

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday, February 1, 2021  
7:00 P.M.  
Virtual Zoom Meeting

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Rissi called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
Members Present: Johnson, Katsma, Slater, Rapin, Deering, Rissi, Krieter, Moxley, and Noordyke  
Members Absent:  
Others Present: Community Development Director Steve Peterson and Planner Brian Hilbrands

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.**

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.**

**Motion was made by Member Johnson to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Rapin. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the January 18, 2021 meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Katsma to approve the minutes of January 18, 2021. Supported by Member Deering with one typo correction from “wo” to “two”. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

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

None wish to speak.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #21-3619/Krause, Brad**

**Public Hearing**

**Property Address:** 2439 Sturbridge Dr.

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting a special use permit to construct an accessory building larger than 832 square feet.

Planner Brian Hilbrands stated that building is 32x48 with a small covered porch, it totals approximately 1,728 square feet, and has a height of 17 feet, 7 inches measured to the midpoint of the roof. Planner Hilbrands stated that this height requires a setback of 40 feet on both the side and rear property lines, and that the applicant does show a 40-foot setback from both property lines. The building will also have to be at least 10 feet from the home as well.

Planner Hilbrands states that the property is over six acres, so the applicant is allowed to have up to three accessory buildings, this will be the third building on the property. Planner Hilbrands stated that applicant has said the building will be used for storage, and that the building is normal in size and appearance for the area.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant does meet the standards for an accessory building, and Staff is recommending approval of the special use permit with the conditions that the building is not used for living space or to run a business, and that any outdoor lighting meet Township regulations.

Member Slater asked what the second building was as she cannot see it on the plan, Planner Hilbrands stated that it is not shown, but that there is a building by the pool, and a treehouse that also qualifies an accessory building. This proposed building will be the third accessory building on the property.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Krause stated that everything was presented correctly, and is measured and staked already. Mr. Krause stated that Planner Hilbrands visited the site, and that Staff has been helpful in this process.

**Motion was made by Member Rapin to enter into Public Hearing. Supported by Member Slater. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

Chairman Rissi asked Planner Hilbrands if there was any comment submitted by neighbors, Planner Hilbrands stated there was not.

**Motion was made by Member Johnson to close Public Hearing. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

A hand was raised to speak as public comment was closing, Chairman Rissi allowed comment.

Mr. AJ Lytle (2487 Sturbridge Dr.) stated that he lives next door to the applicant, and wanted to state that the applicant did reach out all neighbors on the cul-de-sac about his plans and that he believes all are in favor of it.

**Motion was made by Member Katsma to approve the Special Use Permit of Case #21-3619 as recommended by Staff with the two stipulations that any outdoor lighting must meet Township regulations, and that it may not be used as living space or to run a business out of. Supported by Member Krieter. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**Article 7.**

**Case #21-3620/MedBio**

**Property Address:** 3677 Sysco Ct.

**Requested Action:** The applicant is requesting a Site Plan Review to allow for a 21,000 square foot addition to the existing building.

Director Peterson stated that the addition will be just over 21,000 square feet, and that MedBio also owns the adjacent piece property to the north. This is located in the industrial zoning district, and is about 4 acres in size. Director Peterson stated that MedBio has designed the addition to meet all Township setback requirements.

Director Peterson states that this site is required to have a total of 44 parking spaces, and that there is a total of 53 shown on the plan. 22 of these spaces are deferred, and Director Peterson states that this has been done before if the company feels the additional spaces will not be needed. The spaces would need to be built if the applicant feels they need them, or if people begin to park illegally and/or in the buffer yard areas.

Director Peterson states that the area designed for the addition (including parking & stormwater system) has been designed to meet all Engineering requirements. If MedBio wishes to build the additional parking spaces in the future, Director Peterson states that they will need to get (at a minimum) an Administrative Site Plan Approval, which is a Staff level approval.

Director Peterson states that there is no new access to the site, so the Road Commission did not need to review this plan; the Fire Department did review and suggest minor changes that have been incorporated into the site plan. The storm sewer system is an underground detention system, Director Peterson states there are others similar. Director Peterson stated that the airport did make comments and suggestions in regards to landscape and lighting, and the applicant has indicated they will work with the airport on these. Director Peterson stated that their lighting plan does meet Township light level standards, and suggests a landscape bond on \$5,000.

Director Peterson stated that Staff is recommending approval of the Site Plan for the addition with the requirements that a landscape bond be submitted, and the stormwater agreement be executed.

Member Rapin asked if the stormwater detention is adequately sized for the deferred parking spots if they are added in the future, Director Peterson stated that it is the correct size for any added deferred parking spaces. Member Rapin asked if requiring previously deferred parking spaces be built has been an issue in the past, Director Peterson stated that it has not been a problem.

Chairman Rissi asked if the existing loading dock will stay in place as it looks like trucks may have a problem backing into it, and if that is a concern of Staff. Director Peterson stated that was not a concern from Staffs perspective, and that the applicant may have more details.

Chairman Rissi invited the Applicant to come forward with comment.

Mr. James Lewis stated that the truck dock is intended to be kept as is, and that MedBio is excited to be expanding.

Member Noordyke asked the applicant if MedBio would be open to putting parking in now if they are intending to add it in the future. Mr. Lewis stated that the buildings on site have very few staff members, and that occupancy isn't expected to rise much because of the expansion. Mr. Lewis expects parking space demand to remain very low.

Chairman Rissi asked if MedBio plans on consolidating their other locations to this building, Mr. Lewis stated that they are not, this is just an expansion of this location.

Member Katsma states that he is in favor of deferred parking as long as there is nothing put into that space that cannot be easily removed.

Member Moxley asked for confirmation that the stormwater detention area is correctly sized now for possible future parking spaces.

**Motion was made by Member Rapin to approve the Site Plan Review of Case #21-3620 with the conditions outlined by Staff. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 8. Any Other Business**

Director Peterson stated that the next Meeting will be held as scheduled.

Chairman Rissi asked if there is a specific person who should be facilitating a “roll call” vote when one is needed. Director Peterson stated that there is not a standard for this, however Staff has historically facilitated this vote.

Member Katsma asked when a roll call vote should be used. Director Peterson stated that a roll call vote should be used when voting on resolution, or if a vote is expected to be close. Director Peterson stated that anyone can ask or suggest that a roll call vote be used.

**ARTICLE 9. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Johnson to adjourn. Supported by Member Moxley. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Katsma, Secretary