

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, May 19, 2014
7:00 P.M.

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Pennington called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members Present: Hammond, Lewis, Mead, Pennington, Rissi, Robinson, Sperla, Waalkes, Williams
Members Absent: All Members Present
Others Present: Planning Director Steve Peterson

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the flag

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.

Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Agenda. Support by Member Mead. Motion carried 9-0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the May 12, 2014 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Lewis to approve the Minutes. Support by Member Williams. Motion carried 9-0.

ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items (Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker.)

There was no one present who wished to speak on non-agenda items.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #14-3180 – YMCA of Greater Grand Rapids
Public Hearing**

Property Address: 5452, 5500 & 5298 Burton

Requested Action: Applicant is requesting a preliminary plan approval to rezone property to Planned Unit Development for a new YMCA facility with outdoor fields.

Planner Peterson stated that this is a preliminary review of the plan and a Public Hearing. The preliminary plan review is followed by a review of an ordinance that would regulate this property and then the project would be referred to the Township Board. The parcel is at the SW corner of Burton and Kraft. Part of the parcel is the Turnberry PUD that was never developed. The west half of the property is the legal non-conforming RV storage facility. This project will encompass both of these properties. The underlying zoning of the Turnberry parcel is R1 residential. The existing zoning of the RV storage facility is R1 residential as well. That designation does allow for a regional recreational use.

One of the components of that is that you must be located on a major arterial road. Both Burton and Kraft in this area are defined as major arterial roads. The reason for the PUD rezoning is mainly to deal with the township process. With the split zoning between the two properties, they would have to amend the existing Turnberry project and rezone it back to R1 and go back thru the Special Use Permit process. It's easier and cleaner to amend the whole property to a PUD.

The site is very similar to what you saw at the introductory meeting. A few minor things have changed. The site plan shows three baseball fields, tennis courts, the building, soccer and parking. The building was downsized slightly about 2,500 sq. ft. from the original plan.

They gave us the hours of operation: Monday – Friday 5 AM -10 PM; Saturday 7 AM -8 PM; Sunday 8 AM- 6PM. These hours are very similar to MVP's hours which is located directly to the south.

The lighting plan is in the packet. They are not requesting any lights for the fields. There will be parking lot lighting and it meets all of our photometric requirements.

MVP is to the south, to the west is the Consumers Power right of way, to the north there is vacant residential land and to the northwest is the Burton Pointe subdivision of the property.

The Turnberry property has not been developed. When we looked at that originally we had talked about allowing a different type of buffer yard along boundary with MVP. MVP fields do not have any landscaping buffer on their north fields. The Turnberry project was going to make up for that with their residential portion of the project. We talked at the introductory meeting and we felt that with these two common uses the need for the buffer yard, for extra landscaping, was not applicable now as it was when we had the Turnberry project. This is their landscaping plan and it is very well landscaped to the west of the sight. There's not as much landscaping to the eastern portion but this is where the wetlands area is and it makes good sense to allow that to remain natural. There is additional landscaping in the southeast corner of the site.

Of the few changes to the plan, most are occurring due to the storm water system that is being designed. Mike Berrevoets will go through that portion of the site plan and explain the design changes and the Storm Water Ordinance. I did want to point out the report from their engineer reports the storm water runoff pre and post construction calculations. In all of the areas there is a reduction in both runoff quantity and runoff rate for the entire site.

Mike Berrevoets, Engineer for Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, stated that the existing site is in two different drainage boundaries. Everything west of the boundary line drains into the Plaster Creek Watershed or the Martin Beek drain. Everything east of the boundary line drains into Schoolhouse Creek watershed. It drains through the 18 inch culvert that goes under Kraft/Burton into some wetlands north of the intersection and eventually into Wood Lake.

Any new improvements have to meet the Township Storm Water Ordinance. The proposed site is in Storm Management zone A which requires infiltration if soil conditions allow. What they have run into is that on the west there is good infiltrating soils but on the east side the site all drains to high ground water and low infiltration rates. With the permission of the Drain Commissioner they have requested to alter the drainage boundary for the two watersheds allowing water to be redirected from the School House Watershed to the Plaster Creek Watershed. For flood control requirements it is being covered with the infiltration basin with no runoff on the west end. On the east end they are directing the water into these two shallow detention basins. The detention basins have the capacity for the 100 year flood with a restricted outlet to match the .13 cfs per acre. The northeast drainage area by the ball diamonds is directed into the wetlands. At this time there needs to be some water draining to the wetlands area to meet DEQ requirements. They will need to work with the DEQ to determine how much water can enter and exit the wetlands. In the west drainage area it is completely infiltration. The east drainage area goes into two basins. There is a storm water control unit which has to meet the Township requirements. We will need additional information before final approval. The detention time of the wetlands needs to exceed 24 hours. They will need to work with the DEQ to make sure those requirements are met.

