

MINUTES
Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, November 20, 2017
7:00 P.M.

ARTICLE 1. Vice Chairman Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
Members Present: Katsma, Johnson, Lewis, Mead, Rissi and Williams
Members Absent: Pennington and Robinson (E)
Others Present: Community Development Director, Steve Peterson, Township Manager Ben Swayze and those listed on the sign in sheet.

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.

Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 7 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 6, 2017 Meeting.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve the Minutes. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 7 to 0.

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

Mr. Ken Carey came forward and stated that he had attended a meeting of the Township Board around May 10, 2017 where he heard a presentation concerning the Michigan Economic Development Corporation and what they do and expressed an interest in why Cascade was one of the last holdouts to join and receive certification. He owns property in the Village. It would be a great benefit for Cascade and the Village.

Township Manager Mr. Ben Swayze was present and addressed this matter. He stated that Cascade has started the process to certification for the Redevelopment Ready Community program, however, the process could take anywhere from 9 months to 3 or 4 years.

ARTICLE 6. Case #17-3417 Adam Salmon

Public Hearing

Property Address: 6350 Cascade Road

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to construct an accessory building in excess of 832 sq. ft.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting permission to construct a 30' x 48' accessory building (1,440 sq. ft.). The building will be under 14 feet tall as measured to the midpoint. This requires a minimum of a 10 feet setback from the side and 25 feet

from the rear property lines. The Applicant shows the nearest setback of 45 feet to the side property line.

The purpose of the building will be for storage of lumber, a sawmill and a tractor. Applicant is aware that a business cannot be run from the building.

With more than 3 acres, Applicant is allowed to have two accessory buildings. Two already exist, but the smallest building in the Southwest corner of the property will be removed.

The building is planned to have metal siding and metal roofing. While this is a little unusual for the residential zone, this is not a typical subdivision where it would be out of character.

Director Peterson went on to state that a review of past accessory buildings in the R1 zone on lots of similar size shows that this building is larger than most given the size of the home. That any outdoor lighting will need to meet township standards and that accessory buildings cannot be used for living space or to run a business.

Director Peterson recommends that Applicant's request for a Special Use Permit be granted, however, he recommends that the size of the building be reduced from 1,440 sq. ft. to no more than 1,200 sq. ft. due to fact that the size of the home on the property will be smaller (1,300 sq. ft.) and with the following conditions:

1. Building will not be used for living space or to run a business; and
2. Any outdoor lighting meetings township regulations.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Alan Salmon came forward. He showed various photos of his home and existing buildings. Mr. Salmon spoke to the size of the structure he wanted to build. He explained that 1,440 sq. ft. was the smallest he could do because of the size of his sawmill he wished to store. He realizes that the building will be larger than the current home on the property, however, Mr. Salmon stated that down the line, he wanted to replace the home and it would be larger in size than it is currently. He had no problem using wood siding instead of metal if that was preferable. He reiterated his need for the building as storage only. He would not be running a business out of the building. Lumber milling is a hobby of his and currently the existing buildings are not big enough or in good enough shape for what he needs.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to open public hearing. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 7 to 0.

No members of the public came forward.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to close public hearing. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 7 to 0.

Extensive discussion followed concerning the size of the building, whether there were any wetlands on the property, noise from the sawmill that might impact neighboring properties, and any potential business from Applicant's lumber milling. Some members of the Commission disagreed with Director Peterson's recommendation of reducing the size of the building to 1,200 sq. ft., that Applicant's request did not seem out of line with what has been approved in the past.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve Applicant's request for a Special Use Permit to construct an accessory building (1,440 sq. ft.) with the conditions listed by Director Peterson above. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 5 to 2.

ARTICLE 7. Case #17-3421 Lacks Enterprises

Property Address: 5460 Cascade Road

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting to amend the Golfview P.U.D. to allow for a short and mid-term lodging building for out-of-town Lacks employees at the Corporate HQ.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review in order to add a short and mid-term lodging facility for their out-of-town employees and guests at 5460 Cascade Road.

