

MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, April 19, 2021
7:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting

ARTICLE 1. Chairman Rissi called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.
Members Present: Johnson, Katsma, Noordhoek, Noordyke, Rissi, Moxley,
Deering, Rapin, and new Member Windy Korstange
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Planner Brian Hilbrands

ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Katsma. Motion carried 9 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the March 1, 2021 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Katsma to approve the minutes of March 1, 2021 as written. Supported by Member Deering. 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 #21-3625/Randall Burri Builder
Public Hearing**

Property Address: 4670 Quiggle Ave SE

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

Planner Hilbrands states that the building will be 36 x 48 feet, for a total of 1,728 square feet, with a height of 14 feet as measure to the midpoint of the roof. Planner Hilbrands states that this height requires a setback of 10 feet to the side yard, 25 feet to the rear yard, and 10 feet from the house. The applicant is showing that the building will be 12 feet from the side yard, and well over 100 feet from the rear property line.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the property is between 3-6 acres, so the applicant is allowed to have 2 accessory buildings; this will be their first. The applicant has indicated they will use the building for storage of recreational equipment. Planner Hilbrands stated that the building is normal in size and appearance for the area, and the applicant appears to meet all standards for an accessory building.

Planner Hilbrands stated that Staff is recommending approval of the special use permit with the conditions that the building cannot be used for living space or to run a business out of, and that any outdoor lighting meet Township regulations.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment; the applicant did not comment.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to open public hearing. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Chairman Rissi asked Planner Hilbrands if there was any comment made to the Township Office regarding this case. Planner Hilbrands stated there was not.

There was no public comment.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to close public hearing. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the special use permit with the conditions listed by Staff. Supported by Member Johnson. Motion carried 9 to 0.

**ARTICLE 7. Case #21-3631/Bigger, Cory & Karla
Public Hearing**

Property Address: 4983 Clear Ridge Dr SE

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

Planner Hilbrands stated that this building will be 30 x 40 feet, for a total of 1,200 square feet, with a height of 14 feet, 10 inches tall measured to the midpoint of the roof. This height requires a 40-foot setback to both the rear and side property lines, and 10 feet to the house. Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant is showing 45 feet to the rear, and 49 feet to the closest side property line.

Planner Hilbrands states that this property is under 3 acres, so the applicant is allowed to have one accessory building; this will be their first. The applicant has indicated they plan to use the building for storage of household items and lawn equipment. Planner Hilbrands stated that the building is normal in size and appearance for the area, and the applicant appears to meet all standards for an accessory building.

Planner Hilbrands stated that Staff is recommending approval of the special use permit with the conditions that the building cannot be used for living space or to run a business out of, and that any outdoor lighting meet Township regulations.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment; the applicant did not comment.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to open public hearing. Supported by Member Rapin. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Chairman Rissi asked Planner Hilbrands if there was any comment made to the Township Office regarding this case. Planner Hilbrands stated there was not.

There was no public comment.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to close public hearing. Supported by Member Rapin. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the special use permit with the conditions listed by Staff. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 9 to 0.

ARTICLE 8. Case #21-3629/Morse, Bob

Property Address: 6390 & 6420 28th St SE

Requested Action: Basic Plan Review for an amendment to the PUD to accommodate a new car wash.

Planner Hilbrands stated that this is intended to be an introduction to the plan in which the applicant is proposing construction of a new car wash and a drive thru coffee shop on the same parcel. Planner Hilbrands stated that property is currently two parcels that that applicant is proposing to combine, and an abandoned right of way located in between the two parcels. Planner Hilbrands stated the abandoned Pizza Hut located on the western parcel is zoned PUD 80, and the motel on the eastern parcel is zoned B2. The applicant is requesting that the PUD be amended to include the new combined parcel, and car wash.