For bank erosion control requirements they need to hold onto the two year rain event and release it at a lesser rate of .05 CFS per acre. On the west side this is accomplished thru the infiltration basins. The east drainage area goes to two shallow infiltration basins. They do have some infiltration, .5 inches per hour. What they are proposing is that the outlet will be above the two year elevation so all the water from the two year rain event will stay in the basin until it infiltrates. On the northeast, the drainage area goes through the wetlands and they must work with the DEQ to establish what is allowed.

At this stage, they are in the discussion process with the DEQ. They need to have their application meeting. We would like to work with them before final approval to see if the DEQ requirements match up to the Township requirements, and to encourage that both of those requirements are met.

Otherwise, everything meets or exceeds the Townships Storm Water Ordinance requirements.

Planner Peterson stated the project ties into the Townships future land use plan as shown in the Master Plan. The underlying zoning of the property is all R1 residential and in the Master Plan it is what we would refer to as Community Residential/Transitional zone where we transition from commercial to residential.

Our Capital Improvement Plan has talked about the desire for a pedestrian connection on Burton Street to the City of Kentwood. This may be a really good catalyst for those discussions to get ramped up. This has been hinging on MDOT'S construction of the bridge over I-96.

The Master Plan does contemplate bus service down into the Village from Cascade Road and the 28th Street area. The Plan does include a proposed bus pullout which is part of our long range plan. A bus route from Burton/Kraft/28th Street may provide a nice loop of service eventually. This could help accomplish one of our goals.

They have two access points: One on Burton across from the Burton Pointe subdivision, the other at the Burton/Kraft intersection. Those have both been reviewed and approved by the Road Commission in terms of their location. The pullout has to be reviewed by both the Road Commission and The Rapid. This has also met approval by both parties. They simply have to meet their design requirements for acceleration/deceleration lanes.

Traffic and Capacity of the road systems is always brought up on a large project. They did do a large traffic study. Three lane roads such as this can handle 22,000-25,000 cars according to the Road Commission. The roads are currently at 11,000 so there is plenty of capacity in the road system. When they did the traffic study we had them look at the pinch points of high traffic. The findings did bring out four different areas. One area is Burton/Spaulding and the Road Commission was already looking at that intersection and has indicated they would like to study that more. They do not think that it currently needs a light but they are going to study it regardless of this project. The study talked about signal timing at Kraft and 28th Street. The Road Commission is already doing that as well. There are already some lane additions in the Road Commissions plan for 2017 as well. The Burton/Kraft intersections will get a big upgrade that is a result of the YMCA project. The YMCA would be responsible for the complete reconstruction of that intersection. The other traffic item was the acceleration/deceleration lanes for the busses and drives that will be required.

The PUD standards for rezoning is the benefit of the PUD allowing us to look at the whole project rather than having the project resubmitted for site plan and the Special Use Permit. The underlying zoning R1 allows for the regional recreational use. The traffic study indicates that they are making their improvements that are associated with their proposal. Finally, as Mike Berrevoets indicated, they are meeting our Storm Water Ordinance Requirements. This project is compatible with our Master Plan and is consistent with the underlying zoning. My feeling was that this would not pose a negative economic impact on the surrounding area since it complies with our Mater Plan and would be allowed as a Special Use. One of the standards talks was about as much green space as we would otherwise see and other than the area backing up to MVP, where there is no longer a need, I would say there is just as much landscaping with this plan as there would otherwise be. With that, my recommendation is that you approve their preliminary plan with some details they still need to work out with the Township Engineer. We do have the path along Burton. We cannot find any easement on record and we have asked for that easement to be drafted. If anything major changes with the DEQ then we would need that information updated as well. Staff recommends you approve the preliminary site plan, if approved we would then write the PUD Ordinance. That would come back to the Planning Commission for review and then ultimately a recommendation to the Township Board.

Member Sperla asked if a study had been done on the impact of the storm water on surrounding sites such as Schoolhouse Creek. In other words, has this study carried beyond the development site? Engineer Berrevoets stated they're discharging in the same location, the rate is less and it also meets and exceeds the ordinance. Member Sperla asked if it was fair to say all the studies have been done on the development site and not any further. Engineer Berrevoets stated if you looked at what leaves the site, where improvements could be made, they have made them. Member Mead asked Planner Peterson if the packets were up to date. Planner Peterson stated they were. He then asked if there were going to be 4 or 6 tennis courts. Planner Peterson stated there would be 4. The original plans had additional courts; however, they don't have room for more. Member Sperla asked Engineer Berrevoets what was the imperious surface based on the pre and post. What the existing site is and what the future site would be if YMCA if constructed. Engineer Berrevoets suggested that question might be better asked of the applicant.

