

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, August 19, 2019
7:00 P.M.

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Sperla called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
Members Present: Johnson, Katsma, Krieter, Lewis, Noordyke, Pennington, Rissi, Moxley and Sperla
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 Pennington to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Krieter. Motion carried 9 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the August 12, 2019 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Johnson to approve the minutes of August 12, 2019. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0.

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

No visitors came forward.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #19-3527 Roundhill
Property Address: 3000 Thornhills Ave SE**

Requested Action: (From the table of the May 20th meeting) Update report from developer on requested changes.

Motion was made by Member Pennington to remove this case from the May 20th table. Supported by Member Lewis. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Director Peterson stated that at the conclusion of the May 20th Meeting, the developers were asked to provide a complete plan of all of the changes they are proposing. Director Peterson stated that they have not yet completed the engineering of some of those items, and explained some information included in the Members packets for this Meeting. The purpose of this agenda item tonight is to allow the developer to update and inform Members with information that may be useful for the upcoming Public Hearing Meeting.

Mr. Jason Schnelker (attorney for the project developer) came forward to state that they have been working closely with Tom Guisti and Thomas Michael Homes (the primary builder for the project), and that they are really pleased with the first built and sold home, and the work Mr. Guisti has completed so far. Mr. Schnelker then stated that this process has been bumpier than they would like, and that he and Mr. Dan Hula (from Hula Engineering) are here to discuss ongoing questions, answer new questions, and talk about changes that have been made, and the changes being requested.

Mr. Schnelker stated that upon completion of the first home being built, the buyer had a survey conducted, and noticed the deck was outside of the building footprint. Mr. Schnelker said they were surprised to hear that, and they realized there was a misunderstanding as to what had to be constructed within the footprints approved in the PUD. It was their previous expectation that the decks were not included in that footprint, and as long as they complied with the setback requirements, the decks would be fine where they were. They now realize that is not that case, and are proposing and amendment to the footprints for all the homes that will be built on this site. Mr. Schnelker states that if the requested amendment is approved, the decks will be included in the footprints. Units 1-5 will have no decks; they will be walk-out units. The revised footprints will shift the units slightly to give more green space between each unit, and a more open feel in the development.

Mr. Hula came forward to state that the engineer who put this project together originally has passed away. Mr. Hula states that he has been (and is currently in the process of) transitioning CAD files, and says it has been a lengthy process. Mr. Hula states the he still needs to merge drawing contours to be more legible, and the he and Mike Berrevoets (Fishbeck Engineer) agreed that it's imperative that a solid, completely finished plan be presented. Mr. Hula states he still needs at least a week to complete this.

Mr. Hula references the memo, and states the security gate was added and that Mr. Guisti went through the Fire Department for approval of that. Mr. Hula states that he did not check with the Chief. Mr. Hula states that the City of Grand Rapids considers gates to be "structures", and their easement states that is you build a structure on their easement and it has to come down, you need to then take it down. Mr. Hula states that that means if the City has to enter the property to do some work, the gate just needs to be open. Mr. Hula stated that he checked with the City, and "it's not a big deal".

The retention basin configuration changed a little bit, Mr. Hula stated that is not uncommon. Mr. Hula stated that the fill area that they had and filled in worked better with the flow, and that it did not change the volume. The storm sewer configuration had pipes were connected to the wrong basins, those led offsite water to the retention basin, and not around it as it was planned to be, said Mr. Hula. Mr. Hula then stated that he does not know who made the change, but that it is wrong and needs to be fixed.

Mr. Hula states that the City of Grand Rapids asked for the change to the water main loop. It comes in between two units, and they asked for it to be moved as the easement is no longer on the Applicants property.

Mr. Hula states that the retaining walls were not constructed. They have a completed survey for that area, and Mr. Hula states the areas are being stabilized, and the mulch blankets that have been placed are growing well. Mr. Hula did state that there is one small area of erosion that he pointed out to Mr. Guisti, and that Mr. Guisti stated that he would take care of it right away.

The visitor parking area has been changed, and is now located near Unit 1. Mr. Hula states that each Unit has 3 stalls, and to his knowledge there is no visitor parking required in the Zoning Ordinance. The "Authorized Vehicle Only" signs have not been put up yet, and the line of Norway Pines at the top of the hill may be reconsidered.

Chairman Sperla asked Members if they had any questions about items included in their packet. Mr. Hula was asked if it was the Cascade Fire Chief that reviewed and approved the entrance gate. Mr. Guisti stated that the Fire Marshall and a couple members of the Fire Department came over to the property and checked the operation of the gate. Mr. Guisti stated that the Township inspected it, and that these inspections are on record with the Township.

Chairman Sperla asked when these items can be completed and put together in a way for the Township Engineer to review. Mr. Hula stated that would be done by later this week, or the first part of next week.

Member Rissi asked if there are plans for a sidewalk near the entrance gate. Mr. Guisti stated that the sidewalk will be placed on the outside of the entrance gate.

Member Pennington stated that he would like to see visuals that demonstrate what's being done with drainage and grading to be able to eliminate the retaining walls.