Planner Hilbrands stated that PUD 80 currently includes an existing Culvers, Macatawa Bank, and a 61-unit apartment complex. The applicant is proposing an approximate 5,200 square foot building to house the car wash, and an approximate 600 square foot drive through only coffee shop on the same parcel. Planner Hilbrands stated that he communicated to the applicant that he believes the coffee shop should be removed from the plan since the zoning ordinance only permits one primary building or use per parcel, however the applicant has elected to keep the coffee shop as part of their submittal. Planner Hilbrands stated that the car wash will be considered to be the primary use for the building on the parcel, so the coffee shop would be adding a second primary use which the zoning ordinance does not permit.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant still needs to submit a full civil plan set including utility and stormwater information. Those will need to be submitted and reviewed by Township Engineers to ensure they meet Township stormwater requirements. Planner Hilbrands stated that a landscape plan also needs to be submitted, and the photometric plan that was submitted will need to be revised as illumination levels were over what is allowed in the Township.

Planner Hilbrands stated the applicant is planning to remove one curb cut along 28th Street, and will then realign the remaining curb cut with the one across 28th Street. The applicant will need to show documentation from the Kent County Road Commission approving the curb cut change. Planner Hilbrands states that the applicant is proposing to make the existing drive that allows access to the parcel from the southeast a one-way drive, Staff recommends it stay a two-way drive to promote better cross access between properties.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant still needs to complete the process to vacate the abandoned right of way between the two parcels, and this is important because if the application is denied it would change the whole site plan. The Township Board and Road Commission will need to approve this before the preliminary plan review for the applicant.

In his Staff report, Planner Hilbrands provided other recommendations for information the applicant should submit before proceeding to a public hearing. Planner Hilbrands stated that the point of tonight's meeting is to be an introduction phase to the project, and to answer any questions.

Chairman Rissi asked if Members had any questions at this time.

Member Noorddyke asked if there was anything that would preclude approving both the car wash and coffee shop since the applicant will be combining two parcels. Planner Hilbrands states that the ordinance does state there can only be one building or principal use per parcel.

Chairman Rissi asked if the coffee shop could be on its own parcel. Planner Hilbrands stated that it could, but the car wash wouldn't fit how the applicant wanted it to on just one parcel, so combining the two gave them more room for the car wash.

Member Noorddyke asked what process the applicant would need to follow in order to get approval for the two buildings on the combined parcel.

Chairman Rissi asked if the parcel/lot line could be drawn on the west side of the coffee shop where the proposed vacuums are to establish two parcels, or if there are other contributing factors to that not being possible. Planner Hilbrands stated that the buffer yard and setbacks would need to be met, there would not be enough parking spaces per parking requirements as shown at this time, and the B2 zoning requires a three-acre minimum parcel, with this one being just above two acres. Chairman Rissi asked as the parcels sit now, would it be feasible for a car wash to be built on one, and coffee shop to be built on the other one if they were able to fit within the boundaries. Planner Hilbrands stated that would be possible.

Member Noordhoek asked if the proposed driveway cut would need to change if the parcels were kept separate, Planner Hilbrands stated they would need to change. Chairman Rissi asked if cross access would be possible, Planner Hilbrands confirmed that it would be possible.

Chairman Rissi asked if the proposed 5 vacuums would need to be removed from the plan if the parcels were kept separate and both built on, Planner Hilbrands stated that vacuums need a 50-foot setback, so those would likely need to be taken out.

Member Noordhoek stated that he believes this plan is jammed in too tight, and believes there would be backups with too many cars in line at both the car wash and drive through only coffee shop.

Member Rapin asked since technically this PUD is not allowed a curb cut onto 28th Street, is it being allowed because the applicant is reducing from two to one. Planner Hilbrands stated that the Pizza Hut property (where the car wash would go) is not permitted its own curb cut, and uses the access drive on the west side. The motel property (where the car wash will go) is allowed a 28th Street curb cut.

Member Moxley agrees that the plan is too tight, and too dense for the amount of space there is.

Member Korstange asked if the noise level of the car wash/vacuums has been addressed. Planner Hilbrands stated that he has not heard of noise levels being addressed, but will look into the Township general ordinances for that.

