

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, September 4, 2007
7:00 p.m.

ARTICLE 1. Chairman McDonald called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members Present: Koessel, Lewis, Logue, MacAllister, McDonald,
Postma, Richards, Waalkes
Members Absent: Robinson (excused)
Others Present: Planning Director Peterson, Admin. Assistant
Hern, and Members of the Public.

ARTICLE 2. Chairman McDonald led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ARTICLE 3. Chairman McDonald requested motion for approval of the
September 4th Agenda.

Member Lewis motioned for approval of the agenda as presented, supported by Member MacAllister. All in favor with none opposed, the motion carried. September 4, 2007 Agenda approved.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the August 13, 2007 Meeting and August 20, 2007 Meeting.

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for revisions, corrections or a motion for approval of the August 13th and August 20th minutes.

Member Lewis motioned for approval of the August 13, 2007 Minutes and August 20, 2007 Minutes as presented, supported by Member Waalkes. All in favor with none opposed, motion carried.

ARTICLE 5. Case # 07-2890: Clayton Manne
Address of Property: 5770 Buttrick Ave. SE
Requested Action: A Public Hearing was scheduled, however the Applicant withdrew the project.

Planning Director Peterson noted that this case was to be reviewed by the Planning Commission this evening. Applicant Mann has withdrawn his request for a Special Use Permit for a pole barn and his letter is included within the Commissions' packet.

ARTICLE 6. Case # 07-2889: Tom Stoutjesdyk
Address of Property: 5545 Thornapple River Drive SE
(PUBLIC HEARING)

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for the construction of an accessory building larger than 832-square feet.

Planning Director Peterson noted the parcel is zoned ARC and is located on the west side of Thornapple River Drive ½-mile north of 60th and adjacent to Kilmer, adjacent to M-6. The property is approximately four (4) acres.

The building is being proposed at 1,200-square feet with a proposed height of approximately 15-feet to the midpoint. This requires a minimum setback of 40-feet on the side and 40-feet in the rear. The setbacks proposed are within compliance.

The building is metal sided with asphalt shingles to match the house.

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for questions of Staff.

Member Koessel asked if this is the property that was looking to install the cell tower in the past and Planning Director Peterson said it is.

Member MacAllister noted she lives in this area and has noticed the storage of vehicles on the property and asked if some of their materials outside could be stored in this new facility? Planning Director Peterson said that could be asked, the Township does allow for things to be stored outside as long as it is not trash or disabled vehicles. He noted that operable vehicles are allowed to be parked outside.

Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add to Staff's report concerning the project.

Applicant Stoutjesdyk said the building would be used to store their vehicles.

Member Koessel asked the Applicant if they have any lighting proposed on the building and the Applicant said no.

Member Koessel asked if the building would be used for operating a business and the Applicant said no.

Member MacAllister motioned to open the Public Hearing, supported by Member Koessel. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question with all in favor, none opposed, and the Public Hearing was opened.

No public members were in attendance for the hearing. Chairman McDonald asked Staff if any letters or phone calls were received regarding the project. Planning Director Peterson said that Staff did not receive and public comments.

Member Lewis motioned to close the Public Hearing, supported by Member MacAllister. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question with **all in favor, none opposed, and the Public Hearing was closed.**

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for discussion or a motion.

Member Koessel said that based on Staff's report and the Findings of Fact, he motioned for approval for a Special Use Permit to allow for a 1,200-square foot accessory building at 5545 Thornapple River Drive SE and that the building not be used in conjunction with any business and any lighting that may be added be downcast, supported by Member Richards.

Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed. Motion carried.**

ARTICLE 7.

Case # 07-2897: Weesie's Landscape Service, Inc.

Address of Property: 3700 Quiggle Ave.

(PUBLIC HEARING)

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to increase the size of an accessory building larger than 832-square feet.

Planning Director Peterson noted this request is a little different as it is for a landscape/nursery business. The Township does allow for accessory buildings for nurseries within the Agricultural Zone.

The property is located on the east side of Quiggle Ave. just south of 36th Street.

Planning Director Peterson referred to the site map showing the location of the home and the building, noting the building is on the north end of the property and the Applicant is requesting to add onto this building.

When this business was first established in the late 70's early 80's, the Township did not have regulations for these types of buildings. The Township drafted regulations in the 1990's and one of the criteria dealt with the setbacks of buildings.

The building addition being proposed does meet the Township's setback requirements in terms to the building's height. The building is 45-feet from the property line. When the requirements were developed in the 1990's, landscape businesses were required to have a 50-foot setback. The Applicant can either attempt to get a variance or revise the plans so the addition is no closer than 50-feet to the lot line.

