

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, April 15, 2019
7:00 P.M.

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
Members Present: Johnson, Katsma, Lewis, Noordyke, Pennington, Rissi, Moxley and Sperla
Members Absent: Krieter
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 Lewis to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the March 18, 2019 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Moxley to approve the minutes of March 18, 2019. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 8 to 0.

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

No visitors came forward.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #18-3471 Watermark Property LLC
Property Address: 1611 Galbraith Ave SE**

Requested Action: Consider recommendation to Township Board for PUD Amendment for Swim Center and office addition.

Director Peterson stated the preliminary approval was awarded at the March Planning Commission Meeting, and there has since been an ordinance put together with the proper sections amended. The current Snap Fitness building will be allowed to be converted to offices for Watermark, with the square footage of current occupants noted. If or when the current occupants vacate the Snap Fitness building, Watermark will be allowed to convert those areas into Watermark office space as well. Director Peterson states that if approval is recommended, the ordinance and plan will go to the Township Board for a final decision after a public hearing.

Vice Chairman Rissi stated that he did not recall there being specific square footage requirements for the three tenants currently located in the Snap Fitness building. Director Peterson stated those were the square footages given by Watermark to identify

the space in question inside of the Snap Fitness building. Member Noordyke stated he recalled that only the new area of the building would be required to be exclusively occupied by Watermark offices, not the space currently occupied by third parties if or when they vacate.

Director Peterson stated that Watermark would be allowed to continue to lease the specified 3,100 sq ft to the current tenants. Vice Chairman Rissi stated that he did recall that Watermark would be allowed to continue to lease exclusively to the three named tenants, but not that there would be a square footage limit should one of the current tenants want more or less space. Chairman Sperla stated that he would have never voted in favor of the Amendment had the tenants not been tied to the current 3,100 sq ft. Member Noordyke suggested there be a cap at the 3,100 sq ft measurement currently being used by the three tenants, and that they can use that space between them as necessary, but not exceed it.

Chairman Sperla invited the Applicant to come forward with any comments.

Mr. Steve Plakmeyer came forward and introduced himself as one of the owners of Watermark. Mr. Plakmeyer stated that the ordinance in 2010 allowed no more than 6,729 sq ft. of the 14,000 sq ft building to be occupied by attorneys, engineers, accountants, or other low impact offices as determined by the Planning Commission. He states that he was not aware the proposed amended ordinance would be written that once a current third-party occupant vacates the building, the space could only then be occupied by Watermark staff. Mr. Plakmeyer states that he does not understand why Watermark would need to be under this restriction. He states his concern for the way the PUD Amendment is worded. Chairman Sperla suggests that a transcript of the previous two hearings be obtained to see what was said about the 2010 Amendment.

Ms. Kelly Kuiper (of Watermark/Nederveld) comes forward to state that when you walk into the Watermark office building, you're in a lobby with separated tenant spaces to the right, and Watermark offices to the left, the basement houses the fitness facility. Ms. Kuiper states that Watermark would like to expand their office space into the basement, but they would also like to maintain the separate third-party tenant space without any changes made to them, and have language in the Amendment that does not limit the occupants to the current tenants. She continues to say that if those tenants leave and that space can only then be used by Watermark, the interior would require a significant remodel to be retrofit that space to be functional for Watermark offices. Their main concern is to be able to maintain that tenant space, regardless of who the tenant is. She states that the building was designed to house the low impact office users that the 2010 PUD allowed. Ms. Kuiper states that she is concerned of the wording in the last section of 8.B.3 that reads "no more than 3,100 sq ft may be leased out to current tenants only as follows", and that Watermark would prefer it to read that "3,100 sq ft may be leased out to tenants; space A 1,500 sq ft; space B 800 sq ft; space C 800 sq ft." rather than specifically naming the current tenants.

Member Noordyke suggested that Watermark is arguing that they have the option to lease to new third party in the event that one of the current tenants vacates the property. Chairman Sperla then stated that the specific square footage of the space being occupied, and the specific tenants occupying that space, were listed on the Applicants application that was presented, which is why the Amendment was written to include those specifically named tenants.

