

**Minutes**

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday August 16, 2021  
7:00 P.M.  
2870 Jacksmith Ave SE

- ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Rissi called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.  
Members Present: Noordhoek, Moxley, Deering, Rissi, Katsma, Rapin, and Meurlin  
Members Absent: Noordyke and Korstange  
Others Present: Planner Brian Hilbrands and those listed on the sign-in sheet
- ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance**
- ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda**  
**Motion was made by Member Moxley to approve the current Agenda. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 6 to 0.**
- ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflicts of Interest**  
There were none.
- ARTICLE 5. Approve the Minutes of the August 2, 2021 Meeting.**  
Chair Rissi noted some corrections he had for the minutes. In the third line of article 10 he requested the line ‘if there is a sidewalk’ be struck as it was confusing.  
Also in article 10, he wanted ‘barrier’ changed to ‘wall’ in the third paragraph so that it read, “. If a house is built on adjoining property and they have a patio that is within 36” of the wall, that would change the situation and a barrier may be required...”  
Chair Rissi pointed out that the last name ‘Grunki’ in the last line of page six should be spelled ‘Grunski’.  
On page seven in article 11, he requested, “at the south end of the cul-de-sac” be omitted as it doesn’t make contextual sense.  
**Motion was made by Member Katsma to approve the Minutes of July 12, 2021 with the aforementioned corrections. Supported by Member Rapin. Motion carried 6 to 0.**
- ARTICLE 7. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items.**  
There was no one who wished to speak to non-agenda items.  
Member Meurlin joined the meeting.
- ARTICLE 9. Case #21-3629/Bob Morse**  
**Property Address:** 6390 and 6420 28<sup>th</sup> St

**Requested Action:** Consider recommendation to the Township Board for P.U.D Ordinance Amendment for a car wash and coffee shop.

Planner Brian presented the case. He said that there was a revision to the site plan as the applicant has asked that the square footage of the drive-up coffee shop be increased from 550 sf to 664 sf. Staff does not believe that the increased building size will have a significant impact on the site.

Signage was updated to be in line with site requirements.

There were two grammatical changes to the PUD amendments. Planner Brian explained that on the first page it should read, "The project occupies approximately 15.3 acres of land that formerly was the site of a legal non-conforming industry operation as well as a previously existing Pizza Hut restaurant." That was simply a tense change and the other change was in the signage section. The signage section in 'A' is changed to say, "80 ft from the edge of the pavement of 28<sup>th</sup> St," not "80 ft from the right of way" as the Culver's and Macatawa signs are currently approximately 80 ft from the edge of the pavement.

The PUD request has been reviewed by the applicant and staff believe it is in line with recommendations from the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff recommend a positive recommendation to the township board for approval of the PUD amendment. The township board will then hold a public hearing for final approval.

Member Meurlin shared that he was having problems understanding the PUD amendment request as previous versions and amendments were referenced within the text of the amendment in question.

Planner Brian clarified that the amendments would be worked into the original document after the PUD amendment is approved.

Member Meurlin asked for clarification as to what a site plan consists of and how it is identified.

Chair Rissi, Member Meurlin, and Planner Brian agreed that, in the future, they will work to put a process into place where the final, approved site plan will be stamped with its approval and date so it is easier for anyone looking at the document in the future.

Member Meurlin expressed concern about the section of the plan that references the need to demolish the coffee shop building should it remain vacant for 18 months. Chair Rissi and Member Katsma concurred and raised the question as to if they are putting too many constraints or not enough on what is allowed to be done with this building. All members want the applicants to succeed but they don't want to set a precedent that other applicants can have too lenient of terms in the future.

Member Rapin shared that he believes this application addresses what they spoke of a few meetings back and that, just because they approve a site plan now, doesn't mean it can't be changed in the future.

The applicant, Bob Morris, and Jim Morgan, their planner, spoke to the investment they are making to the site and said they were comfortable with the requirements as written.

They requested more information on the section of the site plan that references a guard rail around an underground retaining pond. It was in a previous section of the ordinance that was not being amended and did not affect this case.

Member Meurlin expressed his dislike for the combining of parts of old ordinances with new amendments. He said it was confusing when there are sections of the original ordinance that may no longer apply once amendments are made but still live in the ordinance for posterity. He believed this is what was causing comprehension problems with the retaining pond as well as with a section he found that said the applicant would have to get approval for a special use permit in addition to the P.U.D approval.

Planner Brian clarified that getting the P.U.D approved constituted as approving the special use permit as well. Chair Rissi and Member Meurlin determined that this could be solved by simply approving the special use if the application were to be recommended to the township board.

Member Meurlin referenced section nine where it said “paragraphs four and five should be deleted and replaced with,” stating that there wasn’t a ‘paragraph five’ in the ordinance. It should instead say, “paragraph four should be deleted and replaced with what is below and a new paragraph five should be added.”

**Motion was made by Member Meurlin to recommend the approval of the P.U.D amendments, site plan, and the special use of the drive thru to the township board with the numbering changes just discussed and the changes referenced at the beginning of the discussion. Supported by Member Noordhoek. Motion carried 7 to 0.**

It was clarified by Planner Brian that the pages of the ‘Approved Site Plan’ would be stamped, dated, and marked as such.

Member Meurlin wanted to clarify whose responsibility it is when a neighbor to an approved site is being damaged, even though the developer followed the requirements set forth by the Planning Committee. He was trying to determine if the Planning Commission or the developer holds the liability in this case.

**ARTICLE 10. Old Business**

**Township Email Address Update:** Planner Brian spoke with Manager Swayze and the township is still making decisions as to what server they would use as well as working out other details.

Member Meurlin wanted an update as to when the Rules of Conduct would be completed. Chair Rissi suggested that the workload on the legal counsel was quite high and the Rules of Conduct were not currently a high priority. Planner Brian and Chair Rissi stated they would check in with Director Peterson to nudge the legal team and

determine an approximate timeframe as to when they will be providing more information.

Member Meurlin asked if Chair Rissi had spoken with Mr. Bly with any update in reference to problems with the Sequoia property. Chair Rissi said that Director Peterson sent staff to check the site and emailed the developer on August 6<sup>th</sup> with items they would need to fix. Chair Rissi agreed he would check back with Director Peterson to find out if the problems have been taken care of and comply with Member Meurlin's request that he speak with Mr. Bly and let him know they are pursuing the topic and working on enforcement.

**ARTICLE 11. Any Other Business**

Member Meurlin wanted to explain a survey that had been distributed to the Planning Committee that pertained to the Strategic Planning Committee. He wanted them filled out and submitted to him so that he could take their responses to the meeting to see what changes they prioritized in their community. Some members had already submitted their surveys, though Member Meurlin had not yet reviewed them. There was further conversation on what was detailed in the survey.

**ARTICLE 12. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Meurlin to adjourn. Supported by Member Katsma. Motion carried 7 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Katsma, Secretary