Staff recommends approval of the accessory building with the condition that the addition is moved for a 50-foot side yard setback or a variance is obtained from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for any questions of Staff.

Member Koessel asked if the building is on the north side of the property and Planning Director Peterson said the building is to the north and referred to the site plan and noted the addition is on the east side of the existing building and will not be seen from Quiggle Ave. since it is in the rear of the existing building.

Chairman McDonald clarified that the only problem with the site plan is for the 5-foot variance and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct, the Township requires a setback of 50-feet from the property line. The existing building is at 45-feet and the Applicant would like to keep the same building line for the addition as the current building. The Applicant could move the building's addition in 5-feet that is also acceptable to the Township as well.

Member Koessel clarified that the variance would be needed from the north property line and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member MacAllister asked if the Planning Commission should be reviewing the size of the existing buildings on the property as opposed to the house and Planning Director Peterson said both should be considered. He noted the property is a 20-acre site with a 2,500-foot house and 2,000-square foot barn. Member MacAllister asked if there is any record of the square-footage for the other existing structures on the property. Planning Director Peterson believes there are two (2) other small structures that are roughly 12-feet by 16-feet. He noted the Applicant is present at tonight's meeting and could probably provide the information regarding how big the other two (2) buildings are. Staff does not consider this project to be out of line with the other nurseries in the Township.

Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add his comments to Staff's report.

Applicant Weesie said his intent is to keep the building flush for a more pleasing appearance. He is approximately 800-feet from the back property line and owns a large hedgerow along the property line so the building is shielded from view.

Member MacAllister asked the Applicant how many existing accessory buildings he has on the site and the Applicant said there are three (3) including the barn, two (2) are storage sheds for smaller pieces of equipment. The Applicant noted they are small, roughly 12-foot by 16-foot square footage.

Member Lewis asked the Applicant if he had built the storage sheds and the Applicant did not.

Member MacAllister asked if the addition would be connected to the existing building and if able to walk through? Applicant Weesie said that is correct and he would be able to walk through the barn into the new addition. He is planning to install new doors and the rooflines would also be connected.

Member Lewis motioned to open the Public Hearing, supported by Member MacAllister. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed, the Public Hearing was opened.**

Chairman McDonald invited any members of the Public to add their comments, no public members in attendance.

Chairman McDonald asked Staff if any phone calls or letters were received regarding the project. Staff did not receive any phone calls or letters.

Member MacAllister motioned to close the Public Hearing, supported by Member Waalkes. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed, the Public Hearing was closed.**

Chairman McDonald asked Member Lewis, who also serves on the ZBA, for his perspective on the project and the request for a variance as a ZBA Member.

Member Lewis noted he could only speak for himself regarding the variance request and asked Applicant Weesie if he anticipates coming before the ZBA requesting the variance prior to

construction of the addition? Applicant Weesie said he would request the variance from the ZBA.

Member Lewis said he does not see too much difficulty in the Applicant's request from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance requesting the 45-foot setback for the addition.

Chairman McDonald opened for any other discussion, no further discussion.

Member Lewis motioned that the Applicant's request for a Special Use Permit to increase the size of an accessory building larger than 832-square feet located at 3700 Quiggle Street be granted on the condition that:

- 1) The Applicant go before the Zoning Board of Appeals and request a variance for the 45-foot setback of the building's addition.**
- 2) Construct the addition so that it meets the 50 foot setback.**

Member Waalkes supported the motion.

All in favor with none opposed. Motion carried.

ARTICLE 8.

Case # 07-2862: Drury Inns, Inc.

**Address of Property: 5175 28th Street SE
(PUBLIC HEARING)**

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting to rezone the property to Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) for a new 7-story, 180-room hotel.

Planning Director Peterson noted the property is the old Knights Inn that is located on the north side of 28th Street immediately west of I-96 and is zoned E.S., Expressway Service. The adjoining properties are zoned PUD Office Park to the north and ES to the south, east and west of the Applicant's property.

The Planning Commission met in March 2007 when the Applicant introduced this project to the Township. At that meeting there were several items that the Township wanted explored prior to proceeding.

Planning Director Peterson noted that within the Applicant's plan is an alternate access route towards the northwest through the office park leading to 28th Street through Northern Industrial Drive where Bennigan's and I-Hop are located.

The Applicant is requesting that the hotel be 73-feet high with an additional 14-feet for a parapet wall. For comparison purposes the

hotel in Meadowbrooke was approved as a 7-story, 200-room hotel with a roofline of 62-feet and additional 14-feet for a parapet wall. Staff's report also includes other projects within the Township that have exceeded the limitation including the Crowne Plaza at 54-feet, 41-feet for the Turner Building in Centennial Park and Spring Hill Suites at 40-feet in Waterfall Shoppes.