The project would consist of an approximate 4,300 sq. ft. building and would have 6 apartments. The building would be physically separate from any other building, but would be on the same property as the corporate headquarters building.

Applicant has indicated that this would only be used for their employees and guests. Currently, they have staff from out-of-town stay at surrounding hotels for extended stays.

The property is part of the larger Golfview P.U.D. that has restrictions on the size of the buildings. The most recent amended to the project allowed for the expansion of the corporate headquarters building, but did not have a provision for this additional building.

The Golfview P.U.D. has a complicated history of give and take and has now been completely developed. Some of the concerns relative towards amount of development had to do with the amount of traffic that would be generated by the new development. The thought was to have a mix of uses that would allow for traffic to be distributed at different times, as well as limited "9-5 office traffic" by limiting the amount of offices that could developed. The P.U.D. also tried to adhere to the Cascade Road corridor study from the mid-90's. The intent in part of this corridor plan was to have the buildings look more residential from the road. However, in this case they would actually be putting up a residential building.

The location of the building would sit behind (and lower) than the existing headquarter building. This would make it difficult to see from Cascade Road. The Applicant has provided a couple of elevation drawings, but Director Peterson suggested that they

provide a couple of renderings to show what the building would actually look like from Cascade Road.

The original approved plan for Golfview did include an additional 10,000 sq. ft. building just to the West of the proposed site. This building was eliminated as part of a trade off with the original developer when he could not remove the billboard as originally required.

Since the development of the Golfview P.U.D., Cascade Road has been improved to include a center turn lane at the entrance. For this reason, and the relatively small scope of this project, Director Peterson does not feel a traffic study is needed.

The current Master Plan designation for this property is Mixed Use. This designation is a reflection of the uses that are already there. This project does not change that and would not be inconsistent with the Master Plan.

The Applicant has indicated that the storm water from the site will be addressed and improved to comply with the township's storm water ordinance.

Director Peterson stated that if the Planning Commission finds that all of the procedural information has been provided by the Applicant, then this matter would proceed to a public hearing and consideration of a Preliminary Development Plan. It will be at that stage of the review process that the merits of the request will be considered and the detailed site plans will be required and reviewed.

Therefore, before proceeding to the Preliminary Development Plan review (Public Hearing), Director Peterson recommends that the Applicant address the following:

1. Provide the required site plan information;
2. Revise the site plan to include the necessary storm water information; and
3. Provide a rendering to show what the new building would look like from Cascade Road.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Justin Longstreth of Moore & Bruggink and Mr. Patrick Knight came forward to show a couple of rough renderings of what the building would look like, to explain that it would consist of 6 suites and a couple of conference rooms and that the need was to house out-of-town guests and employees for short term durations because of the convenience to the main headquarters on site.

No formal action is required at this time. Planning Commission members gave Applicant their feedback and this will proceed towards the next step in the process which is the public hearing.

ARTICLE 8. Case #16:3419 Innovative Design, Mark Tomasik

Property Address: 6759 Cascade Road

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting to amend P.U.D. 19 to allow for a revised site plan to accommodate a drive-thru coffee business for Starbucks.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting a Basic Plan Review in order to amend the Thornapple Centre P.U.D. to add a drive-thru coffee business and amend the site plan to accommodate the change. This change would essentially break the existing building into two separate buildings. This allows for the coffee drive-thru at the end of the building. This is being done in essentially the same footprint as the existing building, so we would actually have a decrease in building square footage on the site.

Cascade Township does not allow for restaurants to have a drive-thru. Is Starbucks considered a restaurant? After inspection of other Starbuck facilities, Director Peterson determined that it is not a restaurant based on the definition in the zoning ordinance. If the Planning Commission determines otherwise, then the appropriate plan would be to ask the Zoning Board of Appeals to overturn his interpretation.

As a result of the redevelopment of the site, the developer is required to install a sidewalk from the pathway along Cascade Road to their sidewalk at the front of the building.

