

**MINUTES**  
**CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MONDAY, January 19, 2026**  
**6:00 pm**  
**2870 JACKSMITH AVE SE**

- ARTICLE 1.** Chair Rowland called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.  
Members Present: Korstange, Kraemer, Rowland, Cribbs, Madiol, Kaiser, Lauer  
Members Absent: None  
Others Present: Community Planning and Development Director (Director) Andrea Hendrick, DDA Manager Ryan Sennett, Planning Administrative Assistant Nick Govan 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 Treasurer Korstange to approve the current agenda.**  
**Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**
- ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflict of Interest**  
There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.
- ARTICLE 5. Selection of Officers**  
**Motion was made by Treasurer Korstange to nominate Chairman Rowland to the position of Chairman and Vice Chairman Kraemer as Vice Chairman.**  
**Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**  
**Motion was made by Treasurer Korstange to nominate Commissioner Madiol to the position of Secretary.**  
**Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**
- ARTICLE 6. Approve the Minutes of the December 1, 2025, meeting.**  
**Motion was made by Commissioner Cribbs to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2025 meeting.**  
**Supported by Vice Chair Kraemer.**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**
- ARTICLE 7. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.**  
There was no one wishing to speak.
- ARTICLE 8. Case #25-3906 – Public Hearing**  
**Applicant:** Daniel Pinkham  
**Property Address:** 8178 Bolt Dr SE

**Parcel Number:** 41-19-11-100-052

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting a Type I Special Use Permit to allow an accessory building over 832 sf.

Director Hendrick presented the application, which had been tabled from the December 1, 2025 meeting. The parcel is 2.2 to 2.3 acres in the Agricultural Rural Conservation (ARC) district. Surrounding parcels are also zoned ARC. The applicant originally provided plans for a 3,200 square foot accessory building in December.

Director Hendrick explained the applicant has now provided a new site plan. However, the building footprint is actually 3,272 square feet. While the building itself is slightly smaller, lean-to structures count toward the footprint, so the building requiring a special use permit has actually increased in size. Staff calculated the total floor area of the building at 2,700 square feet.

Director Hendrick noted the building meets the height maximum and setback requirements for accessory buildings in the ARC district, meeting the required 60-foot setback for accessory buildings of this height. She explained that when considering approval, the Planning Commission should take into account the intent and use of the building, the proposed location, type and kind of construction, general architecture and character of the building, size of the building in relation to the house and lot and zone district, type and kind of principal and accessory buildings on adjoining properties in the general area, topography and vegetation, and whether the proposed building will affect light and air circulation on adjoining properties.

Director Hendrick stated one letter was received in opposition, from the same neighbor to the north of the subject property, who still feels the building is too large and will have a negative impact on his property. At the December 1 meeting, the Planning Commission postponed the application, giving the applicant direction to decrease the size of the building, address line-of-sight issues with a landscaping buffer, and update the plans to address the neighbor's concerns.

Director Hendrick noted the applicant had added some landscaping, more in narrative than on the site plan. The light green buffer on the north side of the property in the submitted site plan shows the proposed landscaping. Given the direction of the Planning Commission to decrease the size of the building and address some of the neighbor's concerns, staff recommended denial primarily because the scale of the proposed building in relation to the house is inconsistent with other accessory buildings in the area and previously approved accessory buildings, and the size and proposed location will significantly impact surrounding neighbors and the general character of the Zone District.

The applicant, Daniel Pinkham (8178 Bolt Drive SE), stated after the December meeting he worked hard to get the size down as requested. He acknowledged it was an oversight on his part, stating he relied on his builder regarding the lean-to structures. Mr. Pinkham explained that the interior design requires significant space because pickleball courts take up

considerable room, and they need a gathering area, which is why they developed a loft area with garage parking underneath for efficient use of space.

Mr. Pinkham stated they did not have time to develop a full landscaping plan, but the concept would be to build a berm on the already down-sloping land and plant evergreens in front to screen the building from the neighbor's property. He explained the direction that the neighbor's house faces and the composition of his property create challenges. He stated there is no other location on the property to place the building given setback requirements. Mr. Pinkham indicated that removing the lean-tos would not be a problem if that was an issue.