This area is zoned ES (Expressway Service) and has a height limit of 3-stories or 35-feet. There are also other areas in the Township within this same zoning district and some of those properties include other hotels. Staff believes it would be fair to assume that the decision made for this project may also impact other sites in the ES Zone.

The Township was also presented plans for another 7-story hotel on 28th Street that never made it to the Planning Commission. That hotel was planned where Kraft Street Partners ended up developing. The developers never followed through with the project and Staff believes it was largely due to the fact that they would not have received full access to 28th Street.

The Township's assessment records show that the existing Knights Inn was built in 1984 and has recently been damaged by a fire. The records show the Knights Inn was built originally for 118-rooms.

The Applicant has been unable to obtain access to the light at 28th Street through the Perkins/Red Roof Inn property. The Applicant has indicated that this is due to the involvement of the Red Roof Inn site. Red Roof Inn is currently in the process of being sold and the owners have little time to work out an easement with Drury. In lieu of that access, the developer is proposing access to Northern Industrial Drive through property adjacent to the northwest corner of the proposed Drury hotel site. This involves some grading and roadwork on the adjacent property that would have to be accounted for and agreed to by the property owner.

The Applicant has shown a sidewalk connection to the future walk on 28th Street.

The Township requires one (1) parking space per room and the plans meet this requirement.

The Applicant has supplied a landscape plan as part of the update. The buffer yards being shown on the plan are small but the same or an increase from the existing. They have shifted the site east to increase the buffer on the west. Staff has indicated to the Applicant at the March Meeting that this would be desirable given

the large Consumers Power property to the east of the site. The Planning Commission will also see that the Applicant has included a retaining wall on the Consumers Power property to the east. The Applicant will need to show approval from Consumers for this.

The Fire Department and Township Engineer have reviewed the plan and provided the Applicant with some comments. The Fire Department has only some minor comments relative to the hydrants. Staff just received today the Township Engineer's comments with a few minor issues, but nothing that would impact the site plan being reviewed this evening.

The Kent County Drain Office has also reviewed the plan and provided comments.

The Applicant has received approval from the Gerald R. Ford Airport officials for the project.

In addition to the cross access to the traffic signal and the property to the northwest, the Applicant has also included access to the gas station to the east.

The Kent County Road Commission (KCRC) has also reviewed and approved the plan. Given the large dedicated right turn lane that already exists they do not see the need for any further improvements to the curb cut from what is shown on the plan. To assist with the traffic movement in this area, the Township can concentrate on closing existing drives as redevelopment occurs.

The Applicant has included their proposed signage for the project. At the March meeting they indicated they normally do not utilize freestanding pole signs. They have indicated that they would like three (3) different wall signs and a freestanding pole sign. The wall signs are 195-square feet each, approximately 600-square feet total for wall signage, and a 35-foot tall pole sign at 265-square feet. The Township Ordinance only allows for one (1) wall sign at a maximum of 100-square feet and a pole sign on 28th Street that is calculated based on the lot's 28th Street footage. Given the small amount of lot frontage, this site would be limited to a sign that is 30-feet tall and 20-square feet.

The Applicant is requesting a lot more signage than allowed. Using the other Meadowbrooke hotel for comparison purposes, they were permitted one (1) 100-square foot wall sign and a second wall sign of 65-square feet in lieu of a pole sign. The other newer hotels (Spring Hill and Hampton Inn) have approximately 295-square feet of wall signage divided into the three (3) different wall signs and no pole signs.

Again given the small amount of frontage on 28th Street, approximately 50-feet, the Applicant cannot place a sign in compliance to meet the Township's setback requirements. Staff suggests that the sign be located as far from 28th Street as possible to still allow for the cross connection to the gas station and that it be located as far from the east property line as possible with not obstructing views. Currently the sign is located 5-feet from the property lines, Township's requirement is 25-feet.

The property has back taxes owing and these will need to be paid prior to construction.

A lighting plan has been provided that does not meet the Township's requirements and the plan will need to be revised.

The site is bounded on the north and the east by I-96 and on the south by 28th Street as well as two (2) gas stations. On the west is Perkins, Red Roof Inn and office buildings further north and to the west the Applicant plans to connect with the service drive. The site is relatively flat but is about 30-feet below I-96.

The site is planned to have 187 parking spaces. With 180 rooms and no other uses on site, they need to provide 180 parking spaces. They do not have a separate restaurant or bar and will be contracting with local caterers for weddings and conferences. This meets the Township's requirement for 1-space per room.

