MINUTES
CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MONDAY, September 21, 2026
6:00 pm
2870 JACKSMITH AVE SE

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Rowland called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Members Present: Chairman Rowland, Vice Chair Kraemer, Treasurer Korstange, Commissioner Cribbs, Commissioner Madiol.
Members Absent: Commissioner Lauer, Commissioner Kaiser.

Others Present: Planning Director Dan Swallow, Planner Kevin Garcia (McKenna), Code and Zoning Administrator Harrison Hill and others listed on the sign-in sheet.

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda

Motion was made by Commissioner Cribbs to approve the current agenda.
Supported by Treasurer Korstange.
Motion carried unanimously.

ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflict of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

ARTICLE 5. Approve the Minutes of the August 17, 2026, meeting

Motion was made by Commissioner Madiol to approve the Minutes of the August 17, 2026 meeting.
Supported by Treasurer Korstange.
Motion carried unanimously.

ARTICLE 6. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.

John Slagter (1763 Watermark Dr) discussed the Watermark Condominium Association by-laws. Opined that the by-laws stated that changes to Condominium Documents had a required 2/3rds vote by residents to be able to be brought before the planning commission and that the Condominium Board did not have standing to make changes to the PUD. Stated that the traffic study when the Condominiums were developed showed that the use of winding roads were a deterrent to speeding and that gates were installed at the entrance to the community to further deter this. Opined that there was not a credible speeding problem.

Ed Young (5390 Brassie Ct) stated that in his experience there was not a speeding problem from what he has observed. Stated that meetings were not being properly communicated to the Owners within Watermark.

ARTICLE 7. **Case #26-3924 – Old Business**

Applicant: Watermark Condominium Association, C/O Acacia Group PM
Property Address: Forest Hills Golf Course/Watermark Condominiums PUD-15; a full list of addresses is detailed in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.
Parcel Number: A full list of individual parcel numbers is detailed in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report.
Requested Action: A PUD Text amendment to the Forest Hills Golf Course/Watermark Condominiums PUD-15, Ord #10 of 1997, to amend text related to the use of speed bumps.

Planning Director Dan Swallow presented the staff report. He explained that the application was previously discussed at the August 17th Planning Commission meeting and was postponed at that time. He stated that the Planning Commission requested additional documents showing the Condominium Association's authority to bring the amendment to Planning Commission, bylaw provisions allowing the Board to alter common road infrastructure without a vote of the co-owners, and proof of the owners being given notice of the request and that those were received by staff and were in the packet. Swallow stated that staff believed the board did have the right to bring the request forward because it was not changing the Master Deed or By-laws but the PUD Ordinance. He also stated that the Township had provided notice to the Co-owners for the original public hearing, but the Condominium Board had not done so. Swallow stated that the facts of the previous meeting still stand.

Chairman Rowland asked if staff had asked the Condominium Board to notify the Co-owners.

Planning Director Swallow stated that staff did reach out to the Condominium Board to make the request, but the Board had felt that they did not need to notify the Co-owners.

Vice Chair Kraemer asked staff to clarify that nothing was provided, showing the Condominium Board or management company had given notice to the Co-owners in the past as directed at the previous Planning Commission Meeting.

Planning Director Swallow stated that nothing was provided.

Commissioner Cribbs asked if a vote was needed by the Co-owners for this type of road work.

Planning Director Swallow stated that it is not required for general maintenance, per the 7th amendment to the Master Deed.

Treasurer Korstange asked if the Township Attorney had been consulted with for a legal opinion or if staff felt it was clear.

Planning Director Swallow stated that staff felt that the documents provided showed the authority of the Condominium Board.

Treasurer Korstange stated that the request was not to amend the Master Deed, Bylaws, or asking if the Planning Commission felt the neighborhood should have speedbumps. The request was to amend the PUD and if the Planning Commission felt the PUD requirement would then be in line with the standard. She then asked if there were any other PUDs that prohibited Speedbumps.

Planner Garcia stated that there was no other PUD with this prohibition.

Commissioner Cribbs asked if voting either way would have any future effect on how PUD amendments would be made by the Township Board.

Director Swallow stated that this was a unique case.

Applicant, Leo Ditchcreek (1712 Watermark Dr), stated that no other PUD had a prohibition on speed bumps and that the Condominium Association board had the right to ask for that section of the PUD to be struck. He also stated that the overall cost was around $1,000 in total.

Chairman Rowland stated that the 1990 Speed Study had stated that speedbumps would not be effective and that it was not proved that speeding was an issue.

Commissioner Madiol asked if they were making the decision if speedbumps were necessary or if that it was truly up to the Condo Association board.

Treasurer Korstange stated that she agreed with Commissioner Madiol and that the job of the Planning Commission was to decide if it was appropriate to remove the clause from the PUD.

Vice Chair Kraemer opined that the inclusion of the clause in the PUD meant that the Planning Commission thought it was appropriate at one point and they were now being asked to find the exact opposite conclusion. He also stated that there was not enough evidence that speeding was a problem in the neighborhood.

Treasurer Korstange opined that in the past when the PUD was first developed, there was most likely not an in-depth discussion regarding the no speed bumps clause.

Commissioner Madiol asked if commissioners would be more comfortable if there was a vote of the co-owners.

