

**Minutes**

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday, August 15, 2022  
7:00 P.M.  
2870 Jacksmith Ave SE

**ARTICLE 1.** Chair Noordyke called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M  
Members Present: Noordhoek, Rowland, Rissi, Moxley, Noordyke, Deering, Rapin, Korstange, and Engel  
Members Absent: None  
Others Present: Planning Director Hilbrands and those listed on the sign-in sheet.

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda**

**Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve the current agenda. Supported by Member Rapin. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflicts of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

**ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.**

There was no one that wished to speak.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #22-3729/MPM Interiors**

**Property Address: 6660 Old 28<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Requested Action:** Site Plan Review for a new 10,000 sq ft building and parking lot.

Planning Director Hilbrands presented the case. The applicant is requesting approval for a 10,000 sq ft, two-story office building. This building will be located in the B1 zoning district and must meet the design standards of Section 8.08 of the zoning ordinance, or receive a recommendation from the Village Design Review Committee to allow any exceptions. The site meets the height, setback, parking, and buffer requirements of the zoning district. Located along the west side of the parking lot is a 7 ft tall retaining wall. This does not have any zoning requirements, but consideration for a fence or guard rail at the top may need to be discussed.

The Fire and Building Departments have reviewed and approved the plan and the applicant has submitted photometric and landscape plans that meet township standards. Planning Director Hilbrands recommended that a \$19,000 landscape bond be provided by the applicant.

There will be no new access to the site created, however, the applicant is adding a sidewalk to connect to the public sidewalk within the street right-of-way; they will need

to confirm what approvals from KCRC are needed. The Township Engineer has reviewed and approved this plan and will require a stormwater maintenance agreement.

Staff recommended approval for the 10,000 sq ft building with the four conditions listed in the packet.

Member Rapin asked Staff if other buildings in the area have a different facade on the front than the back. Planning Director Hilbrands replied that most of the buildings in that area were built before the current standards were in place. If there are any, they would be considered legal non-conforming.

Ken Dixon, with Dixon Architecture, thanked the committee for their time. He explained the excitement of going into this plan and becoming a part of the Cascade Village. The previous building lacked appeal, so creating something with more character will provide improvements to the streetscape. Despite being more expensive, they are able to install the facade around the entire building, rather than making only the north side different. Member Rowland asked what the cost differential is to incorporate the same design around the whole building. Dixon responded that it might be around \$5 per sq ft, which would not be significant.

Holly Jackson, part owner of the building, answered a question about environmental clean-up because the previous building burned down. The clean-up process is underway and there is still debris and leftover items that need to be removed. The environmental engineer spoke with the prior owner, filled out and signed a questionnaire, and completed a final interview. They do not see any issues with the soil. Jackson stated that they will not move forward until it is deemed completely clean.

Member Rapin asked for more details on the 7 ft tall retaining wall. The wall west of the parking lot was built to keep nature back. Commission members suggested adding a guard rail or fence on top of the wall and the applicant agreed to this condition.

Member Korstange suggested requiring the same facade around the whole building to set precedence.

Member Rissi pointed out that the proposed dumpster enclosure is not shaded as part of the paved section in the parking lot. Dixon clarified that there will be concrete under the dumpster.

**Motion was made by Member Rapin to approve the Site Plan Review as requested with conditions including the four staff recommendations, completion of the environmental study, the matching facade on all sides, installation of a 42 in railing across the retaining wall, and concrete poured under the dumpster's proposed location. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

#### **ARTICLE 7. Review of Major Street Plan**

Planning Director Hilbrands gave a brief background on the plan. The Major Street Plan is an appendix of the Zoning Ordinance used to classify streets such as arterial, collector,

and local, with requirements tied to each of those classifications. There are certain type 2 special uses only permitted on arterial or collector roads.

He mentioned that a property owner had an interest in purchasing two properties on Kraft Ave, both zoned industrial, in hopes of putting a trucking terminal there. This use would require a type 2 special use and would have to be located on an arterial or collector road, which this section of Kraft Ave is not.

Considering that there had been no revision of the major street plan since 2010, a review seemed necessary to elicit some changes and ask questions. The location of the request stated above seemed ideal for a trucking terminal, but the current street classification would not permit it.

Member Rissi asked about other places in the ordinance where specific uses reflected the map listed in the packet. Planning Director Hilbrands stated residential setbacks and these specific Type 2 special uses in the 17.07(1) section are the only ones he is aware of but will look deeper into this.

Identifying which roads to reclassify might become difficult as there are houses on streets that would be located on a newly defined collector road instead of a residential road. It was also mentioned that similar roads are classified differently and the committee wanted to know the reason for that.

Member Korstange wondered if part of the business's proposal would have to be approved by the Road Commission. Planning Director Hilbrands clarified they would just need approval for a curb cut. The business owner would have to take into account if the road is all-season standard, or if there are restrictions.

Member Rissi, when trying to decide if disregarding the road classification map was the best course of action, asked if the way specific areas are zoned inhibits requests such as this and it is not solely dependent on the classification of the road. Member Korstange said issues pertaining to the roads seem like they would be better handled by the Road Commission.

Chair Noordyke suggested that Planning Director Hilbrands research why this specific topic is coming into question and find out what neighboring township's procedures are. If this issue is relevant to the Planning Commission, then further research will need to be completed to decide which roads need classification amendments.

Member Korstange disclosed that she has family in the trucking industry. She stated this would be a disservice to whoever wanted the land for business, but were unable to obtain it for such use at this time. Member Rapin commented that the fact the discussion was brought to the commission could increase the extent of the business's time frame for purchasing the property.

**ARTICLE 8. Old Business**

Member Korstange attended the Township Board meeting to speak regarding the Composting Use Special Use Permit approval; everything went well and the report was approved.

Member Noordhoek also said the meeting went well and they adopted the Roundhill Committee Recommendations.

**ARTICLE 9. Any Other Business**

The AC District Zoning Review Subcommittee is meeting Thursday, August 18<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 A.M.

**ARTICLE 10. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak**

There was no one that wished to speak.

**ARTICLE 11. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Deering to adjourn the meeting. Supported by Member Rissi. The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diedre Deering, Secretary