The property is designated as Commercial in the current Master Plan. The commercial designation reflects the location of the property by 28th Street and I-96. The proposed use is consistent with the Master Plan designation.

No projects from the current Capital Improvement Plan would be triggered as a result of this project.

Staff reviewed the Standards for rezoning to P.U.D.

Planning Director Peterson said that given the location of this site relative to its location next to I-96, which is 30-feet taller than the site and its location next to Consumers Power and the fact that it does not abut any residential use or zoning, Staff is comfortable with allowing a taller building. However, in order to create more consistency with other allowed projects and to improve on the other non-conforming issues, Staff suggests that the hotel be allowed with a 54-foot roofline height, the same height as the Crowne Plaza. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the plan with the following conditions:

- 1) Lower the height of the building to no more than 54-feet to the roofline.
- 2) Limit wall signage to no more than 295-square feet in total to be divided among as many as three (3) wall signs.
- 3) To limit the site to no more than one (1) 28th Street sign, no more than 20-square feet in sign area and limit the height to 30-feet tall.
- 4) Revise the plan to relocated the pylon sign to as far north and west as possible given its revised size.
- 5) The lighting plan is revised to meet the Township's standards.
- 6) The plans are revised to meet the concerns of the Township Engineer.
- 7) The Developer will provide for the cross connection at the Perkins site and will develop their portion of that connection now.
- 8) When the connection to the 28th Street light is consummated, the Township will allow Drury to have a directional sign no more than 6-square feet at that intersection.

If approved, Staff can begin to write a draft P.U.D. Ordinance for the Planning Commissions' review. That document will then be presented after review by the Applicant for the Commissions' consideration of a recommendation to the Township Board. This would also allow the developer to address any other detail items for the Commissions' review before the recommendation is made.

Chairman McDonald clarified that Staff is recommending rezoning the property given the conditions listed and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member Koessel asked if the 295-square foot wall signage is for consistency with other projects, such as Waterfall Shoppes and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member Koessel asked if 100-square feet is allowed and Planning Director Peterson said it is allowed and as noted in Staff's report this is what Meadowbrooke did and simply added their pole signage to the wall signage.

Member Koessel asked Staff to provide the formula to the Commission in calculating square footage for a pole sign and Planning Director Peterson said the formula is based on the measurement of the setback line of lot frontage for every 5-feet of footage along 28th Street, the owner is

allowed to have 2-square feet measured at the building's setback is allowed and not to exceed 125-square feet. The Developer has 50-feet of frontage and is allowed 20-square feet. If measured back on the property where the hotel is, the property is 300-feet wide and that would allow for a 120-square foot sign. Where the measurement is taken from, this property only has 50-feet of 28th Street frontage. The frontage is measured from the property's setback line of 100-feet, not where the building is actually being located.

Chairman McDonald clarified that by the Township's Ordinance, the Developer is allowed to have 20-square feet and Planning Director Peterson said yes.

Chairman McDonald clarified that Staff is proposing to allow for a total of 295-square feet of wall signage in addition to the pole sign 20-square foot pylon sign along 28th Street and Planning Director Peterson said that is correct.

Member Richards noted that Staff's report indicates the hotel will not have a separate bar or restaurant but the information within the Commissions' packet refers to a separate bar or restaurant. Planning Director Peterson said the hotel will provide small cocktail service and a breakfast but it is not a separate restaurant.

Member Lewis noted the access to the full service drive does the Applicant still have access to 28th Street? Planning Director Peterson said they still have access to 28th Street and noted the property between the two (2) gas stations the developer owns. The Developer has access to Northern Industrial Drive and this could be utilized as their second entrance/exit. Planning Director Peterson confirmed that is correct.

Chairman McDonald asked Staff if they have discussed in detail the requirements for lighting and sign restrictions with the Applicant and Planning Director Peterson said he has met with the Applicant a couple of times and has discussed the Township's requirements.

Chairman McDonald invited the Applicant to add their comments to Staff's report.

Todd Hendricks from the law firm of Rhodes McKee attending on Drury's behalf. Mr. Hendricks also introduced Mike Baker of Exxel Engineering and Joe

Pereles of Drury Inns and serves as Vice President for Development.

Mr. Hendricks said that they believe the request for rezoning is reasonable and falls within the Master Plan.

Mr. Pereles, of Drury Inn, addressed Member MacAllister's question regarding the side elevations and there is no signage on the sides of the building and all four (4) sides of the building will have the same materials and the brick motif will continue around the entire building. Member MacAllister asked if there are windows on the ends and Mr. Pereles said there will be.

Mr. Pereles said they met with Staff back in February in respect to the issues that pertain to this site. It is unique in the aspect of minimal 28th Street frontage and it was Staff's recommendation to pursue rezoning the property to P.U.D.

