

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, October 1, 2007
7:00 p.m.

ARTICLE 1. Chairman McDonald called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members Present: Koessel, Logue, McDonald, Postma, Richards, Waalkes
Members Absent: Lewis (excused), MacAllister (excused), Robinson (excused)
Others Present: Planning Director Peterson, Recording Secretary Hern, and Members of the Public.

ARTICLE 2. Chairman McDonald led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ARTICLE 3. Chairman McDonald requested motion for approval of the October 1st Agenda.

Member Waalkes motioned for approval of the agenda as presented, supported by Member Koessel. All in favor with none opposed, the motion carried.

ARTICLE 4. **Approve the Minutes of the September 17, 2007.**

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for revisions, corrections or a motion for approval of the September 17th minutes.

Member Logue motioned for approval of the September 17, 2007 minutes as presented, supported by Member Richards.

Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed: September 17, 2007 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes were approved.**

ARTICLE 5. **Case # 07-2861: Riebel Development Corp.**
Address of Property: 6300 28th Street
(TABLED AT THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2007 MEETING)
Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting Preliminary Plan Approval in order to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.).

Chairman McDonald requested a motion to remove this Article from the table.

Member Koessel motioned to remove Case # 07-2861: Riebel Development Corp. from the table, supported by Member Waalkes.

All in favor, none opposed; Case # 07-2861: Riebel Development Corp. was removed from the table.

Planning Director Peterson noted that at the September 17th Planning Commission Meeting there were several outstanding items regarding the project including:

- Phasing Plan
- A complete landscape plan
- Lighting plan
- Building elevations
- The drive-thru on the west end of the Building, 1D on the site plan
- The building connection (overhead walkway) and use of it between Buildings 1A and 1B
- The overall signage plan, including the development sign
- An internal traffic analysis

The subcommittee met regarding these items and the biggest changes to the plan include the removal of the east side of Building 1B to allow for traffic flow along the east side of the site.

The plan also shows the removal of the drive-thru. If in the future the Applicant wanted one it would have to come back before the Planning Commission for an amendment to their P.U.D.

The building connection between Buildings 1A and 1B has been indicated that it would be open and useable space.

Planning Director Peterson also said the Signage Plan has changed and the Applicant is no longer asking for two (2) pylon signs by 28th Street. The Applicant has indicated they would like one (1) pylon sign and moving it closer to the eastern drive way. Staff also indicated to the Applicant having a directional sign at the west entrance. The Applicant understands they will be allowed a certain square footage for signage and the total square footage will include all signs on the site.

After reviewing these changes the subcommittee is now comfortable with the site plan being presented and have recommended to the Planning Commission approval of the changes.

If the Planning Commission agrees with the Site Plan, the Applicant still needs to obtain the final Site Plan approval and any of these details can be discussed at that time.

Member Koessel asked about the signage on the walkway and Planning Director Peterson said it is the same signage as shown on the Site Plan at the September 17th meeting but it would be counted as part of the overall all allowed wall signage. Member Koessel asked if the total square footage allowed would come off the other buildings and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member Koessel asked if the walkway had changed. Member Postma clarified that the Applicant does not plan to occupy it but it is part of the building's fire system as there needs to be two (2) ways to exit.

Mr. Koessel noted that the impression he had from the previous meeting was that the subcommittee reviewed plans that indicated a tenant/restaurant was going to use the space as a waiting area with tables. Member Koessel asked if this space is occupy-able or not? Mr. Remminga, on behalf of Riebel Development, said that it is being built as an enclosed space that could be occupied and heated but the intent for now is for the area to be used as an elevator lobby for both sides. The area is wide enough to be used for overflow for restaurants. It is useable and functional by putting the elevator on one (1) side and not the other and the Applicant believes they have increased the use. It is also part of the fire exiting for the building and the offices located on the upper floor. Mr. Remminga referred to the floor plan of the second floor noting the stairways and elevator. The elevator is located in this area to serve the bulk of the parking in the rear of the building.

Member Koessel asked if there is a requirement to have an elevator in Building 1B and Mr. Remminga said that there is a requirement that the second floor must be handicapped accessible and it is with the elevator. There is not a requirement for another elevator.

Member Koessel asked if the walkway is wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs along with restaurant tables and waiting area? Mr. Remminga said the final drawings have not been finalized yet but it is being calculated at approximately 10-12 feet wide. If a restaurant tenant actually did want to utilize both sides, then the developer would probably have to install an elevator in Building 1B noting that if the area is being occupied by a tenant the walkway cannot be used for fire exiting. Applicant Riebel said

they would know more regarding the tenant once 50% of Building 1B has been rented.