Director Peterson suggested that a vote be held on this specific ordinance language, and if that does not pass, to amend the language written into the ordinance.

Secretary Johnson brought to Chairman Sperlas attention that he had a copy of the Minutes from the March 4th meeting. Secretary Johnson then read from the Minutes the motion that was made by Member Noordyke to “approve Applicants request for a PUD Amendment with the condition that the use would be exclusive to Watermark, or Watermark affiliates. Current tenants will not be affected.” Chairman Sperla stated that he would like to listen to the recording of the March 4th meeting as Minutes are a summary, not verbatim, and this Amendment is requiring specificity of words said. Director Peterson stated that the March 4th Meeting may have been recorded over after the written Minutes from that Meeting were approved by the Planning Commission at the March 18th Meeting.

Member Rissi suggested the PUD Amendment be written with the conditions the tenant’s names be removed from the Amendment, but maintaining the exception that no more than 3,100 sq ft be divided across three suites at 1,500 sq ft, 800 sq ft, and 800 sq ft.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve the PUD Amendment with the conditions that Watermark Offices will be permitted to occupy the space, and the 3,100 sq ft tenant space will be allowed to be occupied by low impact office uses. Supported by Member Noordyke. Motion carried 7 to 1.

ARTICLE 7. Case #18-3489 Lanterns

Property Address: 3217 Thornapple River Drive

Requested Action: Consider recommendation to Township Board for PUD Amendment for 21-unit site condominium.

Director Peterson stated this is a new PUD. Director Peterson then noted that this is a condominium project, not site condominium as referenced a couple of times in the documents.; those references will be corrected. The Signature Line will also be changed to reflect correct ownership. Director Peterson then stated that this Amendment does reflect the previous approval awarded by the Planning Commission, and a recommendation will go to the Township Board for final consideration at a Public Hearing.

Chairman Sperla invited the Applicant to come forward with any comment.

Mr. Douglass DeHaan came forward and stated that he did not have additional comments, and then asked if there were any further questions of him.

Motion was made by Member Pennington to forward positive recommendation to the Township Board for the PUD Amendment with the minor changes stated by Director Peterson. Supported by Member Lewis. Motion carried 8 to 0.

ARTICLE 8. Case #19-3519 Golden Valley

Property Address: 5800 Thornapple River Drive

Requested Action: Sketch Plan Review for 27 single family site condominium.

Director Peterson stated that this will be an introduction meeting with no real action taken. This will be a by-right sub division in the R1 Zoning District, with no common open space, and a minimum lot size of 80,000 sq ft., which is almost 2 acres. They will be served by well and septic, so the Health Department will be involved. Director Peterson states that they have proposed a common sewer system, leading to a common septic system. There will be two private roads; one off of Thornapple River Drive, the other off of 60th. There will be no more than 19 units on either dead end road. Director Peterson stated that stormwater will be reviewed by the Township Engineer before this Plan comes back to the Planning Commission. No sidewalks are planned for this project, it will not connect to any future pathways. Chairman Sperla stated that he would like the Applicant to consider joining the two dead end roads for fire safety purposes and ease of access for rescue vehicles.

Chairman Sperla invited the Applicant to come forward with any comment.

Mr. Don DeGroot from Excel Engineering came forward to state that the cul-de-sacs that provided meet Township and County standards that a fire truck could easily maneuver on. He then stated that the dead-end streets are desired to keep out through traffic from the busy intersection of 60th and Thornapple. Being private roads, they will not need to be maintained by the County. Mr. DeGroot stated that the average lot size will be around 92,000 sq ft.

No action is required by the Commission at this time and this will proceed to the next step in the process, a Tentative Preliminary Approval, after all required government approvals are completed.

ARTICE 10. Any other business

There will be a joint meeting with the Township Board and the DDA May 21, 2019.

ARTICLE 11. Adjournment

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to adjourn. Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 8 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Phil Johnson, Secretary