The hotel has been moved to increase the buffer. They have met with Red Roof Inn who is in the process of selling and they have asked Drury to contact them again in mid October regarding the easement rights to the traffic light. In the interim, Drury has secured access agreement through the service drive area and are planning to purchase the property should the project move forward. If the Perkins access is granted, Drury still plans to purchase the property to provide additional ingress and egress to the property.

If the P.U.D. is granted, Drury would like to begin construction in Spring 2008.

Drury will not purchase the property if the back taxes have not been paid, that is a condition they have with Knights Inn.

In respect to other ingress and egress access points, there will be by the Amoco gas station.

The lighting issue will be taken care of and a lighting plan that meets the Township's requirements will be submitted.

In respect to the height issue, the building proposed is a prototype and there are six (6) others up and running within the U.S. and another four (400) in construction. Drury has spent a lot of time developing this prototype with 180-rooms with 2,200-square feet of meeting space and cannot deviate the plan. To bring the project down to 54-feet in

height, that would require removing two (2) floors and this does not make the project economically viable. Mr. Pereles noted that the Crowne Plaza is approximately ½-mile from the highway, as their property is immediately adjacent to the highway, and the Crowne Plaze does have residential adjacent to their property and Drury does not.

With respect to the sign package, Mr. Pereles said they understood the Township does have sign ordinances and they were advised by Staff to develop a package they would like to have. The proposed signage is what Drury is using in other communities. He has spoken with the Drury owner and will reduce the total square footage of signage being requested. If the project is approved, Drury would like to propose the following signage for the project. Their original request was for a total of 850-square feet including the pylon sign. What the developer is now requesting are two (2) signs at 195-square feet each on the building facing 28th Street and I-96 and with respect to the pylon sign of 7-feet by 14-feet. The total square footage for signage now being proposed is for 488-feet.

Mr. Pereles summarized that the hotel has recently earned the JD Powers Award for a second time in consecutive years and the company is privately held. If this project is approved, it would be a long-term investment by Drury.

Mr. Pereles said that the main floor of the Drury hotel is 16-feet tall and the remaining floors are 9-feet tall.

Member Lewis noted that the Applicant began his presentation noting the other hotels in the area are 54-feet or less and Drury will not do that and the prototype has been done, Drury must have some hotels that are not 7-stories tall. Mr. Pereles said they do have smaller buildings but Drury is not building those anymore and if the building were reduced, they would have to extend the building and re-design it. They believe the prototype works very well including the building's safety and security.

Member Lewis asked if Mr. Pereles was stating that it is either the 7-story prototype that is built or nothing and Mr. Pereles said he could not directly answer that question but believes there is little room for negotiation.

Member Lewis asked Mr. Pereles for clarification as to how their proposal fits into the Township's Master Plan and that is in reference to the land's use. Member Lewis

noted that the Master Plan does not speak directly to the height of a building but does refer to density and Mr. Pereles asked what the issue is concerning density, they have ample parking for the number of rooms in the hotel.

Member Lewis said the parking is fine and the density would refer to the 28th Street traffic density, as more cars would be on 28th Street to get to their location. There was a study done at one time regarding traffic on Patterson Avenue and 28th Street and it was found that there is too much traffic there now. Since this study was done, Waterfall Shoppes has been developed and now there are traffic concerns on that site. Member Lewis is not in favor of allowing the height being proposed for this project due to the Township's ordinances.

Mr. Pereles noted that the Knights Inn only had one ingress and egress for their 118-room hotel, Drury is adding approximately 62-rooms with their project with alternate means of traffic accessing the site.

Chairman McDonald asked if Drury will obtain authorization from Consumers Power for the retaining wall and Mr. Pereles said they will speak with Consumers for their approval. Chairman McDonald noted that when Waterfall Shoppes requested approval from Consumers for their project, it did take some time to obtain and Mr. Pereles said they would not begin their project until the proper approval was obtained from Consumers Power. Mr. Pereles said that Drury has contacted Consumers Power and have begun discussion. Planning Director Peterson said that Staff has also contacted Consumers Power regarding Drury's plans.

There were no further questions of the Applicant and Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for a motion to open the Public Hearing.

Member Lewis motioned to open the Public Hearing, supported by Member MacAllister. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. All in favor with none opposed, the Public Hearing was opened.

Chairman McDonald noted there is one (1) letter included within the Commissions' packets concerning the project and Planning Director Peterson said the Township did receive a couple of phone calls inquiring about the project.

Chairman McDonald invited members of the Public to add their comments regarding the project.