Member Koessel acknowledged that the subcommittee was concerned with the walkway connection and asked Member Postma if they are comfortable with this Site Plan and Member Postma said they are but he thought the walkway was wider than 10-12 feet, based on the drawing, the subcommittee thought it was approximately 20-feet wide.

Chairman McDonald reminded the Planning Commission that this is a preliminary site plan review and the details can be worked out during the Site Plan approval meeting.

Member Koessel asked Member Postma if the subcommittee is comfortable with the Site Plan being presented this evening considering there was a previous, similar project recently that was denied by the Planning Commission and if they were comfortable, what was the difference in this plan? Member Postma noted that this is a better site plan for the area than the one that was initially approved. Chairman McDonald also reminded the Commission that the previous site plan that Member Koessel is referring to was denied. That project also showed two (2) buildings being connected but by an architectural structure, an exterior brick arch. This project shows an occupy-able area that is useable that connects the buildings. Member Postma agreed with Chairman McDonald's statement. Planning Director Peterson also clarified that the other applicant was requesting three (3) buildings on the parcel and we agreed to 2 buildings on less than 6 acres. This site is different in that the Township was dealing with the existing Pizza Hut, if the Pizza Hut were removed, there would still be approximately 14-acres that would allow for four (4) buildings and the additional building could remain on its own but it was better to include it within the P.U.D. He agrees that the two (2) projects being discussed are similar but they are not apples-to-apples in comparisons. Member Koessel said he recognizes the extra building on this property and the concerns regarding the extra building on the other site and Planning Director Peterson noted that the subcommittee was more comfortable with this proposal because the connection is useable space.

Mr. Remminga also said that they did speak in great detail with the subcommittee regarding the language in the code concerning the walkway and the purpose of its connectivity. Member Postma noted that Members Lewis and Robinson both stressed the fire safety issues and utilizing the walkway as an emergency exit.

Mr. Remminga also noted that the developer has made notes on the drawings regarding that Building 1B cannot be occupied without the walkway connection and the way that Building 1A is being built with the elevator and stairways, Building 1B is much more important. The building code will not allow for Building 1B to be occupied without the walkway. Member Koessel noted that unless the developer installs another elevator and stairway and Mr. Remminga agreed that is correct.

Chairman McDonald asked if there were any other questions of Staff and/or the Applicant. There were no more questions.

Chairman McDonald requested a motion for approval of the preliminary plan to amend the existing P.U.D.

Member Postma, on behalf of the subcommittee, motioned to approve the Applicant's request for Preliminary Plan Approval in order to amend the existing P.U.D. with the conditions that the following need to be submitted prior to Site Plan approval:

- 1) Complete Landscape Plan**
- 2) Lighting Plan**
- 3) Building elevations**

Member Postma asked if the Applicant was also to pave the area to the east and Planning Director Peterson said the Applicant did indicate they could pave at least a base coat by November 1, 2007.

Member Postma requested the additional condition:

- 4) The area to the east is paved by November 1st or close to that date if the weather is inclement.**

In summary, Chairman McDonald requested Member Postma to restate his motion. **Member Postma motioned to approve the preliminary P.U.D. with the conditions of:**

- 1) A complete Landscape Plan**
- 2) Lighting Plan**
- 3) Building elevations**
- 4) City of Grand Rapids approval**
- 5) Lay the base coat of pavement on the east end for connectivity no later than November 1st.**

Member Logue supported the motion.

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

The Planning Commission thanked the Applicant for making the plan better and nice job on the revisions.

ARTICLE 6.

Case # 07-2904: First Companies

Address of Property: 6640 28th Street SE

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting Site Plan approval for new building approximately 6,000-square feet.

Planning Director Peterson noted the parcel is within the B1-Village Business District on the south side of 28th Street just west of Old 28th Street.

The proposal is to tear down the existing house and build a new 6,000-sf. building for a new dental office and other office use. The building is 6,000-sf. and the footprint is 3,000-ft., the building is a two-story building. Because of the topography, you would be able to see the building much as you see the house now.

The Township's Village Design Committee has reviewed and approved the plan. The concerns expressed have already been addressed.

The landscaping plan has been beefed-up and the Applicant should be required to submit a \$5,000 Landscape Bond for this project. The Applicant has increased their landscaping along the west and north sides of the property to provide a screen from the site parking.

