

**MINUTES**

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday, December 4, 2017  
7:00 P.M.

**ARTICLE 1.** Vice Chairman Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
Members Present: Katsma, Johnson, Lewis, Mead, Pennington, Rissi, Robinson and Williams  
Members Absent: None  
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 Robinson to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Lewis. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 20, 2017 Meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve the Minutes. Supported by Member Mead. Motion carried 7 to 0.**

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

None.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #17-3418 Bill Bos**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address: 1674 Spaulding**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a Type I Special Use Permit to allow for a taller fence around the perimeter of the farm to keep deer out.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting a Type I Special Use Permit to allow for a taller fence around the perimeter of the farm in order to keep deer out. Applicant is allowed to have a 4 feet tall fence in the front yard and 6 feet elsewhere, but would like to go to the maximum of 8 feet. Because Applicant would like to go over 4 and 6 feet respectively, they need a special use permit. Fences do not require a building permit, but are required to comply with Section 4.30 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Director Peterson went on to state that the Township has granted other permits for taller fences, including the need to keep deer out. The Township has tried to preserve what little agricultural use it has and have identified the farm uses on Spaulding as our “farmers markets.” Allowing the farmer to have a taller fence to keep the deer out would be consistent with that goal.

Applicant has indicated that it would be a wire fence.

The fence would only be permitted on the property lines and would not be able to be placed in the Kent County Road right-of-way along Spaulding.

With a Type 1 Special Use Permit, the Planning Commission may allow the height of the fence to increase to 8 feet.

Director Peterson recommends that the Type I Special Use Permit for an eight feet tall fence in the front yard as proposed.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Bill Bos came forward to explain that his need for the fence was to keep deer out of his property because they destroy/damage his crops.

**Motion was made by Member Lewis to open public hearing. Supported by Member Robinson. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

No members of the public came forward.

**Motion was made by Member Mead to close public hearing. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve Applicant's request for a Type I Special Use Permit to allow for an 8 feet fence around the perimeter of the property. Supported by Member Robinson. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #17-3425 Alpha Lima Ventures**

**Property Address: 3009 Thornhills Avenue S.E.**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting to amend the Centennial P.U.D. to allow for 9 additional residential units at the corner of Thornhills and Tahoe.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting Basic Plan Review to amend the Centennial Park P.U.D. to allow 9 more residential units.

Originally, this location was planned for a child or adult day care facility. This has obviously never been built. They are now asking that this location be permitted for 3 buildings of 3 units each for a total of 9 units.

A lot of discussion went into the total number of units permitted on the redevelopment of the golf course. We permitted a total of 252 units on the redevelopment of the golf course, on about 43 acres, plus the day care, lawn maintenance operation, and the recreational uses, including the catering operation at the clubhouse.

This new amendment would bring the total amount of new residential units for the redevelopment of the golf course to 259 units. On 43 acres, this comes to about 6.06 units per acre.

Amending the plan to eliminate the day care and go with 9 new units seems like a reasonable request. During the redevelopment of the golf course, the developer originally asked that this corner be allowed some commercial uses and the day care was a compromise from what they originally wanted.

The property is zoned PUD #39 Centennial Park and is Master Planned Community Residential. The community residential designation reflects the existing mix use nature of the park.

The site plan shows the setback off from Thornhills at 35 feet. Since Thornhills is a collector road, the setback is 43 feet. The plan should be revised to show the correct setback.

The project would be serviced by public sewer and water. Some concern was expressed by the City of Grand Rapids relative to the current plan in regards to the pump station that services this development. A new review will need to be done to determine if this change causes a concern for the city.

The development of this corner also required the development of a sidewalk along Thornhills. Since that time, there has been some interest by the DDA to extend sidewalks on Tahoe and Thornhills.

Curb cut locations and a new street name will need to be approved by the Kent County Road Commission ("KCRC").