Chairman Pennington asked the applicant to come forward.

Ron Nelson, 7544 Whispering Ridge, came forward along with Cheryl Scales, who is their Civil Engineer from Progressive AE. This campus has four unique

components to it. The first one is universal design which simply means this campus will be able to serve people of abilities. The second one is that this campus will contain a healthy living center which emphasizes the farm to table concept. So we'll have actually a farm on this property, a greenhouse, a teaching kitchen, and we'll have meeting space which will support healthy living. The third component is some innovative programming for youth. While we'll do all the things the community expects of the YMCA like teaching children to swim and using sports and fitness exercise to reduce obesity. Our innovative programming includes global awareness, public policy, philanthropy, entrepreneurship, and the environment. The fourth component is around active aging. The YMCA programming will now include programs that deal with chronic disease. We have a diabetes prevention program that's one of two in the state; the other one is located in Ann Arbor. We also have a live strong cancer wellness program. Those are things that deal with active aging as well as being concerned with people's wellness. This also will be the YMCA's third leed certified YMCA in our community. We have our first at our Huntington branch downtown. Our Spartan Stores YMCA on Metro Health Campus is also leed certified silver. And we're expecting this YMCA so be leed certified silver as well.

Since our last meeting we had a neighborhood meeting. At that point we had in excess of 100 people attend. We felt we got a very nice welcome. If there were any negatives it would be that the people would like a light at the intersection of Spaulding and Burton and it has been mentioned that the Road Commission will be studying this. The Storm Water Ordinance has been described beautifully. The building has been reduced to 116,000 feet. We will have plenty of parking for people of all abilities. We'll well exceed what the requirements are for ADA parking. The hours have been mentioned as well as lighting and fields. We will not disturb the current path, but connect to the path and have the path circle the entire property and have it connect again by the entrance. The building height is 19 feet at its west elevation which will be the entrance to the building. The building will be 32 feet if you're coming from the Kraft and Burton Streets. It's been mentioned that we've relocated our storm water system and we've reduced two of the potential tennis courts that we were going to add to the property. We did not discuss the interior of the building when I was here last. One entrance will have views down into two swimming pools which are on the lower level. You can think about swimming pools and gymnasiums having very high ceilings. When you enter there's a chapel to your left and a lobby area. This is a warming pool which will be great for swimming classes for very young children as well as arthritis classes. There is an eight lane lap pool. This location has a very large youth swimming team called the RAYS (Rapid Area Youth Swimmers) and they'll be very happy to have eight lanes of water. There's an area for age's infants through 10 years old for parents to be able to drop their children off safely while they go and exercise or go to a class in another portion

of the building. There will be a clinic for rehabilitation and an area for children ages 10-14 and others to build relationships. The area to the right of the entrance will be offices. There will be an area for healthy living with a teaching kitchen, greenhouse, and farm to the southwest. There's a big multi-purpose area which will look down into the gymnasiums. One of the gymnasiums will be for primarily wheelchair sports and activities. There may some weekends where all the gymnasiums will be used for wheelchair sports or for some other activity. The dressing rooms will have a men's and women's locker room as well as family dressing rooms, and two dressing rooms with mat tables for the disabled. When you enter on the second floor there's a ramp which is an architectural feature as well as a functional feature. This will not only be used for wheelchairs, but for anyone else wanting to use it. We're really emphasizing movement and independence. There is an elevator and stairs in this facility as well. In another area will be free weights, cardio, etc. along with a cycling studio, fitness studio. There's also room for wheelchair storage and repair. There will also be a climbing wall. The other major feature is the area around the building will be a walking/running track, five laps to one mile. That is the largest in our association. The first elevation is from the north off Burton, the second elevation is west where you enter the building, the third one is to the south (looking from the MVP site), and the last one is looking from the intersection of Kraft and Burton.

Cheryl Scales stated Planner Peterson had covered all the PUD requirements. Engineer Berrevoets covered everything that Cheryl Scales was going to say about storm water. Cheryl Scales stated that 4.7 acres is what they're switching from School House Creek to Plaster Creek and will be fully integrated into the sand there. They are working with the DEQ regarding a number of wetland patches that are not in the highest quality. The YMCA would like to include those by adding water to that and enhancing them with plants as part of our improvement application with the DEQ. They're hoping to improve those wetlands and make them a feature of the path so people can enjoy while using the path. Cheryl stated the YMCA worked as hard as they could with ponds trying to fit everything into the infiltration on the site. They were unable to do that. What they did do was meet the requirement for the 25 year and we maxed out as much space as possible and were able to detain a 100 year storm plus infiltrate that first two year storm which is where your most common rain off the site is during your first two years. Cheryl stated the YMCA has a hybrid on the east side. The west side they can 100% infiltrate. The YMCA is doing some more testing this week so if they find they can infiltrate more than the two year storm they will do that. Their goal is to get as much as they can into that. If the pond did overflow it would overflow into the wetland area which is restricted by an 18 inch culvert. The YMCA and the DEQ are fine with holding this water in the wetland area and creating even more wetland in this area. They would attach a

