant Vetvick said that nothing would please them more than to just leave the area as it is and just build the houses. He noted that they have been using the road to access their home for the past forty (40) years and no one new is being added; all of the property owners have inherited their homes.

No other comments from the Public. Chairman Goldberg requested a motion to close the Public Hearing. **Member Robinson motioned to close the Public Hearing, supported by Member Koessel.** Chairman Goldberg called to question the motion and **all were in favor to close the Public Hearing of Case # 06-2846, with none opposed. Public Hearing closed.**

Chairman Goldberg opened the meeting to Commissions' discussion.

Member Koessel had a question in going back over some of Staff's comments, as he understands it, the road must be improved in order to grant the split of the Vetvick property, correct? Planning Director Peterson said that is correct. Chairman Goldberg noted that the Ordinance requires the entire road to be improved to grant the lot split, anything short of that, the Commission may recommend an exception. Member Koessel noted that the Applicant has offered to pave and widen the portion of the road in front of his property and to install the turnaround; Planning Director Peterson said that is correct. Member Koessel said the Commission has heard from many neighbors who desire the portion by the stream be left alone. He also clarified that Mr. Swanson is unhappy with the current conditions of the public portion of Cascade Springs Road and he is happy with the portion in front of his house that is gravel.

Member Lewis was curious that the Applicant said he will be hooking up to the sewer and water; and noted that he drove the area and someone's house was experiencing sewer problems, he questioned if the sewer that will be installed, would cross the culver along with the water connection, it is on the Applicant's side? Applicant Vetvick noted the connection is already there. Member Lewis asked if his project would cause any inconvenience to the neighboring properties regarding their sewer and water connection. Applicant Vetvick said he would not be interfering with the service to the other neighbors. Member Lewis asked the Applicant if he is offering to pave the road in front of his property and the turnaround. The Applicant clarified that he would widen the road in front of his property and the widening would not impact

the sewer and water service would be done now. Currently there is fourteen (14) feet of asphalt and once the weather breaks, they would add four (4) feet on top of what is currently in place. He would pave the section in front of his property and the turnaround in the spring.

Member McDonald asked Applicant Vetvick that if he were not required to pave the road, would he? Mr. Vetvick said he would not; his intention was to divide his property into two (2) lots and leave the road in its current state and preserving the area.

From Chairman Goldberg's point-of-view he said he could certainly understand the residences' desire to leave the road as-is but the Township also has an Ordinance stating the road needs to be improved if the lot is split and the Commission would not be fulfilling their jobs if some sort of an upgrade were not made to the road. He noted that widening the road at the stream crossing might not be possible due to the road's current width in that area and the Township would need that owner's consent and he may not wish to provide his consent. Chairman Goldberg said he tends to lean towards having the Applicant widen and pave the road in front of his property and install the hammerhead "T" as he has volunteered to do and these items do bring the road closer in compliance and keep with the spirit of the Ordinance. Chairman Goldberg noted his one reservation regarding the flooding situation that has been described with the existing culvert. Flooding has occurred over the road and has come close to one of the homes, if this keeps reoccurring, the foundation and the road could be washed away. His second concern is the "handshake" Maintenance Agreement that is in place. Currently the agreement works well since all the residents are currently participating in the agreement without problems. He believes the residents should formally record a maintenance agreement so that those buying property in the future know what they are dealing with. Chairman Goldberg noted he is inclined to go with a formal maintenance agreement, is inclined to support the paving the Applicant has proposed and has some concerns regarding the culvert flooding issue.

Member Koessel noted the culvert flooding issue seems to be outside this project because the flooding issue already exists whether this property is split or not. Member Koessel does not believe the culvert flooding should be considered in this request and does support Chairman Goldberg's thought regarding the paving in front of the property. By paving in front of the Applicant's property, this does show intent to improve the road and bring it closer to compliance and the Township Board would

probably support this recommendation. The neighbors have said they do not wish to have the private area of Cascade Springs paved and the road has been this way for a numbers of years. Member Koessel does have some concern regarding the width of the culvert but noted it must currently be wide enough since the City of Grand Rapids is able to get their large equipment into the area. He also said that Mr. Swanson's concerns with the public part of Cascade Springs should brought to the attention of the KCRC at our annual meeting with them, it should not factor into this case. Member Koessel summarized that Chairman Goldberg's comments show a compromise with the Applicant and still meet the intent of the Ordinance of bringing the road closer to compliance if the areas are paved as he has proposed.

Member Lewis suggested approaching the matter in two (2) steps with the first step being the Commission would like done by the Applicant due to the split, widen the road in front of his property and install the "T". The residents of the surrounding properties have clearly stated they favor the quaintness of the road and crossing and that is fine by him. Member Lewis noted the second step is the Special Assessment Development and its details. Member Lewis said he would support a favorable recommendation to the Township Board to allow the property split if the Applicant widened and paved the road in front of his property, install the paved "T" at the end of Cascade Springs.

Member McDonald asked what would be gained by paving these areas, is this to meet the Ordinance? Chairman Goldberg said from his point-of-view, the Ordinance is written to have gravel roads paved and if the Commission does not required pavement section-by-section as lots are developed, then the Commission is not bringing the road closer to compliance. In terms of why the Ordinance is written this way and why pavement is preferred, generally speaking, paved roads are easier to maintain, easier on vehicles and encourage traffic movement. Chairman Goldberg noted that when and if Mr. Holman decides to develop his property, that would be an opportune time to require that section of road be paved as more and more traffic would be accessing the properties. In this case, one extra home is being added and that will not bring a significant increase in traffic and the section in front of the properties is adequate for the project.