Commissioners discussed Condominium board dynamics, whether the Condominium board was representing the will of the majority of the Co-owners and public comments at the previous planning commission meeting.

Commissioner Cribbs discussed a visit to the site, how the road was curvy enough to discourage speeding, and the open-ended plan on where to put the speedbumps and the fact that they were removable.

Motion was made by Chairman Rowland to NOT RECOMMEND APPROVAL Case Number 26-3924, for a PUD Text Amendment to the Forest Hills Golf Course/Watermark Condominiums PUD-15, Ord #10 of 1997, related to the use of speed bumps, for the following reason:

1. **Failure to prove a speeding issue within the Condominium complex or that speedbumps would provide relief from vehicles speeding.**

Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.
Motion carried with the following rollcall vote:
Yay: Cribbs, Kraemer, Rowland Nay: Korstange, Madiol

ARTICLE 8. Case #26-3926 – Public Hearing
Applicants: Trent & Shannon Almassian, Johnathan & Mary Borisch, Thomas & Jessica Borisch, Kara Ann Borsch
Property Address: 5200, 5234, 5260, 5292, 5320, 5354 Dayenu Drive SE.
Parcel Number: 41-19-27-301-029, 41-19-33-200-059, 41-19-33-200-060, 41-19-33-200-061, 41-19-34-101-008, 41-19-34-101-009
Requested Action: Approval of a Special Use Permit for a Shared Dock.

Planning Director Dan Swallow gave an overview of the request. Swallow stated the standards for special use permit, keyhole ordinance, and gave an overview of the staff analysis of the special use standards as they related to the application before them.

Planner Kevin Garcia gave an overview of the existing conditions. Garcia stated that there is already an existing dock on site and that the request was to formalize the use agreement with the current households that use the dock.

Director Swallow mentioned the public comment that was printed and given to the Commissioners and discussed the questions posed in the comment.

Chairman Rowland asked if there was a boat ramp on site or just a dock.

Staff clarified that there was just a dock.

Treasurer Korstange stated that the keyhole ordinance was intended to be used for new development and not be used for already existing grandfathered properties.

Director Swallow stated that there was a mechanism in the keyhole ordinance to have existing keyholes apply for a special use permit, though it was mostly to document where these exist.

Chairman Rowland asked if the neighborhood expanded would additional homes have access to the dock.

Staff stated that additional homes would not.

Commissioner Cribbs asked if there was a HOA controlling the dock.

Staff stated that there was a maintenance agreement and easement between

the properties but no official HOA.

Treasurer Korstange asked if there were six lots or four.

Staff stated that there was a total of six lots with one owner that owned three lots, with a total of four owners, and the recommended motion was identifying four addresses that would have recorded access.

Applicant, Trent Almassian (5260 Dayenu Drive SE), stated that there would not be a new dock built and that there was a loose HOA but the agreement document would be the standard for the dock maintenance and use.

Motion was made by Chairman Rowland to open the Public Hearing.
Supported by Commissioner Cribbs
Motion carried unanimously.

Ron Hyde (7400 Kirkwood Trail), stated concerns related to expanding the use of the dock if the neighborhood was developed and the size of the dock expanding and negatively impacting the river.

Motion was made by Chairman Rowland to Close the Public hearing.
Supported by Cribbs.
Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Rowland asked if the Township could regulate the size of the dock itself and that the Township was just regulating the access to the dock.

Staff stated that the dock would be regulated by EGLE, but the Keyhole Ordinance allowed for the regulation of access to the dock by specific properties.

Applicant, Trent Almassian (5260 Dayen Drive SE), stated that the point of the application was to prevent overcrowding of docks and that the use of the docks was tied to the four specific properties.

Commissioners discussed the intent of the keyhole ordinance and the grandfathered status of existing docks.

Planning Director Dan Swallow discussed the difference between non-conforming docks and new development and why the Special Use was requested.

Chairman Rowland asked if the properties could still build personal docks and if the access was for the properties or the owners.

Staff clarified that they still have the right to build a personal dock.

Vice Chair Kraemer stated that the right was tied to the specific addresses.

Motion was made by Treasurer Korstange to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the Special Land Use permit for a SHARED DOCK and access drive, serving 5200, 5234, 5260, and 5292 Dayenu Drive based on the following findings:

1. **The request aligns with the intent of Section 4.10. Keyhole Development, E. General Provisions 1. Maximum Residential Access, which authorizes shared access for four (4) adjoining waterfront property owners;**
2. **The request meets the general requirements in Section 14.8. Special Land Uses, D. Standard for Approval; and**
3. **The shared dock and access drive are located on and adjacent to the property at 5292 Dayenu Drive, in accordance with the Easement Description dated December 31, 2024.**

Supported by Vice Chair Kraemer.
Motion carried unanimously.

ARTICLE 9. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.

Ron Hyde (7400 Kirkwood Trail), asked when was the Keyhole Ordinance passed.

Chairman Rowland stated that it was renewed in the recent Zoning Ordinance update.

Planning Director Dan Swallow followed by stating that the original ordinance was created in 1995, and several amendments have been made since.

ARTICLE 10. Other Business

Planning Director Dan Swallow gave an update on future meetings and possible work sessions for amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

ARTICLE 11. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 7:08pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Commissioner David Madiol, Planning Commission Secretary