culvert through here so that we can get this culvert to feed this wetland which is actually being starved now because it doesn't have enough water. We're trying to keep as much water on our site as possible. Cheryl showed a color copy of what has been a black and white. The YMCA did go down to four tennis courts, originally it was shown with a possibility of six, but because of the wetland we were limited to four. The YMCA is limited to just about what you see on this site. You do see an area labeled "future development 3.7 acres". Cheryl did size the detention ponds to handle that development should it occur. At this time all they anticipate would be fields, but we're not planning to do anything with it and will just leave it "as is" for right now. She does have a traffic slide as well, but Planner Peterson covered all the basic issues she had. She stated Pete LaMourie, Progressive AE, who performed the traffic study with the KCRC was available for any specific questions.

Member Sperla asked Cheryl if the Storm Water Design Plan which is required under the Ordinance has been drafted or prepared yet. He explained there was a Storm Water Drainage Plan required under section 7.2. Cheryl stated the YMCA has sized all the ponds and done all the calculations for the pond volume. She stated the YMCA owes the Township the final pipe sizing for the pipe routing and then a Maintenance Plan as well. Also a Soil Erosion Sedimentation Plan which is something that's really important on this site to make sure they don't mess up the infiltration plans, but that's a part of the Kent County submittal as well. Member Sperla stated that what he was referring to was Section 2.03 of the Drainage Plan which says "the developer shall provide drainage plan to the township for review and approval from the township". It then goes on to list 15 different items. Planner Peterson stated the Township would consider these plans to be the Storm Water Drainage Plan. Member Sperla asked Planner Peterson if he had gone through a checklist to make certain all items had been addressed. Member Sperla stated he didn't see a certain item such as subsection one which is "location of the development site and the water bodies which will receive storm water runoff". Some of those just aren't listed and then it goes on to discuss some off-site impacts as well. Member Sperla stated all the data may be there, but it may need to be re-worked in order to comply. Planner Peterson stated a note could be added to the plans to talk about what Engineer Berrevoets has already indicated and what water bodies would receive it. Member Sperla stated all items should be looked at. He stated there was a Maintenance Agreement as well. Planner Peterson agreed and stated that would typically be done inside the PUD Ordinance.

Member Mead asked about the new curb cut across from Burton intersection. Will water be allowed to come into your site or is the YMCA collecting it because it runs down the road. Cheryl stated there currently is a collection point and they will also collect water in a catch basin to go here as well. Member Mead

asked if they were introducing any new water to the site. Cheryl stated the site currently has water; they're just moving it from where it is now and locating it to a new place. Member Mead also asked Cheryl to speak on the stacking capability of the new stop light, how many vehicles there might be available for that on their site leaving the site. Cheryl stated the KCRC makes sure Burton and Kraft work right and then the YMCA get the tail end of the people waiting to turn out. The KCRC's goal is to keep traffic moving on Burton and Kraft and if people are having to wait a little longer to turn right or left out of the YMCA then that's how they set the timing for the light. They'll work this with the Kraft and 28th Street light to keep traffic moving smoothly on the road. Member Sperla stated it looked like most of the parking was in the back (west) of the site. Pete LaMourie, of Progressive AE, who did the impact study stated when doing distribution of site traffic, we do base it on how the site is laid out and where parking lots are laid out relative to the access points. He believes most of the parking traffic will use that driveway opposite Burton Point. But at the same time, there will be a pretty good percentage of that traffic that will want to go out to Kraft and Burton to the south and to the east. We feel that the internal circulation around there will be used quite a bit for those folks who want to go in those directions even though the parking is more towards the other side. They feel it will be a pretty good split with the amount that's distributed during the peak hours. The overall design of that area at the signalized Burton and Kraft intersection will make sure that the storage the YMCA has in their driveway (which they don't expect to be much) will not be stacked up. It will be designed, both the YMCA's driveway and the peak hour signal timing to reduce any kind of queuing issues there. Either way the standards they used for the impact study for the level of service and the ratings from a-f on how that's rated and how we run it through the model indicate that those intersections and the driveway intersection will operate well within the acceptable levels during the peak hours. Looking at the plan there's about 150 feet between the Burton Point intersection and the first drive into the YMCA's parking lots. Pete LaMourie stated they try to have a pretty good distance between the exit points and the first internal cross access in order to have room for left turns. Member Mead asked Pete LaMourie as far as a Burton Point typical day exiting versus the hours of operation for the YMCA do you see a direct conflict? Pete LaMourie stated that may be the case in the mornings, but Burton Point is a fairly small development. The volumes they counted going out of there were relatively low. There will be times when the volumes coming out of Burton Point will be occurring at the same time as the volumes coming in and out of the site, but the volumes are low enough that analysis indicates that the levels of service will be well within acceptable levels. Member Mead asked if the YMCA entrance would mimic that of Burton Point in its width. Pete LaMourie stated it probably wouldn't. Burton Point has a boulevard. Pete LaMourie worked with KCRC on finding the most appropriate