Mr. Henry Kramer of 1969 Burning Woods Court is part owner of the BP gas station. He said that approximately 8-years ago a hotel wanted to purchase the property but wanted a hotel over 3-stories tall and that was not allowed. He also noted other surrounding businesses that have requested taller pylon signs that were also denied by the Township. His concerns lie with the previous requests being denied and this one being approved and upsetting local business owners as to why Drury receives special accommodations when others were denied previously.

No other public comments.

Member Lewis motioned to close the Public Hearing, supported by Member MacAllister. Chairman McDonald called the motion to question. **All in favor with none opposed. The Public Hearing was closed.**

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for discussion amongst the Planning Commission.

Member Logue believes a 7-story hotel should be welcomed in the area and his concern falls with the project fitting into the Township's Ordinances. He is not sure if allowance could be made without upsetting others but the hotel would provide economic growth in the area.

Member Lewis noted that the P.U.D. should not be used to get around the ordinance. He noted the 7-story Meadowbrooke project was approved three (3) separate times but has not been built yet. If this project is not included in other project references, the height of other buildings that have been developed is now down to 54-feet or 40-feet. This project is asking for a large variance from the written ordinance. Member Lewis noted it is a good project with tremendous opportunity but the ordinance should take precedence in the project's development and the request is extreme.

Member Richards acknowledge both Member Logue's comments and Member Lewis' comments. She, personally, would prefer to stay in a taller more secured building instead of a Knights Inn that is not secure and safe. She does not have an issue so much with the density and the location of the property abutting the highway. The

Planning Commission does not want to violate the Township's ordinances. West Michigan needs more hotels to attract larger conventions to the area; the conventions will not be scheduled if hotel accommodations are not in the area.

Member Koessel noted at the last Planning Commission Meeting there was another hotel that was discussed with an 82-foot setback for a small portion of the building that ended in a 4 to 3 vote for 8-feet of the standard. When these issues are discussed at the Planning Commission, he listens carefully to provide insight at the Township Board Meetings. He agrees with Member Lewis that the height is an issue and a large hotel would help the Michigan economy but the Township's ordinance does not come close to what is being proposed with this project and the Planning Commission has approved three (3) other hotels in the area that generally meet the Township's height requirement. He also noted that the hotel in Meadowbrooke is not as congested of an area as 28th Street and there is more freedom of movement at Meadowbrooke than on this site. Meadowbrooke is not on 28th Street as this property is and once a 7-story hotel is allowed on 28th Street that would set precedent along 28th Street. Member Koessel shares the same concerns as Member Lewis in granting such a huge height allowance than the norm. He believes Staff's recommendation in allowing the hotel at 54-feet is reasonable, taking into consideration as to what has already been built. He is not sure how the Township Board would react to a 72-foot building and believes the concern will fall in the traffic along 28th Street. If the easement with Perkins is not granted, there really is not anything anyone can do to bar traffic from accessing 28th Street through the controlled light at that location and believes travelers would seek the controlled access onto 28th Street anyway.

Member Koessel is also concerned about the proposed signage, it is asking for way more than what has ever been allowed, including the pylon sign even if it were at 14-feet by 17-feet.

He believes the Planning Commission would be stepping outside the norm in granting a 7-story hotel on 28th Street.

Member Waalkes acknowledge the good comments from the other Commissioners and questioned if higher buildings should be allowed within the Township. Is a 7-story hotel

something the community wants to see in Cascade Township? Does the Township want to start building upwards and possibly change the ordinance to allow for taller buildings? Chairman McDonald noted that the Township will be reviewing the Master Plan and Member Waalkes' comments should be considered at that time and asked Member Waalkes to keep his thoughts for when the process begins.

Member Koessel noted that one thing the Commission is not allowed to do is use the financial issues in considering a vote whether it costs the developer more to do something or less. Finances cannot be a consideration in how one votes. He noted he is not familiar with the hotel business and did acknowledge the Township has received many requests for this area. The land on 28th Street being what it is, there may be more requests to build vertical and is not sure the people of Cascade Township would want taller buildings since land is in shortage. The Master Plan has not been revised yet to allow for taller buildings. He also heard Mr. Pereles say that he may have a hard sell to the Drury owner in only building 54-feet up because of their finances and projected market but the Planning Commission is not allowed to base their vote upon finances. Planning Director Peterson also reminded the Planning Commission that the Standards the Planning Commission should be using are listed within the Staff's report.

Member Lewis also recognized that if the Planning Commission does not approve the project, the Applicant may also go before the Township Board seeking approval of the project and proposed site plan. The Township Board, being composed of different Township residents, may approve the plan regardless of the people's opinions that serve on the Planning Commission. On the other hand, because Member Koessel is a member of the Township Board, he is comfortable that Member Koessel would be able to express the feelings of the Planning Commission if this case were to go before the Township Board without a favorable recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Member Logue noted this hotel is proposed near the highway, it should not impede traffic flow along 28th Street too significantly.

