

AGENDA
Cascade Charter Township Planning Commission
Monday, June 3, 2019
7:00 pm
Cascade Library Wisner Center
2870 Jacksmith Ave. SE

- ARTICLE 1. Call the meeting to order
Record the attendance**
- ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the flag**
- ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda**
- ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the May 20, 2019 meeting**
- ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non-agenda items.
(Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker.)**
- ARTICLE 6. Cascade Township
PUBLIC HEARING
Requested Action: Consider Recommendation to Township Board for Approval of
the Master Plan**
- ARTICLE 7. Any other business**
- ARTICLE 8. Adjournment**

Meeting Format

1. **Staff Presentation** *Staff report and recommendation*
2. **Project presentation-** *Applicant presentation and explanation of project*
 - a. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - i. **Open Public Hearing.** *Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker; exception may be granted by the chair for representative speakers and applicants*
 - ii. **Close public hearing**
3. **Commission discussion – May ask for clarification from applicant, staff or public**
4. **Commission decision - Options**
 - a. *Table the decision*
 - b. *Deny*
 - c. *Approve*
 - d. *Approve with conditions*
 - e. *Recommendation to Township Board*

MINUTES
Cascade Charter Township
Planning Commission
Monday, May 20, 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 Lewis to approve the Agenda. Supported by Member Pennington. Motion carried 9 to 0.

ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the May 13, 2019 meeting.

Motion was made by Member Johnson to approve the minutes of May 13, 2019. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0.

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

Mr. Kerry Gorsuch (3044 Thornapple River Drive) came forward to state that he lives at the bottom of the creek where the sediment sand from Roundhill and Thornapple Creek is drained to. Mr. Gorsuch stated that it deposits into the bayou where his boat lift is, and is filling up fast. Mr. Gorsuch did state that at draw down he does have to move as much sediment out of the way as possible in order to lower his boat lift to get his boat on it. He then stated that he feels it is a losing battle, and something more needs to be done to control the erosion better. Mr. Gorsuch then states that he has been in front of the Township Board regarding this mater as well.

Mr. Judd Rohde (3087 Thornapple River Drive) came forward to read a letter written by his father, Mark Rohde. The letter states that four years ago he conducted an analysis, code review, and presentation to the Planning Commission regarding the then proposed Roundhill PUD. Mark Rohde states that he has over four decades of experience as a Michigan registered civil engineer. Mr. Rohde states that at that time, there were two State of Michigan law violations in the design that should have prevented its approval, and that attorneys (including representation from Varnum) confirmed these violations in writing. He then states these illegalities were ignored with no response. Roundhill PUD was approved in spring of 2016. Mr. Rohde states that in July of 2017, his request from the Planning Department for a copy of the drawings was denied.

Mr. Rohde claims that Roundhill PUD made no requests for an Amended PUD as violations continued to be documented and sent to the Township in summer and late 2018, and that he had received no response from the Township regarding these violations. Mr. Rohde continues on to say that in the fall of 2018, there was a major breach of the Roundhill property line; sediment flowed onto adjacent properties, into the drains on Thornhills, and into the Thornapple River. The Kent County Road Commission called in Roundhills PUD soil erosion bond, stopped construction, and called in outside help to construct additional sediment barriers to prevent further problems with adjacent properties. Mr. Rohde states that Roundhill PUD does not yet have a soil erosion control plan, which would have prevented this problem. In the spring of 2019, a soil erosion bond was reissued with no amended PUD to the Roundhill PUD. Mr. Rohde continues on to state that the single home that has been built is larger than the approved footprint, and has a three-stall garage instead of the two-stall garage that was PUD approved.

Chairman Sperla interrupted to state that he believes this is related to the Agenda item, and to remind Mr. Rohde that visitor comments are limited to 5 minutes. Chairman Sperla states that he will let Mr. Rohde continue this time.

Mr. Judd Rohde continued to read the letter written by his father, Mark Rohde. Mr. Rohde states that he believes the Planning Commission has no fault in any of these violations, but is the source of the solution, and that they should act accordingly.

Mrs. Cherie Grunske (3056 Thornapple River Drive) came forward to express her concerns regarding the erosion coming from the raw dirt flowing into the bayou from the Roundhill property. She stated that when it rains, mud flows into the bayou, and then water from the river flows backwards and stands stagnant. Mrs. Grunske stated that she would like to see some sort of retaining wall built on the Roundhill property to keep the dirt and sand (mud) on the Roundhill property.

Chairman Sperla stated that municipal bodies do not have jurisdiction over a lake or stream, and that jurisdiction would fall with the Inland Lakes and Streams Act under the Department of Conservation, Department of Natural Resources, and Department of Environmental Quality, nor does the portion of road in question fall under the jurisdiction of Cascade Township.

