

**MINUTES**  
Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission  
Monday, August 15, 2011  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Vice Chair Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
Members Present: Lewis, Logue, McCarthy, Pennington, Sperla, Williams  
Members Absent: Hammond, Robinson, Waalkes, all excused  
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson

**ARTICLE 2.** Vice Chair Sperla led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.**

**Motion was made by Member Lewis. Support by Member Pennington to approve the Agenda. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the August 8, 2011 Meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Pennington to approve the Minutes as corrected. Support by Member Lewis. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 5. Case #11-3042 Turnburry**  
**Property address:** 5500 Burton St SE  
**Requested Action:** Basic Plan Review

Planning Director Steve Peterson said that the location is at the SW corner of Burton and Kraft. The applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review in order to amend the existing PUD. The existing PUD was approved in 2005. The applicant had started to remove trees and grade the property when the residential market collapsed. The applicant had also completed the sewer and water in Burton St before deciding to delay construction.

The original project was recommended by the Planning Commission at 123 units and was ultimately approved by the Township Board with 106 units in a mix of attached and detached units. They are now seeking a plan with 152 units with a mix of units. The layout of the revised plan is similar to the original PUD plan recommended by the Planning Commission.

The property is zoned PUD and is Master Planned Community Residential. The community residential designation reflects the transitional area and the different densities in the neighborhood.

The Planner would like to see a comparison plan that shows the original plan along with the approved and the proposed. This comparison would be helpful in

looking at the layout, parking, number of buildings, height, amount and location of open space, and layout of the roads.

The open space in the project is sprinkled throughout the entire project. The landscaping plan along the border with MVP (south) was planned at the time to incorporate both properties.

The plan includes a clubhouse with a swimming pool. These were not on the previous plans.

The access to the site is in the same location as originally approved by the KCRC. We should get another approval from the KCRC to ensure that this still complies.

The Township Engineer will need to approve the storm water plan prior to the public hearing. The developer will have to enter into an agreement for maintenance of the storm water system.

Before proceeding to the Preliminary Development Plan Review (Public Hearing) Staff recommends that the applicant submit the following information:

1. Review and approval by the KCRC.
2. Approval from the Township Engineer.
3. Provide a comparison plan showing the original, approved and the proposed plan.
4. Have the plans reviewed by the City of Grand Rapids for comments on the acceptability of this project for sewer and water.
5. Completed plans with all of the required details.

Vice Chair Sperla asked if there were any questions for Staff. Sperla then asked what the underlying zoning would be if it were not PUD. Peterson replied that before it was rezoned it was R1 Residential. Sperla asked what the density was. Peterson said that it was about a lot per 30,000 sq ft. Depending on what type of project you do dictates the lot sizes.

Member Logue asked how the 152 units fit with the Master Plan. Staff replied that the community residential category indicates 4-6 units per acre.

With no other comments or questions Vice Chair Sperla asked the developer to offer any other information for his project.

Denis Johnson is a co-developer and the architect for the project. His son was also present; he is also an architect. They have owned this property since 2004. The past few years have been a struggle in the housing market in terms of determining what works. Johnson has over 30 years of experience in the

housing market. To them, a changing market is viewed as an opportunity. We are starting to develop the future housing. Turnburry redefined architecture. We believe that when we come out of the economy that we are in now, the housing needs are going to change. Young people will not be purchasing homes as quickly as they used to, as there are higher demands on equity and they have job mobility issues. There is also a changing "boomer" market: when to dispose of their house, when to look at retirement, when to cash out of their house. These trends are emerging since the collapse of the housing market.

Mr. Johnson discussed how they have been working with MVP who borders part of the property. They have an agreement in regards to landscaping the shared edge.

For the upcoming Public Hearing, Johnson will take the three site plans that he has and will show the history of the plans.

The sanitary sewer has been extended along Burton Street and paid for by the developer allowing 34 residents to connect upon failure of their existing septic systems.

The only issue will be density and will be addressed at the next meeting. The plan includes underground parking and proper landscaping.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any questions for him. Member Lewis questioned what a multiple living unit arrangement consists of and asked if the developer could explain how it all comes together. Mr. Johnson explained that the approved plan included townhomes in the middle wrapped with condos that were one story with walkouts. The bike path was out by the road. The new plan includes townhomes, single family residential, and 3-story buildings on top of garages with elevators for the Boomers. The bike path will be further away from the road.

Member Pennington questioned the parking. The developer replied that some residential parking will be underground and then attached garages for all of the row and garden homes.

Member Williams wanted clarification if the buildings would still be condos. The developer answered by saying that everything is rental. Units will be larger and upscale.

Vice Chair Sperla said that this meeting does not require any action. The Public Hearing date has not yet been scheduled.

**ARTICLE 6: Case #11-3033 Zoning Amendment: Keeping of Farm Animals in Residential Zone – Section 4.11**

Proposed revision to our current regulations.

Planner Peterson commented that they are still in the investigative portion of the subject. After taking comment at the Public Hearing and following the Members discussion, Peterson came up with a first draft of possible changes to the regulations for farm animals in the residential zone. Additions include adding R-2 and any PUD with underlying zoning of R1 and R2.

Everything would stay the same with the exception of chickens. A person can start with 4 chickens for the first three acres and one additional chicken for each additional acre.

There is a procedure for a Public Hearing/special use permit. Three conditions would have to be met.

Staff is not certain that the Township needs to make any changes, however if changes are made, he feels that fewer changes are better.

Vice Chair Sperla asked if there were any questions or comments for the Planner. Sperla asked what would be the case if a person only had one acre. Peterson said under the new draft a person would still need three acres.

Referring to item #5 of Section 4.11, Member Pennington questioned if the word 'structure' should be struck. Peterson said that is today's language.

Member Williams noted that some urban areas may not have agriculture areas like Cascade Township. That differentiates us from places such as Grand Rapids or East Grand Rapids. Cascade has a lot of land that allows for this use other than in the residential areas.

Vice Chair Sperla commented that they should decide as a group if they really want or feel the need to make a change before the Planner puts more effort into it. Peterson mentioned that there were three members absent so maybe a decision should be made later when all nine members could be present.

Member McCarthy asked if this would also relate to ducks or geese. The Planner said it would be easy to put in a definition of small animals.

Member Lewis isn't so sure the Ordinance should be revised.

Vice Chair Sperla stated that it would be a good idea to wait until all Members are present before making a decision whether or not to continue with possible changes.

**Member Lewis made a Motion to table this item until the next meeting in anticipation of more members being present. Support by Member Logue. Motion carried.**

**ARTICLE 7: Any other business:**

Planner Peterson said nothing is planned for the September 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, so the next meeting would be September 19.

**ARTICLE 8: Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Williams. Support by Member Lewis to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Al Pennington, Secretary

Carol M. Meyer, Planning Administrative Assistant