The 28th Street curb cut has been reviewed and approved by the Kent County Road Commission and they will have to make modifications to the island out in 28th Street to accommodate left turns into the site. Left turns out of the site are not being permitted.

The Township Fire Department and Engineer have reviewed and approved the plans.

Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) Submit a landscape bond of \$5,000.
- 2) Apply for and receive a soil erosion permit prior to construction.

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for any questions of Staff from the Planning Commission. There were no questions.

Representatives from Prein & Newhoff and First Companies were present and noted that Staff covered the report very well and they had nothing to add.

Member Koessel motioned to approve the Site Plan for a new building approximately 6,000-square feet at 6640 28th Street SE with the conditions that:

- 1) The Applicant submits a \$5,000 landscape bond.**
- 2) Apply for and receive a soil erosion permit prior to construction.**

Member Postma supported the motion and conditions.

Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed, motion carried.**

ARTICLE 7.

Case # 07-2903: Universal Traffic Service

Address of Property: 5500 International Parkway

Requested Action: Site plan review for a new 16,000 square foot addition.

Planning Director Peterson noted the property is located in the Meadowbrook Industrial Park just south 52nd Street and west of Kraft Avenue.

The Applicant originally developed the site in 1998 with a building approximately 15,000-sf. in size. It does back up to the home on Kraft Avenue. At that time there was particular care taken to the residential area to the east of the site and the Applicant provided additional landscaping and berming.

This addition would basically double the size of the building. One thing it does is remove the vehicular circulation around the east side of the site. The parking that is being added to the site, is essentially on the small lot to the north of the parcel and these lots will need to be combined into one (1) parcel.

The additional landscaping to the east of the site will remain and there will be additional landscaping to the north near the parking.

Both the Township's Fire Department and Engineer have reviewed the plan.

Meadowbrook Review Board has also reviewed and approved the project.

Staff recommends Site Plan Approval for the 16,000-square foot addition under the following conditions:

- 1) The Applicant applies for and receives a soil erosion permit from the Township prior to the issuance of any building permit.
- 2) A Landscape Bond for \$3,000.00 is provided to the Township.
- 3) The lot to the north is added to 5500 International Parkway before a building permit is issued.

Chairman McDonald asked what the Applicant needs to do to combine the lots and Planning Director Peterson said they need to file paperwork with the County.

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for questions of Staff from the Planning Commission. There were no questions.

Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add his comments to Staff's report.

Universal Traffic Service representative said that Staff's report was complete and accurate, no further comments.

Member Waalkes motioned to approve Site Plan for a new 16,000-square foot building addition at 5500 International Parkway with the conditions:

- 1) **The Applicant applies for and receives a soil erosion control permit from the Township prior to the issuance of any building permit.**
- 2) **A Landscape Bond for \$3,000.00 is provided to the Township.**
- 3) **The lot to the north is added to 5500 International Parkway before a building permit is issued.**

The motion was supported by Member Richards.

Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed, motion carried.**

ARTICLE 8.

Case # 07-2880: Spruce Meadows

Address of Property: 5375 28th Street Ct. SE

Requested Action: Recommendation to Township Board for approval of the Proposed P.U.D. Amendment.

Planning Director Peterson noted that at the August 20, 2007 Meeting, the Planning Commission awarded preliminary approval for a new hotel in the Spruce Meadows P.U.D. The plan was approved based on the site plan that was presented at that meeting. This hotel is located behind Meijer and is the same hotel that

requested an 8-foot variance for their entryway into the lobby. One thing Staff wanted to mention was that there was discussion regarding if the building should be moved forward or back to accommodate for the entryway. He reviewed the Township's zoning code and noted that there is a condition that if a building's rear yard buffer is adjacent to residential, the buffer does increase to 60-feet back and the Applicant was meeting Township's requirement to pull the project away from the residential area.

Staff has prepared the text amendments to regulate this project. The Applicant has reviewed the changes and has agreed with the language. However, we are still in need of a legal description. Staff has received the approval of C & O.

Member Koessel asked under B in the Site Development Standards and under Setback Requirements, the Township approved the setback at 82-feet as it related to the section the entryway out in the front. Planning Director Peterson said that is why we also reference the approved site plan.

Member Waalkes asked if the setbacks listed are actual? Planning Director Peterson said they are and Member Waalkes questioned the rear setback and Planning Director Peterson noted the little section in the rear by the patio.

Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add any further comments, no further comments.

Member Koessel motioned to recommend to the Township Board approval of the proposed P.U.D. Amendment; supported by Member Postma.

Chairman McDonald called the motion to question.

Member Logue said that he is more comfortable in allowing the 8-foot variance now that the residential setback has been clearly defined. No further comments.

All in favor with none opposed, motion carried.

ARTICLE 9.

Case # 07-2908: Meijer Inc.

Address of Property: 5595 28th Street SE

Requested Action: Basic Plan Review for an amendment and addition to the P.U.D.

Planning Director Peterson said this is in reference to the restaurant located on the corner of 28th St and Kraft.

The Meijer property is zoned B2 Commercial and a few years ago the gas station and the Macaroni Grill were rezoned into their own separate P.U.D. The logic behind the rezoning was that Macaroni Grill wanted to be on a parcel less than three (3) acres and did not abide by the one building per three acre rule and the Township rezoned the property incorporating the gas station and the Macaroni Grill as two (2) buildings on approximately seven (7) acres.

Planning Director Peterson referred to the site plan noting the gas station and Macaroni Grill. He noted the only parcel left is the former Chinese restaurant. If the Planning Commission were to include this parcel, the property would increase the size of the P.U.D. to approximately 9.09-acres.

The site has been vacant for quite some time and has lost any legal non-conforming status, therefore, variances would be needed to be granted to reuse or rebuild the restaurant.

Most of the constraints of the property are due to the small size of the property, and the fact that it is a corner lot with two (2) front yards.

The proposal is to develop the site with two (2) buildings. The Applicant shows a retail center and a bank with the bank closer to the 28th Street and Kraft Ave. intersection.

The site plan shows modifications to the entries into the site and the Applicant would be closing them and opening a new one that does meet Township's requirements but needs to be approved by the County Road Commission.

The site does connect to the internal system and to Meijer with connections to the west and north.

After reviewing the plan staff has listed several items to discuss:

- The rear yard bufferyards are not being met;
- The location of the dumpster adjacent to Kraft Avenue.
- The location of the building relative to the front yard setbacks.
- The calculation for parking on the site.
- The Township will need elevation plans
- The Township will need lighting plans.
- The stacking for the bank drive-thru.

Staff also indicated that given the fact the Applicant is proposing doing two (2) buildings that the developer provide a site plan showing how much building they could develop on the site with no variances to judge the amount of development going in is the correct density.

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for questions of Staff from the Planning Commission.

Member Koessel noted the footprint provided within the Commissions' packets that showed the combined parcel for Macaroni Grill and the gas station. To him, it looked like there was very little side yard setback on the west of the property but the drawings this evening look as if there is enough room. Planning Director Peterson clarified that is because the Applicant is using the grassy area to the west of the restaurant site, even though that area is part of the Macaroni Grill/Meijer PUD.

Member Koessel asked if the old restaurant would be torn down and Planning Director Peterson said it would be.

Member Koessel asked what the square footage is of the old restaurant and Staff does not have the square footage.

No further questions of Staff and Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add their comments.

Ms. Scales presented a site plan to the Planning Commission noting they had reviewed several different options.

The site is 2.13-acres and is not allowed to be developed without a string of variances. In looking at the setback restraints with the two (2) front yards, the development area is restricted for the site. The parking area is also limited to 60% being in the front yard. This leaves virtually very little room on the site to develop anything.

Member Postma asked in knowing that, why did the Applicant allow the benefits of the property expire and come to this point? Ms. Scales believes that Meijer no longer wants to be associated with the parcel. She also believes that the parcel is not up to Cascade Township's standards and believes that the Township would like something nicer on the corner.

Member Koessel asked if the old restaurant is 4,000-sf. and Ms. Scales said she could provide the information regarding the actual square footage but believes the building is 5,000 to 6,000-square feet.

Ms. Scales showed another drawing if the parcel were developed into a 3-acre lot and the lot configurations crosses into the Meijer parking lot and interferes with their access drive. Again, this shows the limitations of the site.

The developers reviewed the possibility of putting one (1) building on the site and combining it with the existing P.U.D., what size building would it be and in what configuration could it fit on the parcel. Ms. Scales showed the plan that she believes is within the Township's requirements with the only need being to include it within the P.U.D.

The building could be up to 26,754-square feet, the parking meets the 60% front yard requirement, and the green spaces are met in this plan.