location to make sure conflicts are minimized when turning left out in and out of there.

Member Rissi stated on the east side they have “east retention basin” immediately left of that there’s another marked “retention basin” and then to the north of that there’s an empty area. Is that just assumed it will be another basin? Are there three there or two? Cheryl Scales stated there are three, but the two that are right across from each other have an equalizing culvert between them so they act as one. The other little one is a wetland which they are trying to get irrigation going there and to pick up the tiny bit of water which is coming from the sloping road to a low point so that we can be sure we’re getting everything from the site. When these basins overflow they will go into the culvert which goes under the road. Cheryl Scales worked with the DEQ to make sure the site keeps the water going into them to keep the wetlands. The DEQ may end up restricting that, but it’s up to them to decide what the YMCA would need to do with that site. The KCRC has free flow there right now so they can’t restrict that. Member Williams spoke to Mr. Nelson and stated that in many of the YMCA’s a big component is regular childcare and you talked about a drop-off for participants children. Will you have childcare there too? This is not designed for full-day childcare. We have that available at this branch at the Porter Hills Presbyterian Village. He stated that in their studies there seems to be quite a lot development along Cascade Road dealing with childcare so we didn’t feel the need to service that ourselves.

Motion by Member Sperla. Support by Member Hammond to open the public hearing. Motion passed. 9-0.

Chairman Pennington asked for any members in the audience wishing to speak on this matter to approach the podium and give your name and address and please restrict your comments to five minutes or less, don’t restate what others have stated.

Paul Bajema, 5349 Burton Court SE, related concerns he has with the traffic be MVP, YMCA and Burton Point. He would like to see a road put in between MVP and the YMCA instead of forcing all that traffic out onto Burton and all the way around when you can easily have an exit there? With the YMCA exit it will be very difficult for him to get in and out of his property. He would like to have short acceleration/deceleration lanes on his side of the road like they have on the other side of the road. At the end of their divided area would it be possible to put in a gate at that point so that we don’t have heavy traffic flowing directly out of here and up out the other exit?

Robert Upton, 1407 Laurel Avenue, wants to go on record as stating this is just an incredible project for Cascade Township. Having worked in municipal government for over 23 years he's sat in hundreds of public hearings and planning commission meetings. He feels the applicant has done a tremendous job of putting together and presenting this. He feels this is a world class project. He wants the Planning Commission to approve this project because it will benefit the children of this community, the seniors of this community. It will be a tremendous enhancement to the area. Ron Nelson is one of the best directors of the country right in our own community. He has worked with Cheryl Scales in the past and found her to be an outstanding engineer. He would also would like to commend the chair and all the commissioners in considering this project and reviewing all the details of this project and making sure the area has a world class facility. He urges the commissioners to speedily approve this project so it can get going and benefit the citizens of this community and the entire Grand Rapids Metropolitan area.

H.M. Busse', 6631 Waybridge SE, I would like to say I am in support of the YMCA, that the Township has always endeavored to present an outstanding communal organization. You have proven that to me by having excellent parks, by having excellent ways to get about. I am a tri-athlete and I enjoy the paths. I cannot think of any better usage of the land that offers itself at Burton and Kraft then putting together a YMCA which has an outstanding reputation for decades. The fact that it is being built in Cascade Township and not Grand Rapids Township tells me that your are concerned about putting together a Township that the people who live here can not only enjoy but be proud of. The BBQ issue does not enhance the Township, you should have put it indoors. I again, cannot think of a better usage of the land than a YMCA and I encourage you to vote on your part to approve this speedily.

Lee Pool, 4879 N. Quail Crest Drive SE, asked if there were copies of the sight plan that he could report back to the Quail Crest Condo Association. I share with the gentleman from Burton Pointe. When is an entrance to the south by Meijer going to be available? Shouldn't there be an entrance to Meijer's to make it easier for traffic control. There is room for it. It may require an easement. It may reduce a little of the traffic on Kraft. Is this a three lane or two lane. Is there a left turn lane for those exiting? Cheryl Scales stated that the road is a three lane road at the intersection that merges down to a two lane. There is a left turn lane at the light as well. Are the deceleration lanes long enough for the cars to truly decelerate in time? Ron Nelson stated they would be according to Road Commission rules. My main concern is safety for the drivers and the residents who live in the area. These are essentially residential streets and they are functionally two lane roads. With those recommendations, I would be

satisfied with this. I would suggest you modify your requirements to insure the safety of Cascade residents.