The size of each condominium is about 1,500 – 1,600 sq. ft.

The traffic study report from the redevelopment in 2014 indicated that the existing roadways have capacity to handle the redevelopment. The only improvement noted was to clear some vegetation looking North on Thornhills to help sight distance.

The KCRC has indicated that a typical two-lane road has the capacity for about 8-10,000 trips per day. The current road system has plenty of capacity to handle the traffic from this development. The KCRC has also indicated that they will continue to monitor signal operations around the area.

The Township Engineer will need to review the revised plans and provide a report.

Director Peterson stated that if the Planning Commission finds that all of the procedural information has been provided by the Applicant, then this matter would proceed to a public hearing and consideration of a Preliminary Development Plan. It will be at that stage of the review process that the merits of the request will be considered and the detailed site plans will be required and reviewed.

Therefore, before proceeding to the Preliminary Development Plan review (Public Hearing), Director Peterson recommends that the Applicant address the following:

1. Review and approval by the Township Engineer;
2. Provide review comments from the City of Grand Rapids relative to the pump station;
3. KCRC review of curb cut location and street name approval;
4. Pathway on Thornhills and sidewalk on Tahoe; and
5. Revise the site plan to show the correct setback off from Thornhills.

Once these items are satisfied, a public hearing will be set to consider the amendments.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Rick Palaskey of Nederveld came forward on behalf of Applicant to give a presentation/overview of the project and to answer any questions the Planning Commission may have in regards to the project.

No formal action is required at this time. Planning Commission members gave Applicant their feedback and this will proceed towards the next step in the process which is the public hearing.

**ARTICLE 8. Case #16:3424 Bentineau Residential**

**Property Address: 2768 Orange Avenue**

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting to rezone the property from R2 to B1. The Applicant is offering a conditional rezoning for three new homes.

Director Peterson stated that the Applicant is requesting a conditional rezone from R2 to B1. Since the township has not done this before, there are a few things that are important to point out for a conditional rezoning.

The Applicant must offer the conditions. The Township cannot place additional conditions on the rezone. This is not a P.U.D. It is essentially reviewed as a straight rezoning request with conditions the Applicant has offered.

The advantage to the Township for this process is to know what we are getting when the property is rezoned. This is the only way to do this because the property is not eligible for a P.U.D. rezoning due to the fact that it is less than 2 acres.

Because the Township has not done this before (and neither has Applicant), the Applicant has agreed with the following process:

1. Plan introduction;
2. Public Hearing;
3. Review of contract offered by the Applicant and recommendation to the Township Board;
4. Township Board public hearing.

The standards used to make the decision will be the conventional rezoning criteria. The rezoning would allow three single family detached homes. The homes would be about

3,000 sq. ft. of finished living space and an attached 2 car garage. Very typical in terms of size for Cascade.

The property is zoned R2, but is identified in the Master Plan as B1.

Applicant has supplied a site plan showing the three homes and does meet the minimum setback requirements.

The property is on the corner of Orange Avenue and Peace Street. Orange Avenue is a public street until Peace Street is changed to a private road.

Anytime there are additional lots added to a private street, we need to evaluate the private road. While the staff evaluation of the road indicates that the road itself meets out standards, we need to see the private road maintenance agreement, as well.

We do not have driveway spacing standard for residential homes. The homes are coming off from the private road section of Orange Avenue.

Vice Chairman Sperla asked the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Messrs. Joel Peterson and Rick Palaskey came forward on behalf of Applicant to give a brief overview of the project. These units will be single family, one-story homes with a walk-out.

A brief discussion followed mostly concerning storm water and roads. Director Peterson reminded the Planning Commission that the storm water ordinance does not apply since these are single family homes and no road is being built.

Formal action was not required. The Planning Commission asked staff to advertise the project for the public hearing.

**ARTICLE 9. Any other business**

**ARTICLE 10. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Mead to adjourn. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Scott Rissi, Secretary