Chairman Rissi asked if zoning for a car wash vacuum is the same in other parts of the Township, as he does not believe they are 50 feet from lot lines at two other locations. Planner Hilbrands stated there is a section in the zoning ordinances for auto repair shops, garages, and car washes where the 50-foot buffer is stated to be required.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Morgan stated that the applicant would be willing to draw a property line to have each building on its own parcel, however they would have setback issues as stated by Staff. Mr. Morgan stated that all of the information required by Staff is almost complete, and will be submitted soon.

Member Katsma asked why the applicant is choosing to put a one-way drive on the south side of the property. Mr. Morgan stated that the owner of the development to the south preferred this as he believes it will reduce the traffic flow through his development, the applicant does not have a preference of one-way vs. two.

Member Rapin asked if the aforementioned one-way entrance flow of traffic to the north will be an issue with the traffic flow heading south. Mr. Morgan stated there is also a north "through" drive next to The Electric Cheetah building to help ease congestion.

Chairman Rissi asked if there will be a cross flow agreement with The Electric Cheetah. Mr. Morgan stated that he is unsure as The Electric Cheetah has their own curb cut.

Mr. Bob Morse (applicant) stated that a lot of the Tommy's car wash buildings are set up to operate on one acre of land, so he believes this location will be laid out very well

(even with the coffee shop) with 2.1 acres of space, and that the ingress and egress of vehicles should be smooth.

Member Katsma asked if the proposed coffee shop will be 100% drive through, Mr. Morse stated that is correct.

Member Noordhoek asked about the amount of space from the exit of the car wash to where people are vacuuming their vehicles directly across from the car wash exit, and is concerned the space will get backed up. Mr. Morse stated that during busier times, they have physically put traffic cones in place to force exiting vehicles in one direction. Mr. Morgan stated that the 38-foot space in between the exit and the vacuums will be clear, as people pull forward into the vacuum area leaving the 38-foot space behind them. The available space to vacuum vehicles is 18 feet.

Nicole Howell (Tommy Car Wash) stated that there is room for 31 vehicles to be “stacked” at a time waiting to get into the wash, and the wash itself can process 208 vehicles in one hour.

Chairman Rissi asked if there was any member of the public wishing to speak. There was no comment.

Planner Hilbrands stated that he would like clarification on whether or not the coffee shop should be included in the next plan approval as he heard comments both for and against it.

Member Johnson stated that as the zoning ordinance does not allow the coffee shop to be on the parcel, he wonders if the appropriate course of action should be to get a variance from the Zoning Board. Planner Hilbrands states that since it's a PUD, he believes it may be able to be included in the approval, but stated that he will have to check further into that. Member Johnson asked that Planner Hilbrands brings that information to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Member Noordhoek stated that he is concerned about the congestion of traffic, and would like to see either the coffee shop or car wash removed.

Member Moxley agreed with Member Noordhoek.

Planner Hilbrands stated that setting a precedent is important, and would expect any new development to meet current standards.

Member Johnson asks if Planner Hilbrands can do some research into a statement that the applicant made indicating there are existing PUDs with multiple use buildings on them. Chairman Rissi stated that would be a good idea, and also believes that parcel size should be included. Planner Hilbrands stated that he will provide a memo for these requests.

Member Noorddyke stated that since this was originally two parcels combined into one, and that the uses are inline with what happening in the geographic area, he is inclined to have the coffee drive through stay on the plan. Member Noorddyke also states that

the applicant should be aware that multiple Planning Commissioners believe the space to be too dense for both businesses, and be prepared to show additional plans and studies showing how they will make it work.

Chairman Rissi asked if the current Pizza Hut building is in a PUD. Planner Hilbrands stated that it is, and that the motel building is on its own parcel. Chairman Rissi asked for clarification of that parcel being under three acres as it sits right now, Planner Hilbrands confirmed and stated that it is just over two acres.

ARTICLE 9. Case #21-3632/Gole Dental Properties

Property Address: 3636 Kraft Ave SE

Requested Action: Basic Plan Review for an amendment to the PUD Ordinance to accommodate a dental office in the existing building.