Mr. Ron McCollum (6660 Old 28th St) came forward to express his concern that this project was approved for a condominium PUD, not site condominium project as it is now being built. Director Peterson clarified that the form of ownership is not what is regulated by the Planning Commission, but things like setbacks and the number and size of units are regulated. Director Peterson did state that Roundhills original presentation was as a condominium. Mr. McCollum again expressed his concern that this is turning from a condominium project into a subdivision. Chairman Sperla stated that it is not a specific structure that is approved, and that legally the structures can take different forms with different characteristics.

ARTICLE 6. Case #19-3527 Roundhill PUD Amendments- Sentenel Pointe

Public Hearing

Property Address: 3000 Thornhills

Requested Action: Amend the existing PUD to allow for decks for the single-family portion of the project to extend beyond the approved building envelope, but no closer than 25 feet from the rear property line.

Director Peterson stated that this is the original subdivision plan in the form of a condominium, which is why the building envelopes are identified. Building envelopes identify where buildings and structures can be built. Decks over 30 inches tall are defined as a building and structure, below 30 inches would be considered a patio, which is not regulated. Unit number 8 of Roundhill has been built on and they would like to add a deck, which has actually already been built. This is an after-the-fact enforcement proceeding, Director Peterson stated that the Township will certainly work with an Applicant as they are going through the process for a variance or approval. There has not been a permit issued yet for the deck. Upon submission for approval of the PUD, it was noticed that the deck itself goes beyond the building envelope. Roundhill would like to amend the project to allow for decks only to expand outside of the original building envelope, provided they are not any closer to the normal rear yard setback of 25 ft. Director Peterson stated that the buildings (homes) themselves would stay inside of the building envelope. If approval of this PUD Amendment is suggested, Director Peterson offered that a side yard setback of 10 ft (the normal minimum) be discussed as well.

If the PUD Amendment request is denied, the deck that has been built on Unit 8 will need to be removed, or reduced in size to fit within the approved building envelope.

Director Peterson stated that at the last meeting there was a packet given to the Planning Commission by the neighbors with a list of concerns, some of which have been addressed tonight, and they have also received a letter of support from a nearby person. He then stated that he would like to address bullet points of the large letter to clarify the Townships perspective on these issues.

The first point addressed is the claim there is no soil erosion plan in place. Director Peterson stated that that is untrue, and stated that when a meeting was held with the County Road Commission and Mr. Rohde, that specific question was asked of the County (who has the jurisdiction about soil erosion), and whether or not an active permit was in place. The County stated that everything Roundhill has filed with them is in order. Director Peterson reiterated that the soil erosion permit is where it is supposed to be with the County. Enforcement is up to the County.

The second point addressed is the claim that the PUD site development plan completely changed in construction. Director Peterson stated that he does not find that to be the case, but states the project is not yet finished, so it is not unusual for final grades to be completed until the project is done. If there is something they want to change, they will need to apply for an amendment, or build the project as originally approved.

The third point addressed is the thought that the home size has violated the PUD approval requirements. Director Peterson stated the buildings are limited to the

building envelopes, and they need to stay within those lines. The current home and second home that has been started are both within those envelopes. Director Peterson stated that only minimum house size would be regulated, not maximum as long as it is within the building envelope.

The fourth point addressed is that the recently completed home deck requires Planning Commission approval. Director Peterson agrees, and states that is why they are having this meeting. Approval is needed to be outside of that building envelope.

The fifth point addressed is the PUD mandated landscape buffer cannot be installed as required. Director Peterson stated that is something expected to be completed during final stages of construction, not while construction is still happening.

The sixth point addressed is that the site fill was improperly compacted at the south property unit locations. Director Peterson stated that Mr. Mark Rohdes concern about fill being out for other sites this is something that was discussed with Mr. Rohde when they met. The Building Department was made aware that it was there, and it is up to them whether or not to require any testing.

There was also reference to a letter from an attorney at Varnum that talks about the retaining wall, and a comment was made that that was the Townships attorney. Director Peterson states that although Varnum is the Townships attorney at this time, they were not when that letter was written.

Chairman Sperla asked Director Peterson if there has been any contact with the Department of Natural Resources regarding the concern of silt and materials drifting into the river. Director Peterson states there has not been recently, but the Township Board has sent their engineer out to test the bayou for materials in the past, and tests have come back as mostly organic to the river. Director Peterson then states that a couple of years ago there was a big drain project completed to stabilize a hill near Centennial Park (west of Thornhills, east of the condo project) where it was believed a lot of fill was coming from and flowing into the river. They have both been completed in the past few years.

Director Peterson was asked how far beyond the approved envelope the deck is that has been built onto the complete unit (#8). Director Peterson stated that is well beyond the normal 25 ft setback requirement, and is also beyond the building envelope. He did not have an exact measurement.

Member Moxley thanked Director Peterson for the background regarding the points in the letter for those on the Planning Commission that do not have the history on the project, or were not here when the project was approved.