Mr. Fulk said from the retail aspect, however, it is not a very aesthetically pleasing plan as it is difficult to see if entering from the interstate highway and believes it would be difficult to market. This is an example, however, of the largest building that would fit on the lot without requiring any variances except for the P.U.D. 69 inclusion.

Ms. Scales showed the preferred plan that shows two (2) buildings on the parcel. The reason they are requesting the two (2) buildings is that on this development, the maximum square footage is approximately 25,000 to 26,000-square feet.

The plan shows additional parking based on Staff's calculations and utilized the fast food calculation (i.e. Starbuck's, Qudoba, etc.), a restaurant where a sit-down area is not necessary, and balanced the additional parking with the necessary additional landscaping.

Ms. Scales noted that the plan does encroach on the rear space and can certain add additional plantings if needed. She also noted that the dumpsters could be better screened in the proposed area.

This plan is also a little different than the plan Staff has by the bank area. She noted the stacking for the bank's drive-thru could accommodate up to five (5) cars in the lanes.

Chairman McDonald asked where the drive would be located to Kraft Avenue and Ms. Scales pointed out the proposed drive and the current drive locations.

Ms. Scales said they are looking for the Planning Commission's feedback on the plan they would like to proceed with which does require compromise on both sides. They feel that having two (2) buildings on the site would be a better thing than having the giant L-shaped building.

Chairman McDonald asked how many tenants do they project to have and Mr. Fulk said there are nine (9) internal bays with room for a restaurant on each end. Chairman McDonald asked if they would have access to both the front and the back and Mr. Fulk noted that the rear is primarily service access and employee parking. They intend to keep the rear area as clear as possible to accommodate the drive-thru stacking and it is also a normal commuting lane for vehicles entering and exiting from each end.

Member Koessel asked how they envision traffic moving through the site to the bank drive-thru? Mr. Fulk noted rear entry points on the site plan and noted a 28th Street exit point with a light and Kraft Ave. exit point.

Chairman McDonald noted that the Applicant offered enhancing the rear landscaping and what did they have in mind. Ms. Scales said that if the Township allowed the encroachment on the east, they were willing to provide additional buffer noting that another difficulty with the site is that there is a swoop in the rear parking area and this is where they encroach.

Chairman McDonald asked if this plan meets the front yard setbacks along Kraft Ave. and 28th Street and Ms. Scales said it does not.

Chairman McDonald noted that it seems the biggest challenges with the project is four (4) buildings instead of three (3), the setbacks and the other items listed by Staff. Planning Director Peterson said it was a fair summary. He believes some of the site constraints is from how the parking is being calculated. It seems if the parking were recalculated and reduced, it would allow the developer to free up some of the space and move the buildings to meet setbacks.

Member Waalkes agrees with Chairman McDonald regarding concern over the proposed setbacks and four (4) buildings on nine (9) acres but the L-shaped plan shows the maximum amount of square footage and the Planning Commission may want to consider the fact that the four (4) buildings does offer less square-footage on the parcel. Also their setback is less than the current building and suggested revising the plan so that the new building do not extend and closer to the setback line than the existing building. He is comfortable with four (4) buildings on nine (9) acres if the setbacks could be improved upon.

Member Postma asked what types of materials would they be building with and Mr. Fulk noted they have brought sample elevations based on other projects they have done but Meijer will have to approve the elevation plans that includes all four (4) sides.

Member Koessel referred back to Staff's comments with the Macaroni Grill and gas station currently on approximately seven (7) acres and including this parcel would bring it to a little over nine (9) acres with four (4) buildings. The Meijer parcel is very large at approximately 20-acres and Planning Director Peterson noted that if all the parcels were combined into one (1) including Meijer's, the property would be close to 30-acres. Member Koessel noted that if the Planning Commission were to allow the fourth building, the logic would be that the Township would be allowing five (5) buildings on 30-acres. Member Koessel noted that the entire parcel is owned by Meijer and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct. Member Postma asked if the ownership would be changing hands and Planning Director Peterson said the ownership would change. Member Postma asked if the ownership changes, could they all be encompassed within the same P.U.D. and Staff noted that it could and that is what occurred with Macaroni Grill. Member Koessel noted that this is a unique project and parcel and noted the Applicant could, feasibly, build the 26,000-square foot building that would be allowed, but they are opting for less square footage, density, if allowed the two (2) buildings.

Member Koessel agrees that the bank does need to shift back on the site to comply with the setbacks more. Also by shifting the bank further west would help alleviate some of the concerns with the drive-thru area.