Paula Rowland, 2519 Rivers Edge Drive, I think that welcoming the YMCA to the Township is absolutely wonderful, but I think the location is absolutely wrong. This is one of the most difficult roads in the entire Township. I have been on Burton where traffic has been backed up from Spaulding to Kraft. Also, I would like to remind you that in the mid 80's, shortly after Meijer's was put in, the Township made a commitment to the residents on Kraft that this would stay a residential street and area past the last entrance into the Meijer's property. This is not a residential development.

Cynthia Cooper, 6944 Oakbrook Street SE, I am here to generally support the YMCA. I may even become a member. I think it's a good opportunity for our residents. I want to talk about storm water drainage. I appreciate that the project has made some effort to go above and beyond the Ordinance requirements but I would pose to you that this is not sufficient. There is an assumption that Schoolhouse Creek can handle any more water. Even after a 100 year retention basin has been built. I would pose to you that that is not possible. This is what Schoolhouse Creek looked like two years ago. This picture is when the water was actually two feet lower than its highest peak. The water was overflowing the bridge and the bridge fell down and the roadway was washed out. I believe this was talked about as a 100 year rain. Schoolhouse Creek cannot handle any additional water. It cost \$20,000 for the new bridge. I would like those retention ponds to be deeper to handle more than a 100 year rain. We, as residents, cannot sustain damage like this again.

Gregory Mott, 2377 Bob White Court SE, my backdoor is about 100 yards from Burton so I am very in tune to what's going on with the traffic. If the Road Commission did a traffic study, it must have been done at night under disguise because there have been no traffic control counters on Burton in the last year. Traffic does back up at that intersection. I believe we need a light at that intersection for safety. It caught my attention that you are running busses to the YMCA and that is going to add more noise. I would expect that there would be some type of berm or a buffer wall to protect us or our property values are going to tank. Also, this is zoned R1 residential, how much tax base are you losing by selling this property to a non-profit rather than a developer who could build houses there.

Joe Borowsky, 1980 Deerfield Ct. SE, my comment is to support to other gentleman that stated that an additional exit would be welcomes. If a traffic study was done did they look at the light at Spaulding and Burton did they look at a light right at the entrance? Maybe that would preclude the necessity for a

light at Burton/Spaulding. One thing that happens on Burton is that it has a slight rise and a curve and people build up speed and this could be really dangerous.

Lori Streeter, 2645 Knightsbridge Drive SE, stated that an exit across MVP was mentioned. I would ask that you not consider this. We already have a hard time getting out of our development when soccer games let out. We can wait 7-10 minutes to get out of the development. That exit is also used as a Meijer entrance too. Now we have the street that comes from Goodwill and we can wait forever to get out. I appreciate the traffic studies being done by the Y but I think you need to take it up Kraft a little ways past Meijer and see how the traffic flows.

Lawrence Halfen, 2487 Candlewick Court, this means my backyard and patio abuts Kraft. I have created a yard that is an open woods in an effort to promote a certain diversity of wildlife and plant life. When you are driving down the street it is pretty obvious where the brush stops and where the open woods are. I have watched this tonight and I understand developing an ownership interest in a property you have the right to develop in a reasonable fashion and to expect a return on the utility that the property represents. To that end, I am not against the YMCA and I want that heard right at the first. Some of the comments about water budget and runoff. There is a substantial emergent wetlands across from this project. A rather substantial one that if we measured it, I am not sure if anyone in the technical group here has measured as it may be a federal jurisdictional wetlands. In addition surrounding it is a wet woods. That particular area will have to be maintained or sustained or you're going to lose it. The same thing applies in terms of the wetlands you have parallel to the Burton area on the frontage of the property, there may be introduction of more water there or fluctuation of water there. Having practiced environmental biology for 36 years, I know that fluctuating water levels in a wetlands for convenience of water management may lead you in a direction where you decimate the plants that were there that rely on a certain level of hydration to be there to successfully exist and reproduce. We have a number of basins that are being created on this property. I have heard the term infiltration or retention type basins. There is a word that has to be incorporated into the management of these basis and that is succession. Pioneer plants that will come in there. Look at Turnberry and the plants that have taken over the area. What concerns me is that as you look at your management plan for storm water system make sure that there are provisions in the plan to grub out the ponds to remove leaves and brush so that the drains get occluded and the system does not work properly. That has to be part of your plan. That is an O & M expense that is typically overlooked. My last point is that in our experience of living on the west side of Candlewick and sitting out on our deck in the evening and listening to all of the excitement coming from the fields across the street, we feel like we are

participants sometimes. We understand that, young people being exuberant and healthy. We are very concerned about the situation, and it has happened, where someone decides that they want to throw a party over there and they have a sound system brought in that rattles the windows. This noise does not stop at 10PM. If we were to look at a Township Ordinance for controlling sound such as that at a reasonable time, will we get any help from the Township? Chairman Pennington stated that the Township already has a Noise Ordinance.