Planner Hilbrands stated that this is intended to be an introduction to this project as a basic plan review, and that the applicant is requesting PUD 49 be amended to include this new use. PUD 49 currently includes an existing single-family home being used as an office by Pension Concepts. The applicant is proposing to use the existing building to house the dental office, and is proposing some changes to the parking lot area as well. Planner Hilbrands stated that the current PUD ordinance language is very specific and states that the building will be used by Pension Concepts for their permitted use, so that language will need to be amended in order to allow for any other use.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant will need to provide an existing and proposed site plan indicating the net increase in impervious surface of the parking lot. The Township Engineer will need to review this for stormwater compliance. Planner Hilbrands states that proposed site plan should also indicate setback information for the property line and edge of the streets for the proposed sign, and should also show aisle and width information for the driveway and parking lot. Planner Hilbrands stated the applicant should also confirm any proposed changes to curb cuts, and include any comment the Kent County Road Commission has on that.

Planner Hilbrands stated the applicant will need to submit a landscaping plan, and a photometric site plan of any new exterior lighting being proposed. Planner Hilbrands states the applicant has indicated they will be connecting to sewer and water, so a Kent County Health Department approval should be submitted for that.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the next phase is to schedule a public hearing for a preliminary development plan review once the applicant provides the documents and information provided in the Staff report.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Phil Gole stated that he submitted a new site plan that includes a service drive and a trash disposal area on the south side of the building. This will be a straight access drive coming from the west.

Mr. Gole asked if there was objection by the Planning Commission to this site being used as a dental office as his closing on the property is contingent as it being used for dental use. Planner Hilbrands stated that as long as there is no discontent from the Commission or Staff, he does not see an issue with a dental office at that location. Chairman Rissi agrees with Planner Hilbrands. Member Rapin and Member Noordhoek also state their agreeance.

ARTICLE 10. Discuss and Consider Virtual or In-Person (Hybrid) Meetings

Planner Hilbrands stated that the Township now has the ability to hold in person hybrid meetings at the Wisner Center. Hybrid makes it possible for Board Members, Staff, and applicants to meet in person, but also gives the option of joining virtually via Zoom for those who are unable to attend in person. Planner Hilbrands stated that Kent County extended the emergency order to allow municipalities to continue virtual meetings until June 30th, so full virtual meetings are a possibility until then. Planner Hilbrands asked for input from the Planning Commission on how they would like to move forward.

Member Johnson asked if Members and those in attendance would have to wear masks through the entirety of the meeting, Planner Hilbrands stated that he is unsure of the answer to that at this time.

Member Noordhoek stated that during the most recent Township Board meeting, participants were able to not wear a mask while speaking.

Chairman Rissi asked if it was possible for Members to participate in a meeting via Zoom if they chose not to attend a meeting. Planner Hilbrands stated that he will ask Assistant Manager Fast that question and follow up with an answer.

Member Rapin asked if when the current emergency order extension expires, meetings will go back to full in person attendance at that time. Planner Hilbrands stated that's what it sounds like unless the order gets extended again.

Members held a discussion about meeting options, and decided that Staff will work towards being able to safely accommodate in person meetings going forward.

ARTICLE 11. Any other business

Member Deering asked about the status of Chick-Fil-A being built in the Township, Planner Hilbrands stated that last he heard from Economic Director Korhorn was that they do not have a timeline yet but still plan to build in the Township.

Member Deering asked about the pathway going in on Burton that will cross I96. Planner Hilbrands stated that he believes that to be a 2022 project, but will check into the status. Member Deering asked if this will be an addition to the existing bridge, or a new bridge. Planner Hilbrands stated that he believes it to be a separate pedestrian only bridge.

Member Moxley asked about the property on Cascade Road north of Burton that has construction machinery, equipment, and multiple vehicles parked/stored on a residential lot. Planner Hilbrands stated that he will check with Assistant Manager Fast on the progress of this complaint.

Chairman Rissi asked about the five-year plan of the Kent County Road Commission, and if it will be on a future agenda of the Planning Commission for Members to review. Planner Hilbrands stated that it can be added to a future agenda for review.

ARTICLE 12. Adjournment

Motion was made by Member Johnson to adjourn. Supported by Member Katsma. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Katsma, Secretary