Member McDonald clarified that what the Commission should consider is having Mr. Vetvick pave in front of his property, install the paved "T" and not improve the crossing, therefore avoiding a Special Assessment; Chairman Goldberg said that is correct.

Member MacAllister clarified that since a Special Assessment does not seem necessary if the Commission goes in this direction, should the Maintenance Agreement be put in place now. She noted that the Maintenance Agreement is already in place, it just needs to be written. Chairman Goldberg noted Member MacAllister is correct and the Special Assessment and Maintenance Agreement are two (2) different things. He noted that if the Special Assessment were done, it would only affect the culvert and the residents have voiced their opinions in leaving the culvert and crossing as they currently are. Member Koessel also vaguely remembered a lot at 28th Street and Buttrick being split and the Commission requesting a Maintenance Agreement. His concern lies with the road being maintained to allow emergency vehicle traffic, etc. Planning Director Peterson said that many requirements for a Maintenance Agreement is done because they never formally existed and the Ordinance does require a formal Maintenance Agreement. Member Koessel said that he does not see any disadvantage to the residence of having a formal Maintenance Agreement as they are currently sharing in the expenses of the snow plowing and an agreement would be for their protection if something should happen. Member Koessel said that if Member Lewis were to make a favorable motion for the paved areas that he also may want to include the condition that a Maintenance Agreement be formally submitted.

Chairman Goldberg said that he does not believe that a Maintenance Agreement can be made a condition of one (1) lot split that a dozen people would have to sign because the dozen people may not be in favor of the lot split and this would allow those dozen people to say “no” to the lot split. Chairman Goldberg encourage the residence to enter into such an agreement and believes it would be in all of their best interest to do so but he is personally uncomfortable making it a condition for a motion of a lot split.

Member Logue noted that the Maintenance Agreement would further the road improvement and may also be considered as removing some of the non-conformity of the road. Planning Director Peterson also confirmed that the Ordinance does require a Maintenance Agreement.

Member Koessel said he agrees with having a formal maintenance agreement filed since one already exists. He also noted that a maintenance agreement may be required if any of the residents apply for loans on the property, as Member Logue referred to

earlier. He said that he did not hear any Public objections into entering into a formal maintenance agreement and does not believe this would hold up Mr. Vetvick's project.

Member McDonald noted for clarification that the Commission is considering allowing the split of Mr. Vetvick's property on the condition that he widen and pave the portion of the road in front of his property, the "T" be installed and paved at the end of Cascade Springs Road, the culvert and crossing are not being reviewed by the Commission as to honor the residents' wishes in leaving the area in its current condition as much as possible.

Member Koessel asked the Public Members in attendance if they objected to entering into a formal maintenance agreement. The Public Members said they were not opposed to entering into a formal agreement but asked who is responsible for making sure the portion in front of Mr. Vetvick's property is done correctly. Planning Director Peterson noted the residents of the area are responsible. Chairman Goldberg clarified that if the condition is that the road be widened to eighteen (18) feet to comply with Township standards, then the Township will ensure the road meets compliance prior to the lot split becoming official.

Member MacAllister noted that Fire Chief Sigg suggested marking the culvert at the crossing and does the Commission want to pursue those comments regarding the road's safety. Member McDonald noted there is clear direction over the crossing.

Chairman Goldberg opened for a motion. Member Lewis noted his only hesitation is the road agreement and if it should be included as a condition. He suspects the residents would formalize the verbal agreement. Member Lewis noted that the job of the Planning Commission is to maintain the Ordinance and if the Township Board would like to make exceptions they may do so.

Member Lewis motioned for a favorable recommendation to the Township Board for the split of Applicant Vetvink's property with the conditions that:

- 1. The Applicant widens and paves the road in front of his property.**
- 2. The Applicant installs and paves the "T" turnaround.**
- 3. The Applicant presents to the Township Board a written Road Maintenance Agreement, signed by the neighbors, meeting the Township's requirements.**

Member MacAllister supported the motion.

Chairman Goldberg opened the meeting for discussion of the motion. Member Logue noted that if any of the property owners sell their property, the maintenance agreement would be required and any new residents in the area should receive a copy of the agreement so they are fully aware of how the road maintenance is handled.

Chairman Goldberg called the motion to question: **All in favor with none opposed. Motion carried.**

ARTICLE 6. Any Other Business

Chairman Goldberg opened the meeting for any other business.

Planning Director Peterson noted the 2007 Schedule handed out has been approved by the Township Board.

Member Lewis said he received a phone call from one of the citizens giving a compliment regarding the project by his home on Beard Farms and Cascade Road. The resident is so pleased with the development of the property as the seed and other landscaping has been done and looks very nice.

Member McDonald noted that if there were a December 18th Planning Commission Meeting, he would not be present.

ARTICLE 8. Adjournment

Chairman Goldberg requested a motion for adjournment.

Member MacAllister supported by Member Lewis moved to adjourn. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Claude Robinson, Secretary

Lisa Hern, Recording Secretary