Angela Johnson, 6227 Patagonia Drive stated that she is very excited about the project. My question is about membership costs and if it is going to be affordable in comparison to MVP.

Nancy Ayres, 3801 Oak Tree in Cascade Township. She is the current Board Chair of the Southeast Y. She, obviously, wants you to approve this project. She wants to stress the fact that the Y prides itself on being good neighbors in the communities in which we exist. Her board has reserved a spot for a neighborhood member wherever this Y ends up; and she certainly hopes it's here at this location. They want to be good neighbors and will work to that end.

Roger Kraft, 2485 Kraft Street. Originally, this road was going to be turned into five lanes. Are there any plans to turn it to five lanes? Chairman Pennington stated there were no plans to turn it into five lanes. Roger Kraft's other concern was that the speed is 45 going into the curve and 35 coming out of the curve. Could the speed limit be changed here? Chairman Pennington stated the KCRC and the State Police regulate speed limits. Roger also asked about the seven houses going down Kraft Street. Is that going to stay residential? In talking with Cheryl Scales he discussed the fact that he cannot see around the curve or the traffic light from his driveway because there are so many trees. Cheryl Scales told him that they Y would be cooperative and move some of those trees so that he gets a better line of sight. It's pretty dangerous for him because he has to turn out on the street and then see if there's anything coming. Cheryl Scales also told him that the Y would be adding more trees to provide shade from the light and noise from the Y. Roger inquired as to whether or not alcoholic beverages would be served on the premises. Again the commissioners could not answer that because they are not the owners. Member Sperla stated he was not aware of any YMCA locations that had a liquor license.

Gary Rowland, 2519 River Edge Drive, stated that he keeps looking at this plan and this has got to be the largest YMCA facility in the whole of the United States. I believe that to be true. There are plenty of spaces available out by the airport to plan it in an area where you are going to be putting so much more traffic where it is planned is ludicrous. The Y is a fine institution. There are better locations than the one that they have picked. Obviously, that will be your

decision than going to the Township Board. As far as the tax implications are concerned, we all know that it will absolutely unequivocally have a tax impact on the properties located within a half mile of this facility. Now that is not just the end of it because you are going to end up wanting revenue neutral. So if the values go down the taxes have to go up to compensate for the lower income. Which means our taxes are going up because the Y has moved in to this particular area. I would request that the board take a look at a facility or property more in keeping the residential areas residential. Put it out by the airport where it has a lot more capability of handling the traffic. That would be a win, win.

Motion by Member Lewis. Support by Member Mead to close the public hearing. Motion passed. 9-0.

Member Mead asked Planner Peterson how many residents Turnberry was currently approved for. Planner Peterson stated 106 residents. Member Mead asked in a typical traffic count, how many trips per resident is typical? 8? Planner Peterson stated that for a typical single family home it is 10 so it is a little bit less so around 8. Member Mead stated that would be over 1,000 vehicle trips per day if just that portion were to be developed in its current capacity.

Member Lewis wanted to thank everyone for being here and sharing your thoughts. I am always impressed at how polite people are when inside they are probably jumping up and down. I am going to make it easy, I am going to support the vote for the YMCA. That's the easy part. The hard part is looking at some people and explaining why I am going to do it. I have a procedure that I use just about every time I vote on the Planning Commission or the Township Board. The first I look at is does it fit the Township Ordinance and Master Plan. What you have heard tonight from the experts is that this does fit the Township Ordinance and the Master Plan without any close calls it stands by itself. What we didn't talk about was some of the professional people that have looked at it and given it their approval. For instance, the Fire Chief, the Planner, the lawyers and the engineers have all looked at it and it fits what we should be looking for. The second thing I make an observation of before I vote is, how it fits into the total township and this fits really positively into the Township. We've taken an eyesore and turned it into something very, very positive that we can all be proud of doing. And in doing that it help the entire township. I understand that for some people it may cause some traffic difficulties, some inconveniences, but I would only ask you to recognize that there are other places in the Township that we go through the same thing and get the traffic or they get the build-up and

you benefit from it. I wish there was a way to make everyone happy, but there isn't. The point I am making is that I feel that this project with the Y is something that the Township needs to help bring people into Cascade Township and to send a message to other businesses, corporations and restaurants that Cascade is open for business. That we want to welcome as many people as we can to improve the financial status of our Township and we are proud of it. I am so proud I am going to vote yes.