Commissioner Madiol asked if Mr. Pinkham recalled the square footage from the last plan. Mr. Pinkham stated the last one was 3,200 square feet and this version was paired down to 2,592 square feet. He explained they could meet the percentage requirements comparing the accessory structure to the primary residence, but with the lean-tos, it pushed them over.

Chair Rowland asked if Mr. Pinkham was opposed to removing the lean-tos. Mr. Pinkham confirmed he would not be opposed to it and that his wife did not like the look of them either.

Commissioner Cribbs asked about the height of existing trees around where the building would be located. Mr. Pinkham stated there is nothing substantial where the building would sit. He confirmed both he and the neighbor would be able to physically see the building if built with the current trees. Mr. Pinkham explained landscaping screening would need to be installed. He proposed eight to ten foot trees on a berm, likely evergreens. While it may not screen entirely initially, over time trees like maples would grow to 30-40 feet.

Vice Chair Kraemer asked about similar large buildings in the area. He noted the staff report indicated they looked at a half-mile radius and did not see any similar structures. Mr. Pinkham stated he wished his builder was present as the builder had been traveling. The builder had cited a few examples inside Cascade Township.

Treasurer Korstange noted those examples were in the Commission's packet. She observed that while some approved buildings were similar sizes, many were on much larger acreage such as 40, 50, or 100 acres, which helps hide buildings more effectively.

**Motion was made by Chair Rowland to open public hearing.  
Supported by Vice Chair Kraemer.  
Motion carried unanimously.**

There was no one wishing to speak.

**Motion was made by Chair Rowland to close public hearing.  
Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.  
Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Rowland voiced appreciation for what the applicant was doing but stated he was worried about the next few applicants afterwards and setting precedent. He reviewed the list and noted only one was close in size.

Vice Chair Kraemer stated he appreciated the applicant trying to reduce the size based on previous comments. He noted that when the applicant was last present, they discussed how small the building could be made for its intended use. He indicated some commissioners might still take issue with the size and suggested the applicant should be confident this was as small as it could be. Mr. Pinkham responded it would not make sense to build if made smaller than proposed.

Commissioner Cribbs noted the building would be secluded with the buffer in front separating it from the house to the north, along with existing seclusion from houses on the east side. He stated the beauty of the building and the building not being an open field makes a difference.

Treasurer Korstange noted height concerns, stating it is not just a big building but a tall building. She asked about the peak height. Director Hendrick indicated she would need to check if peak measurements were in the drawings but compliance was determined using the current midpoint measurement.

Chair Rowland noted it would make it the largest accessory building on a two-acre lot on the comparison list.

Commissioner Madiol stated he agreed with everything that had been said. He understood the building's intention and thought it was well thought out with appropriate exterior design. However, he expressed concern about the 832 square foot threshold where special use permits begin. He worried about setting precedent.

Treasurer Korstange agreed about hating to deny but noted that 832 square feet is not very large in the agricultural area. She stated she thinks the new zoning will address this issue.

Commissioner Madiol asked if the applicant is denied, can he reapply under the standards of the new Zoning Ordinance. Director Hendrick the process would not be a Planning Commission hearing, but the applicant would have the right to come back with a new application.

**Motion by Chairman Rowland to DENY Case #25-3906 for a Type I Special Use Permit for a 3,272 sf accessory structure at 8178 Bolt Drive SE based on the following findings:**

- 1. The scale of the proposed building in relation to the house, lot, and zoning district is inconsistent with that of accessory buildings in the area and of previously approved accessory buildings.**
- 2. The size of the structure and proposed location will significantly impact the view for the surrounding neighbors and the general character of the Zone District.**

**Supported by Treasurer Korstange.**

**Motion carried 5-2.**

**Yea: Korstange, Lauer, Kaiser, Madiol, Rowland**

**Nay: Kraemer, Cribbs**

**ARTICLE 9.**

**Case #25-3911 – Public Hearing**

**Applicant:** R's Post Frame LLC

**Property Address:** 8375 36th St SE

**Parcel Number:** 41-19-14-300-028

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting an Amendment to a previously approved Special Use Permit.

