

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, February 6, 2017
7:00 P.M.

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

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 6 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the January 16, 2017 Meeting.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to approve the Minutes. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 6 to 0.

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

Residents came forward to voice their opposition and/or concern about a new business which is going in at the old Family Fare site not far from their neighborhood called the "Fowling Warehouse."

Each resident that came forward spoke to the potential problems they felt a business of this kind would bring. First, no one felt it was an appropriate family-friendly business and was not a good fit for the area. Next, was the consumption of alcohol and all that might imply. Residents were worried about possible intoxicated drivers and general rowdiness and how that would affect neighboring businesses that are frequented by the residents. Another aspect that was of concern was the noise level. There is an aspect of the fowling game where a bull horn sounds three times.

Director Peterson explained that the Planning Commission does not have a role in this project since it is a permitted use. Any business which moves into the township is required to adhere to all of the township ordinances, such as the noise ordinance. He also explained that the Township Board passed a resolution of support for the redevelopment liquor license for this particular business, but it was the State of Michigan that ultimately will decide whether or not to grant the liquor license. It was suggested that they might address the Township Board which was meeting on Wednesday, February 8, 2017 at 7:00 p.m., because the owner of the business will be at that meeting to answer questions.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #16:3348 Edward Rose/Meadowbrook P.U.D. Amendment
Public Hearing**

Property Address: 5794 Broadmoor Avenue & 5201 60th Street

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a preliminary plan review to amend the Meadowbrooke P.U.D. to allow for multifamily residential and commercial development.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting Preliminary Plan Approval in order to amend the existing Planned Unit Development. The amendment is needed because they would like to add a residential use to the development. The proposal is to add 492 apartments to the PUD. They are also reserving approximately 37 acres for commercial retail uses. Although the retail is already permitted in the PUD the residential use is not, thus the need for the amendment. The area is master planned as Mixed Use which can accommodate the residential use up to 8 units per acre. The proposal is at about 6.8 units per acre after taking out the commercial portion of the development. This development will be known as Phase III of Meadowbrooke. This will be important moving forward with the PUD amendments in identifying the changes to accommodate this development.

The developer has provided a traffic study. Their study was done as approved by the KCRC and MDOT. The study assumes the apartments and commercial sites are developed and occupied by 2022. MDOT has asked that developer amend the study to include additional mitigation of their project on 60th Street. Once completed, the new study will be evaluated by MDOT and KCRC to determine if the new alternative(s) are better for the system than the original alternatives. If so, they can be incorporated into the final approval. In addition, the developer has had the traffic engineer include in the analysis a second drive to 60th Street. While not part of the project now, it is possible that a second drive to 60th could be desirable depending on what the future uses are. It should be noted that the second drive did not change the results of the study as it also recommends that any new drive to 60th also include a center turn lane. Any future access to 60th St. should be evaluated by a future traffic study when the use is known. No individual access will be allowed on 60th or M37. The development will be served by public utilities and sewer and water will be provided by the City of Grand Rapids. The servicing of the commercial area with sewer and water needs to be addressed, as it could have an impact on how the apartment phase is completed.

The development has been reviewed and approved by the Township engineer.

Director Peterson recommends approval of the preliminary plan with the following conditions:

1. Provide an amended traffic study to evaluate the alternative mitigation methods on 60th Street.
2. Address the 4th item in the traffic study to the Commission's satisfaction.
3. The sidewalk and pathway connections shall be provided as indicated by staff. Ten (10) foot side paths on M-37 and 60th and five (5) foot sidewalks elsewhere. The developer will also be responsible to provide an easement to the township for the pathways and the paths and sidewalks shall be constructed to township standards.

The developer will be responsible to grade their property to allow the pathways to connect to any adjacent property.

4. All sidewalks and pathways shall be built no later than 5 years after the first building permit is issued.
5. The developer shall agree to a vehicular connection with the properties along 60th Street to the east.
6. Comply with the Township engineer's memo dated February 1, 2017.
7. Create Phase III of the Meadowbrooke review board to review future projects in this portion of the development.

Director Peterson noted that a letter was submitted by Edward Rose Development dated February 6, 2017 addressing the conditions brought by staff.

Chairman Waalkes asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Ms. Rimes came forward on behalf of Edward Rose Development Co. and gave a brief overview of the project and to answer any questions the members may have.

A brief discussion followed.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to open the public hearing. Supported by Member Williams. Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. VanSolkema came forward to inquire what type of residents would move in and what school district this development would be in (Caledonia). He expressed some concern it might be an overload to the schools in the area.

Mr. Liscom came forward. He resides on 60th Street and was concerned about the need to acquire some of his property for the left turn lane on 60th st. Peterson explained that it would be within the right-of-way or would be taken from the developers property.

Discussion followed.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to close the public hearing. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to approve the preliminary plan to amend the Meadowbrooke P.U.D. with the conditions set forth above by Director Peterson and the response from the applicant dated 2/6/17, and with the added condition that if the amended traffic study warrants the 60th st improvements that those be incorporated into the final plan. Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 6-0.

ARTICLE 7. Case #16:3329 Spees P.U.D. Amendment

Property Address: 6010 28th Street

Requested Action: Recommendation of P.U.D. Amendment to allow two fast food restaurants along 28th Street and a third building in the rear of the site.

Director Peterson stated at the Planning Commission approved the preliminary plan for this project at the December 5, 2016 meeting. The plan was approved with conditions. The PUD Ordinance amendment has been written to reflect that decision and the Applicant has had an opportunity to review and approve the language. In addition, they have amended their plans to reflect the conditions.

Director Peterson recommends a positive recommendation to the Township Board for the approval of the P.U.D. amendment and revised site plan. The Township Board will then hold an additional public hearing to consider your recommendation.

Discussion followed.

Motion was made by Member Sperla to send a positive recommendation to the Township Board for approval of the P.U.D. amendment and revised plan with one change. On page 2, the paragraph numbered 2 should read: “. . . not to exceed one-hundred eight (108) square feet in total sign area per building.” Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 6-0.

ARTICLE 8. Any other business.

No other business was presented.

ARTICLE 9. Adjournment.

Motion was made by Member Mead to adjourn. Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 6 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Rissi, Secretary