Member Sperla stated that he is very much in favor of the Y, it's a great asset. As a former Board Member of the Downtown Y for over 25 years and it's an excellent organization and I would really like to have it at this location. My only concern is what is going on with Schoolhouse Creek. Cindy is a one of my neighbors and she explained what happened last year. A lot of that preceded this project. Despite some of the exchanges I have had on this project, I don't want anyone to think I am adverse to this project if we can work thru the issues in regards to drainage and the storm water that has caused a lot of problems for Schoolhouse Creek and anyone that lives that lives along that outlet. A lot of the storm water drainage that is coming off of the commercial businesses along 28th Street and Cascade Road has been discharged into Schoolhouse Creek. Over a period of 25 to 30 years that I have lived there it has become a very uncomfortable, damaging situation that just cannot continue to occur. Again, I think a lot of that proceeds this project. Even though I am very supportive of the project, I am going to abstain from voting in favor of it tonight until I see all the pieces. The maintenance agreement for example, I have seen other projects where the maintenance agreement covers not only the immediate site but off site considerations. I think that is a big issue for people that are in my neighborhood. So, even though I am a big supporter of the Y, I have seen it support a lot of underprivileged kids, it's a healthy community asset for us and I think it could go a long way towards making this a better place to live. I agree with Member Lewis that this will make Cascade a better place to live. As far as location, its right next to MVP. You have the biggest commercial operation in the Township with Meijer's and MVP is a transitional use, this is somewhat of a transitional use. It has minimal impact on the existing residential neighborhoods. I think it has made some pretty good moves to try to satisfy the drainage issues on Schoolhouse Creek and some of the challenges that present themselves with the driveways. I think the Y has gone a long ways and I have been impressed with how flexible they are. I can attest first hand to all the good things that they have done in the area. They will do a lot for the kids and it is a positive activity that they will bring to this area of the Township and I look forward to them being here.

Member Mead stated that he supports Member Lewis that it is a great sign that Cascade is open for business but it also is a sign that we have created a place

that is a great benefit for the residents. Having 13 years' experience as a tax assessor, a lot of time non-profits create a center and they do improve value more so than on the negative side of things. I think this as a whole will improve the immediate area of value. A very attractive proposed project. One thing I would like to see is the flare lane coming from the west approaching the driveway, it would be nice to see that extended in anticipation of a future light at Spaulding. So that if that light is put in and anyone going thru the intersection would have a separate lane to improve traffic flow at that time. I would encourage the developer to do that now realizing it is an additional cost. With that said, I would be in favor of this project.

Member Williams stated that she has been impressed by all the information that has been provided. I think its real positive for the community for tiny little babies to the elderly. People with limitations are accounted for as well. I think it could create a center for people to go to and interact with their neighbors especially with some of the winter's we've had where you don't see your neighbors for months at a time. I just think it is really positive for the community and I am very glad they have considered Cascade Township.

Member Waalkes stated that the project is meeting all the Ordinances, we are creating a new PUD out of the existing Turnberry Ordinance. As far as traffic, Member Mead pointed out the trips per day and that eastern half of the current property, if we approved it upwards of 800 trips per day and on a busy Saturday during soccer season it may be that high. I would think that the traffic wouldn't be every day and it would be spread out thru more of the peak times and throughout the rest of the day. It meets our Storm Water Ordinance. Whether or not it is increasing the amount of water that is ending up in Schoolhouse Creek today or not a property owner had the right to develop their property in accordance with the Ordinances that are in effect and that is what is in effect. They are actually doing more than what our Storm Water Ordinance requires. As far as traffic in general the experts have studied the roads and the Road Commission will not put in lights in anticipation of potential trips that may occur. After the fact if traffic poses an issue, I am sure the Road Commission will act and come up with solutions to alleviate the problems. We can anticipate and design for what we do know but we cannot anticipate for things that may or may not come.

Member Waalkes made a motion to approve the preliminary plan as presented to us so that we may move forward with drafting the PUD Ordinance and then forwarding it to the Township Board. Support by Member Lewis. Motion carried 8-0. Member Sperla abstained from the vote.

ARTICLE 7. Any other business

There was no other business.

Article 8. Adjournment

Member Waalkes made a motion to adjourn. Member Mead supported. Motion carried unanimously 9-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Steve Waalkes, Secretary
Ann T. Seykora & Debra W. Groendyk, Planning Administrative Assistant