DDA Manager Ryan Sennett presented the request for an amendment to a previously approved Type II Special Use Permit for the existing public golf course at 8375 36th Street. The property is a 275-acre site zoned PUD 61 that has operated as an 18-hole public golf course since 1998. The site is located on the north side of 36th Street, east of Buttrick, and extends north to 30th Street. The portion under consideration is located near the east property line toward the southern portion of the property.

Sennett explained that to add an additional building to the property, the previous special use permit approval must be amended. The applicant is proposing a new 4,800 square foot ancillary building to function as a year-round golf center. The building would include a digital golf simulator, bays with outside access to hit balls during instruction and interior space for educational purposes.

Staff evaluated the request under the general special use standards in Section 17.06 of the Zoning Ordinance and the golf course specific standards in Section 17.07.2.c. The proposal meets all applicable dimensional standards including setbacks, building height, and minimum acreage requirements. The building would be 40 feet by 120 feet in footprint and located just north of the existing maintenance building. The building would be over 400 feet from the nearest property line and 500 feet from the closest residence.

Sennett stated the site plan does not provide specific distance between buildings, but the applicant indicated verbally it would be at least 10 feet from the building to the south. Staff does not anticipate significant traffic increases beyond normal golf course operations. Regarding parking, the site plan does not provide specific details on the number of spaces, so staff included a condition recommending a site plan be provided demonstrating compliance with access, parking, and loading requirements.

Staff does not anticipate noise impacts as construction activities are moving indoors and may actually reduce outdoor noise. The site is heavily wooded and the proposed building is well-screened by existing mature vegetation. Staff does not anticipate removal of existing trees or additional visual impacts. Two residents requested copies of the plans, and neither submitted formal comments or objections. One resident mentioned to staff they had no issues with the proposal.

Staff found the proposed building meets applicable special use standards

and remains clearly incidental to the primary golf use. Staff recommended approval as stated in the staff report.

Treasurer Korstange asked if there are regulations on the number of buildings allowed. Sennett confirmed there is no specific cap on buildings as long as they are ancillary to the primary use approved with the special use permit.

Treasurer Korstange asked about size requirements for accessory buildings in a PUD. Zoning Administrator Sennett explained there are no specific regulations for accessory buildings incidental to commercial uses in PUDs. The proposal was reviewed under Type II special use permit standards. The proposed structure meets the height requirement, but there is no specific size limitation.

Treasurer Korstange confirmed the golf course standards in Section 17.07.2.c contain nothing about the number of buildings. Sennett confirmed this was correct, noting only setback requirements and similar standards apply.

Chair Rowland asked if a water drainage study was required. Staff confirmed that the Township Engineer had done a preliminary review and found no immediate issues, again noting site plan review requirements included in draft the motion.

Mikki Palmer, the applicant's representative, made herself available for questions.

Kyle Holmes, Owner of Quail Ridge Golf Course, presented additional context. He explained the building would be an eight-bay indoor/outdoor hitting facility operating both summer and winter. They anticipate creating eight to ten new positions, including at least one to two full-time positions plus part-time staff to run the building and bar. Their goal is to create a Midwest hub for high-level golf instruction accessible to anyone. They plan to focus on junior programs, seniors, women, and getting as many people involved in golf as possible.

The applicant explained they have plans to develop youth and school programming and currently work with Grand Rapids Christian High School, Grand Rapids Catholic Central, and have some involvement with Davenport University. They plan to reach out to schools to offer space where teams could practice indoors during the three to four months when competing teams from warmer climates have advantages.

Mr. Holmes stated they want to differentiate their facility from typical simulator golf venues where players just hit into screens. They will have garage doors that open to allow hitting down the driving range, combining simulator technology with outdoor hitting. The owner indicated this appears to be a unique concept nationwide and would reset how people view year-round golf. He stated that they would do whatever is needed to be compliant with the parking lot and structure.

Chair Rowland asked for clarification about having a bar in the building. The owner confirmed they would have a bar but not full food service, as that would require a full kitchen with hood vents.

The owner stated the site already holds a license through the Michigan Liquor Control Commission and operate bar carts on site. He stated that the license would encompass the proposed accessory structure.