Member MacAllister said that she supports Staff's recommendations listed in their report and fits the Township's ordinances.

Chairman McDonald requested a motion regarding the project.

Member Waalkes motioned to approve the Applicant's request to rezone the property at 5175 28th Street SE to Planned Unit Development with the following conditions:

- 1) Lower the height of the building to no more than 54-feet to the roofline.**
- 2) Limit wall signage to no more than 295-square feet in total to be divided among as many as three (3) wall signs.**
- 3) To limit the site to no more than one 28th Street sign no more than 20-square feet in sign area and limit the height to 30-feet tall.**
- 4) Revise the plan to relocate the pylon sign to as far north and west as possible given its revised size.**
- 5) The lighting plan is revised to meet Township standards.**
- 6) The plans are revised to address the concerns of the Township Engineer.**
- 7) The developer will provide for cross connection at the Perkins site and will develop their portion of that connection now.**
- 8) When the connection to 28th Street light is consummated, the Township will allow Drury to have a directional sign no more than 6-square feet at that intersection.**

Member Lewis supported the motion.

Chairman McDonald opened the motion for discussion.

Member Postma said he is not in favor of taller buildings and does not support the proposed 54-feet in height to the roof line.

Member Logue asked the Planning Commission if they would consider discussion regarding Condition 1 in allowing for a 7-story building since it is buffered by I-96. There was no discussion regarding Condition 1.

Member Lewis noted that the Township Board will receive a copy of these minutes and will review the issues that have been discussed this evening.

No further discussion regarding the motion. Chairman McDonald requested a roll call vote by Recording Secretary Hern.

Commissioner Koessel – yes
Commissioner Richards – yes
Commissioner Postma – no
Commissioner McDonald – yes
Commissioner Lewis – yes
Commissioner Waalkes – yes
Commissioner Logue - yes
Commissioner MacAllister -- yes.

Chairman McDonald noted the vote is approved seven (7) to one (1) and the motion carried.

Planning Director Peterson said Staff will draft the P.U.D. Ordinance for the Planning Commissions' review for the Board's recommendation.

ARTICLE 9.

Proposed Capital Improvement Plan

Consider Resolution for Capital Improvement Plan

Planning Director Peterson noted it is that time of the year again to review the proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Staff has attached the Plan along with a resolution for the Planning Commissions' consideration.

The Planning Commission may recall the CIP document is a planning tool to be used for budgeting public improvement projects that are over \$10,000. The CIP does not address all of the capital expenditures for the Township, but provides for the large, physical improvements that are permanent, including the basic services and installations needed for the functioning of the community.

The Capital Improvement Review Committee, which includes members of the Planning Commission (Jack Lewis and Tom McDonald), has reviewed the document and is recommending it for approval. After the Planning Commission adopts the CIP it is forwarded to the Township Board for their consideration.

Chairman McDonald noted that Member Lewis made some excellent recommendations in the CIP and noted the pathways along Laraway Lake were originally slated for 2004, then 2006 and it keeps getting moved out. Planning Director Peterson noted the

CIP is a guideline and that particular project at Laraway Lake is now scheduled for 2009. These dates can change every year and Staff equates the projected dates with the KCRC and is a guideline in developing the Township budget.

Chairman McDonald asked if a survey has been done for the Laraway Lake pathway and Planning Director Peterson said the Township needs to speak with the property owner where the large hill is. The Township has had a couple of discussions with the property owner who has not shown any interest in improving the area or the pathway.

Planning Director Peterson said Staff is seeking approval of the resolution.

Chairman McDonald opened for a motion to approve the resolution. **Member Koessel motioned to approve the resolution to the Capital Improvement Plan, supported by Member Richards.** Chairman McDonald noted the Planning Commission unanimously approved the resolution to the Capital Improvement Plan and will forward the document to the Township Board for their consideration.

ARTICLE 10.

Any Other Business

Chairman McDonald opened the meeting for any other business.

Member Postma noted that some of the Planning Commission has been assigned to a sub-committee to review the Reibel Development. The developer has been requested to provide a complete site plan for the sub-committee's review and have not received the documents requested. How should the sub-committee proceed with the developer, they have had approximately three (3) meetings with them and still have not seen a full revised site plan for the project that was due August 28th, the next meeting is scheduled for tomorrow. The sub-committee is seeking direction from the Planning Commission as to how long should they continue to hold meetings with the developer? Should tomorrow's meeting be cancelled since the revised site plan has not been received?