Member Postma asked about sidewalk connectivity and Planning Director Peterson noted the sidewalk along Kraft Avenue and agrees there should also be sidewalk connecting the sidewalk on

Kraft to the two (2) buildings. He does not believe that a sidewalk down 28th Street would be appropriate for the project because of recent discussions with M-DOT and they have indicated the Township will only receive one (1) crossing under the interstate highway and that the preferred location is the on the south side of 28th Street.

Member Richards asked the Applicant if they already have a commitment from a bank and Mr. Fulk said they have interest from a few banks that have expressed an interest but nothing is confirmed. Member Richards asked if they have any idea as to the businesses that would go into the retail building and/or the restaurant. Mr. Fulk said they have an idea of the types of retail and restaurant. They have obtained feedback from Starbuck's and Subway, with feedback being received from four or five separate entities including a women's clothing store.

Member Logue asked Planning Director Peterson if Meijer would go along with encompassing the project in the P.U.D. and asked if Meijer's has any say in this development? Mr. Fulk noted that Meijer's does currently own the lot despite the P.U.D. and are looking to sell the lot to the developer. Planning Director Peterson said that the Township has talked to Meijer from time-to-time regarding the property and they seem to be reluctant to add their store into a P.U.D. with the concern that the Township would require them to make too many changes.

Member Postma asked about Staff's concern regarding the dumpster and if the pad was 20-feet, Mr. Fulk said it is. He also noted that they will see if they can move the dumpsters to a more appropriate location on the site so they are not so close to Kraft Ave.

Member Waalkes asked if the green space between the parking and the curb of the Meijer drive on the northwest corner of the lot, there is not the required amount of setback and green space in this curve of the property and noted this is another variance to the project that would need to be granted if the Planning Commission approves the plan. Ms. Scales said they could explore other options when moving the bank building further back on the site and maybe provides extra landscaping in other areas.

Chairman McDonald asked Staff that if the Planning Commission asks the Applicant to come back before the Commission with a plan that conforms more to the setback requirements, they would still need to receive a variance on the setback as well as if the

Commission likes the two (2) buildings, conceptually, and Planning Director Peterson said that any exception like that would be built into the P.U.D.

Member Postma asked where the storm water would go and Planning Director Peterson noted this is something that will have to be reviewed by the Township Engineer. Ms. Scales said there is a system that connects to the Meijer run off and there is an easement where it runs off into a regional system. They will have the storm water reviewed to ensure that the system can handle extra storm water from the development or other options.

Chairman McDonald asked Planning Director Peterson if the Applicant should come back to the Planning Commission for a preliminary plan that the Commission can review, since three (3) members are absent, prior to Public Hearing? Member Koessel believes there are enough Commissioners present and does not believe the Applicant should have an extra meeting. The difference on this site, in his opinion regarding the number of buildings on the site, is that this could be included on the Meijer property and there are fewer buildings on the property than allowed.

Member Richards said she is comfortable with the two (2) buildings for the site and it is a highly visible site and welcomes the improvement. She questioned Meijer's reluctance to include the parcel on their site but understands the theory of it being included within the P.U.D. Ms. Scales said they would speak with Meijer and ask them to also attend the next meeting with the Planning Commission.

Member Koessel noted that mass should be considered when dealing with this project. Member Koessel encouraged the Applicant to see if Meijer would include the project within their P.U.D.

Chairman McDonald thanked the Applicant and asked them to continue to work with Staff on the project.

ARTICLE 10.

Any Other Business: Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for any other business.

Planning Director Peterson noted that the Requests for Proposals have been distributed to the Commission for their review, there are a total of eight (8) submissions. The process is for the Planning Commission to review the proposals by the next meeting and

discuss which firms to bring in for interviews. He would like to have the Planning Commission come to the next meeting with their thoughts of the proposals submitted and reach a consensus of who to interview.

Chairman McDonald thanked the Riebel Development subcommittee for their diligence in creating a much better project.

Member Koessel also noted that the Township Board did not approve the Capital Improvement Plan and the Board motioned to use it with the budget. There are a lot of projections for equipment placement that the Township is not sure they may need and have agreed to utilize the document as a working document with the budget.

ARTICLE 7.

Adjournment

Chairman McDonald requested a motion for adjournment.

Member Waalkes supported by Member Logue moved to adjourn. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Lewis, Secretary

Lisa Hern, Recording Secretary