He also stated that the bar would not be open and alcohol would not be available during events held for minors.

**Motion was made by Chair Rowland to open public hearing.  
Supported by Treasure Korstange.  
Motion carried unanimously.**

Bruce Wright (3447 Quiggle Avenue SE) stated he is probably the closest neighbor at 400-500 feet from the property. He expressed support for the proposal, noting he and his family have lived in the area for 13-14 years. Mr. Wright stated the golf course has been a great neighbor, well-maintained and well-managed. He said any issues that have arisen have been handled professionally by the golf course management. Mr. Wright indicated he supports the simulator facility as a way to make the golf course more viable year-round and expressed no concerns about neighborhood impact.

Chair Rowland thanked Mr. Wright for attending and noted that neighbor support carries significant weight in the Commission's considerations.

**Motion was made by Chair Rowland to close public hearing.  
Supported by Vice Chair Kraemer.  
Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Rowland stated the bar component gave him pause initially but found the operation to be a good idea.

Commissioner Cribbs mentioned that he supported having another training facility that serviced youth sports.

Treasure Korstange questioned if they needed a liquor license for the bar. Chair Rowland noted the golf course has a liquor license at the main clubhouse and questioned whether the liquor license would cover the new building. The Owner noted that the License covers the entire property and provided the example of having beverage carts on the course.

Treasurer Korstange stated that if there was a bar being added, she wanted to ensure it would be legal. Chair Rowland asked if the Commission needed to know where the bar would be located, noting it was not shown on the site plan.

Director Hendrick recommended that the Planning Commission request a floor plan showing the location of the bar.

Commissioner Madiol stated the golf club is a great addition to Cascade

and expressed support for anything the club can do to build their business.

**Motion by Treasurer Korstange to APPROVE case number 25-3911 to amend the site plan approved by Special Use Permit to allow construction of a building ancillary to the public golf course use at 8375 36th St SE for the following reason:**

- 1. The proposed building satisfies the Special Use Permit approval standards outlined in 17.06 of the Cascade Township Zoning Ordinance.**

**And with the following conditions:**

- 1. The use remain ancillary to the primary use (public golf course) of the property.**
- 2. The applicant submit a site plan to Planning Department staff, demonstrating compliance with the access, parking, and loading requirements of the Cascade Township Zoning Ordinance.**
- 3. The site plan include the location of the bar.**
- 4. Confirmation of the state licensing for the bar be provided.**

**Supported by Commissioner Cribbs.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

## **ARTICLE 10. Planning Commission Annual Report**

Director Hendrick presented the Planning Commission Annual Report and requested Commission feedback. She explained the report would be submitted to the Board of Trustees at their January 28, 2026, meeting under Receive and File.

Chair Rowland noted the significant drop in violent incidents in 2025 and questioned the data accuracy, while acknowledging he was pleased if the numbers were correct.

Director Hendrick explained the data related specifically to hotels and reflected the success of the township's hotel licensing ordinance. She stated that by regulating hotels more closely through the licensing program, the township had achieved exactly what was intended in reducing incidents at hotel properties.

Commissioner Madiol expressed appreciation for the positive outcome and asked if staff had identified any other interesting trends while compiling the report.

Director Hendrick noted a decrease in single-family residential development but explained this was expected given Cascade is primarily built out. She indicated that the township is focusing on preserving large areas and that future development would likely be redevelopment of existing sites rather than new construction. She stated the areas designated for development in the Master Plan are largely built out.

Chair Rowland asked about hotels that had been considering vacating. Director Hendrick confirmed all 16 hotels in the township renewed their licenses for 2026. She noted that, while hotels can continue operating under current regulations, the new Zoning Ordinance, once adopted by the Board, will create additional redevelopment opportunities for some hotel locations.

**ARTICLE 11. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.**

There was no one wishing to speak.

**ARTICLE 12. Other Business**

Chairman Rowland welcomed Commissioner Lauer and Kaiser and encouraged them to voice their opinions. He stated that the Planning Commission had historically been a civil space.

**ARTICLE 13. Adjourn**

**The meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Commissioner David Madiol, Planning Commission Secretary