Planning Director Peterson supported the fact that the Developer has not provided the revisions and recommendations in one site plan for the sub-committee's review and it has been difficult to assist the Developer without seeing the revised site plan.

Chairman McDonald asked if the Developer knew about the deadlines and both Members Postma and MacAllister said that the

Developer were making notes and scheduling into their calendars the dates.

Planning Director Peterson further clarified that the number of buildings on the site may not have been clearly defined but the due dates for site plans and other documents was clearly defined.

Chairman McDonald asked if there is a clear agenda for tomorrow's meeting and Member MacAllister said it was made clear to the Developer that they need to provide a revised site plan that met the criteria discussed by August 28th for the sub-committee's review prior to the September 5th Meeting and the plans have not been submitted. The sub-committee defined perimeters for the Developer though this is not the perfect site for the project but she is comfortable working within the perimeters established with the Developer.

Planning Director Peterson said he has heard some comments regarding the connections of the buildings not being acceptable and believes the Developer should hear these comments.

Chairman McDonald noted that Member Postma is reluctant to meet with the Developer since the site plans have not been received and Planning Director Peterson said the sub-committee may want to still meet with the Developer to provide definitive insight to the building connections the Developer assumes to be valid or not.

Member Postma noted the traffic flow into the development would be congested along with pedestrian crossings and believes he clearly communicated these concerns during the meetings. He also expressed his concern for the property not having enough garbage dumpsters to accommodate two (2) restaurants and the other tenants. The Developer said they would submit a revised plan and the sub-committee has not seen it. Planning Director Peterson does not believe it would be inappropriate to cancel the meeting since the plans were not submitted in a timely fashion.

Chairman McDonald suggested that Staff contact the Developer and cancel the meeting noting they would like to review the plans prior to any future meetings. Chairman McDonald also noted that the sub-committee could list the recommendations for changes prior to coming before the Planning Commission.

Member Koessel asked what the Applicant has developed since coming before the Planning Commission and Planning Director Peterson said the Applicant is now proposing a 2-story plaza with a connector to the two (2) buildings; the connector is similar to what

you would see downtown. Member MacAllister noted the difference with this connector is it is occupy-able space for the restaurants with a waiting area and tables. The direction to the Developer given by the sub-committee is this area would be considered a connector and joins the two (2) buildings into one (1) building. The Developer is requesting six (6) total buildings but consider two (2) of the six (6) buildings as one due to the connector.

Member MacAllister also noted that it was pointed out to the Developer that they have proposed higher density for the project and want to see what the Township is receiving in return and the sub-committee has not seen that, Planning Director Peterson agreed.

Member Koessel asked what is different between this development and the Spees Development? Planning Director Peterson said that the Spees Development was connected with an archway and proposing three (3) buildings on a little over five (5) acres. Member MacAllister noted that the Reibel Development is connected with occupy-able space. Planning Director Peterson noted the Spees Development originally proposed three (3) buildings with an arch. Member Koessel noted that the entire development has changed since the Planning Commission last reviewed the project.

Member Koessel asked if Reibel should come back before the Planning Commission since the project has changed drastically and Member Postma recommended the development come back before the Planning Commission for their review. Member Koessel appreciates what the sub-committee is doing but believes the project should be brought back before the Planning Commission since the project has drastically changed. Planning Director Peterson will contact Reibel Development for appearing before the Planning Commission Meeting.

Chairman McDonald also noted in the August Minutes that Staff was going to contact Waterfall Shoppes regarding the on site traffic flow issues. Planning Director Peterson has not contacted the Developer but has contacted traffic engineers regarding the area. He also noted that M-DOT has also restricted the one entrance to a right-in and right-out only and would allow people from the gas station to exit from that ingress. M-DOT may also have to be involved to improve traffic flow but Staff is working on it.

Member Logue asked how long it would take the Burton Street sewer project to be re-laid and Planning Director Peterson said two

(2) to three (3) weeks. Planning Director Peterson informed the Commission that part of the Burton Street sewer line was laid incorrectly, the first segment was missed by a couple of feet and needs to be re-done. There is approximately 18-feet that needs to be re-done and the error was in the survey done by Fishbeck. The project was originally ahead of schedule but this will cost some time but the Township will not be accruing any additional costs.

Member Koessel also reported that the Township Board has narrowed its search for a Township Manager down to three (3) candidates who will be publicly interviewed during the next Township Board Meeting and invited the Planning Commission to attend.

ARTICLE 11. Adjournment

Chairman McDonald requested a motion for adjournment.

Member MacAllister supported by Member Logue moved to adjourn. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Lewis, Secretary

Lisa Hern, Recording Secretary