Member Moxley stated that he believes one of the biggest issues is that the retaining walls were required in the PUD, and the Applicant is stating they're not going to construct them. Member Johnson stated that it will be important to be able to clearly explain to the neighbors why the retaining walls are not needed.

Member Rissi asked about the retention area, and why the concrete aspect has been eliminated. Mr. Hula stated that it has been constructed with reinforced "turf", and is strong enough to hold whatever flows over it. Mr. Hula stated that he does not like concrete, as it is easily flowed around.

Member Krieter asked about the neighbors' attorney letter, and where it read that the Road Commission had feedback about not having a concrete retaining wall, and instead replacing it with the turf-like substance. Mr. Guisti stated the Wayne and Andrew from the Kent County Road Commission believed it would be better to use the reinforced turf substance. Mr. Guisti stated that the turf-like substance would give more space to the back part of the buildable areas. Member Krieter stated that the letter eluded to the road being impacted by particles washing over the road, and stated that maybe the Road Commission can provide this information for review. Mr. Guisti stated that he believes they are talking about two separate areas of the property.

Member Krieter stated that any impact to any road in the area of this project would be of concern. Mr. Hula stated that yes, it would be of concern if they were not addressing these issues. Mr. Hula then stated that the intent is to have no erosion issues at all, and that a lot of concern about incidents stated in the neighbors' letter were happening before these current changes were made.

Member Moxley asked if the landscape buffer planned for the southeast corner is still being considered. Mr. Hula stated that the plan has not changed at all, and will continue to be completed as homes and landscapes are finished.

Member Rissi asked if there was a way information can be provided from a density perspective to show how much more or less area is being covered with the footprints of the homes under the new buildable envelopes. Mr. Guisti stated that he believes it is only about 96 sq ft more than originally calculated, not including the decks. Mr. Hula stated that two of the original three parking areas are being removed, he believes the space can be better used. There will be one designated parking space area near Unit 1.

Chairman Sperla stated that he would like to see updated square foot numbers available for each lot for the Public Hearing. Mr. Hula stated they are in the drainage calculations that he put together, and that he will enter them onto a separate document.

Member Moxley asked if the 96 square feet added to each house includes the garage; Mr. Guisti stated that yes, since it has a roof, it does include the garage.

Chairman Sperla asked how many of the then lots are increasing from two to three garage stalls. Mr. Guisti stated that all ten of them are increasing to three stalls. Mr. Hula stated that they will be constructed within the proposed footprints. Mr. Hula stated that the increase is to keep up with market demand for extra storage space.

Member Rissi stated that he would like to see the square footage footprint changes before the next Planning Commission meeting.

Member Moxley confirmed that Units 5-10 will have decks, 1-4 will not. Mr. Guisti confirmed that is correct.

Director Peterson stated (for the Applicant) a list of things the he heard the Planning Commission ask for tonight. They are as follows:

1. The completed engineering
2. The visual aid for the cross-section of the retaining wall
3. A report from the Road Commission on soil erosion
4. A lot coverage comparison plan
5. Updated site plans showing revised parking plans
6. Report from the Fire Chief about the entrance gate
7. Detailed reason for change of the retention area material

Chairman Sperla stated that this is not a Public Hearing tonight. There will be an upcoming Public Hearing in front of the Planning Commission for a recommendation, and then go in front of the Township Board.

Member Rissi asked Mr. Berrevoets if there are any other retention or sloped areas in the Township that are using the reinforced turf-like substance rather than concrete. Mr. Berrevoets said yes, he believed there to be, but could not list offhand where. He then stated that that change was approved by the Township Engineers. Mr. Berrevoets stated that the new substance is to be a 100-year retention basin, and will not crack or erode like concrete.

Chairman Sperla thanked the Applicants for attending.

**ARTICLE 7. Case #19-3542 Watermark Property LLC
Public Hearing**

Property Address: 1611 Galbraith Ave SE

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Preliminary Plan Approval to amend the P.U.D. to allow for an expansion of the pool equipment building and build an additional building to accommodate the restaurant/bar at the Swim Center building.

Director Peterson stated that the only change since the introduction of this project last week is that the Township Engineer was able to sign off on this project. That report is included in Members' packets.

Director Peterson stated that Staff is recommending approval, and, if approved, text amendments will be provided to make that recommendation to the Board. Tonight, the amended plan needs to be approved in order to write the amendment.

Member Rissi asked Director Peterson if the two buildings being connected by a roof would be considered one building or two, Director Peterson clarified it would be considered one building.

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

Ms. Kelly Kuiper (Nederveld) came forward to state that everything presented last week is still accurate, and that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Member Krieter asked Ms. Kuiper if she was able to find out if the liquor license will still be valid; Ms. Kuiper stated that it does cover the entire property, and will not change with this proposed plan.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to open public hearing. Supported by Member Krieter. Motion carried 9 to 0.

No members of the public came forward with any comments on this matter.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to close public hearing. Supported by Member Krieter. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to approve Applicants Preliminary Plan as presented. Supported by Member Krieter. Motion carried 9 to 0.

ARTICE 8. Any other business

ARTICLE 9. Adjournment

Motion was made by Member Pennington to adjourn. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Phil Johnson, Secretary