The project does create some new traffic flow around the building to accommodate the drive-thru. However, it appears that it would be done with minimal impact on the public road system. Director Peterson suggests that the existing curb cut out to the main entry drive be realigned with the drive-thru, as well as the inclusion of some landscape islands in the parking lot to help with traffic flow in the parking lot. Although the added traffic is a change to the site, he does not feel a full traffic study is warranted. However, he did suggest that they provide information from Starbucks on the expected traffic generation from the site so the township can evaluate the need, if any, for other possible changes.

Although it appears that no added impervious areas are being added, the Township Engineer will need to review and approve the revised storm water plan for the site to ensure compliance with the storm water ordinance.

The changes also include a slight change to the wall sign. The current development included rectangles on top of each entrance that the developer could use. They appear to want to make a change to that. They should provide plans showing the existing sign allowance and what they are asking for. Although a small change, this could be problematic for the rest of the project depending on what the change would be. This also begs the question about signage in the development and the need to make changes for the entry way. Others in the development have expressed interest in making changes to the overall sign package. These changes should be included in the P.U.D. amendment. Drawings that the developer had put together had been submitted some time ago. These show not only some of their ideas for entry signs into the project, but also a traffic circle fountain on the project. This redevelopment should allow for that to happen.

The Fire Department will need to review and approve the site plan.

Other projects that have separated buildings like this has resulted in building code issues. The Applicant should have their architect review these changes now, to avoid any issue during permitting.

The DDA Director will need to review and approve the site plan.

Director Peterson stated that if the Planning Commission finds that all of the procedural information has been provided by the Applicant, then this matter would proceed to a public hearing and consideration of a Preliminary Development Plan. It will be at that stage of the review process that the merits of the request will be considered and the detailed site plans will be required and reviewed.

Therefore, before proceeding to the Preliminary Development Plan review (Public Hearing), Director Peterson recommends that the Applicant address the following:

1. Provide the traffic generation information from Starbucks;
2. Realign the drive and drive-thru with landscape island to improve traffic flow through the site;
3. Comply with comments from the DDA and Fire Department;
4. Have the developer's architect review the plans for any building code issues;
5. Provide documentation that the existing wall signage is the same as what is being proposed;
6. Coordinate meeting with the other owners in the development to address the main entry sign changes;
7. Agree to an easement to allow for the proposed traffic circle;
8. Include a sidewalk connection from Cascade Road to the front of the building; and
9. Receive approval from the Township Engineer.

Once the above items are satisfied, a public hearing will be set to consider the amendments.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Mark. Tomasik came forward to present renderings of what the drive-thru and surrounding property would look like. He let the members of the Planning Commission know that he agreed with Director Peterson's assessment that Starbucks is not qualified as a restaurant. They have only accessory food and do not prepare food from scratch on site. He spoke to Mr. Peterson's suggestion that the main entry drive be realigned with the drive-thru to help traffic flow to which he did not see a problem.

Some discussion followed.

Formal action was not required. The Planning Commission asked Applicant to address Director Peterson's list above, so that this could proceed to public hearing.

ARTICLE 9. Any other business

- a. Discussion of possible sign ordinance amendments

Director Peterson stated that in response to comments heard from businesses and in community surveys, as well as the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the need to address the regulation of signs on a content neutral basis, staff had conducted a series of meetings with business/property owners to discuss amendments to the sign ordinance. At the last meeting, he distributed copies of the proposed changes for the Planning Commission to review. Director Peterson then went through each amendment with the members to be certain each was understood. He then went on to say that this will now be set for public hearing where further discussion will take place.

- b. Resolution of support to adopt the Cascade Charter Township capital improvement plan 2018 – 2023.

Mr. Ben Swayze presented and gave an overview of the Capital Improvement Plan for the 6 years of 2018 – 2023 and answered any questions presented by the members.

Motion was made by Member Mead to support the resolution to adopt the Cascade Charter Township capital improvement plan from 2018 – 2023 and forward recommendation to the Township Board. Supported by Member Johnson. A roll call was conducted. Motion was carried 7 to 0.

ARTICLE 10. Adjournment

Motion was made by Member Mead to adjourn. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 7 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Rissi, Secretary