Member Rissi asked Director Peterson if an extension were to be granted for decks to be built outside of the buildable envelope, would that conflict with the retaining walls being built as construction continues? Director Peterson states that he has had that conversation with the builder, and the builder has indicated there should be no reason

the decks would alter the approved grading plan. Director Peterson stated that that would be a good question for the applicant for the record.

Member Pennington asked for clarification that the decks would be in compliance with the required 25 ft rear yard setback. Director Peterson stated that yes, it would be in compliance with the required setback, and also the 10 ft side yard setback.

Chairman Sperla invited the Applicant to come forward with comment.

Mr. Tom Guisti came forward and introduced himself as one of the developers, general contractor, and builder of the site. Mr. Guisti stated that they were not aware the decks needed to be shown on the original drawing submitted of the individual units. Mr. Guisti stated that the south side of the property (lots 5-10) are walkout lots, so they would require a deck for safety and egress out of the back of the house from the first floor. He then states that they have lessened some of the sloping on the south side of the property and installed some high velocity erosion matting, and soil stabilization seed to encourage growth on the slope in back that is in question. Mr. Guisti stated that Mr. Rohde has expressed from the beginning that he does not want the retaining wall that was approved to be put up, so they are doing what they can to try to keep him happy and not build the retaining wall as he is right behind them. Mr. Guisti stated that they are meeting all of their requirements, and have a storm water operator visit the site once a week or after every rain event to document and report to the DEQ. He continues on to state that the stormwater retention pond has been tested and come back with results as good or better than the original report.

Mr. Guisti stated that the decks are 10 feet deep off the back of the house, and it extends to 13 feet to allow for a landing down to grade. Mr. Guisti believes that this development is a great addition to the downtown area of Cascade, being within walking distance to the library, shopping, and dining in the Downtown District. He states that the first unit was a great success with no comparable properties in the area.

Member Rissi asked Mr. Guisti if he still planned to build the planned retaining wall on the north side of the property if they chose not to put up the wall on the south side. Mr. Guisti stated that they would probably not put the retaining wall up on the north side of the property either, as the grades are not what they thought they would be. Runoff from the library or the units themselves will run to the catch basins. With grading, landscaping, and seeding, Mr. Guisti stated that everything is doing what it is supposed to do.

Mr. Guisti asked what the status of construction currently is. He stated that the first complete property is occupied, the others have not even been listed as of now. They are trying to go easy and keep things contained as best possible.

Member Rissi asked Director Peterson if omitting the retaining walls is a choice Mr. Guisti can make without Staff approval. Director Peterson stated that he would need to see their revised engineering plan and the impact on engineering before he can make that call.

Motion was made by Member Rissi to open Public Hearing. Supported by Member Katsma. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Chairman Sperla invited members of the public to come forward with comment.

Mr. Ken Clapp (6800 Tricklewood Ct.) came forward to express his concern regarding the confusion of adhering to the original plan. He is questioning the removal of the retaining walls, or addition of the deck without prior approval. He then asked Director Peterson if the bayou has been tested for erosion debris since the start of this project. Director Peterson stated that he does not have an exact date of reports, but can look them up. Director Peterson states that conclusions of testing in the past has been a lot of organic fill from the river. Chairman Sperla stated that this information is available to the public through the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. Patrick Brady (2870 Overlook Summit Dr. SE) came forward and introduced himself as the President of the Homeowners Association of the Bluffs of Cascade. He stated that he has really enjoyed living in Cascade for the past two years, and has seen growth in that time. Mr. Brady states that he became interested after hearing about this project and the concerns of the neighboring owner from his property manager. Mr. Brady states that the builder of this project (Mr. Guisti) built a home for him 17 years ago in Plainfield Township, and has since built hundreds of homes with a reputation for constructing high end homes that bring a lot of value to the areas that they are in. Mr. Brady states that he also believes Mr. Guisti does things right. He continued on to say that he loved their home, and they got a lot of money for it when they downsized to come to Cascade. He states his opinion that its great that a developer and builder took a risk to build on this property and do something different that will possibly increase property values.

Mr. Craig Meurlin (6333 Thornhills) came forward to confirm the home is occupied. Chairman Sperla confirmed that it is. Mr. Meurlin questioned how it had a building permit granted if it was in violation of the PUD, Chairman Sperla answered that a temporary permit can be given subject to the proceeding that is currently being held to amend the PUD. Chairman Sperla explained that applying for an amended PUD makes more sense than applying for a variance in this instance. The PUD will allow for all structures built to have a deck; a variance would have to be done on an individual basis in a separate proceeding with the ZBA. Chairman Sperla explained that if the Planning Commission recommends approval, it will go in front of the Township Board for final approval. Without recommendation from the Planning Commission, the Township Board still has final approval. Mr. Meurlin asked how may temporary building permits the Township of Cascade issues in a year. Director Peterson answered that it is a rare occurrence.

Mr. Jeff Dionne (2984 Thornapple River Drive) came forward to comment that last February he was in front of the Board to ask that his 10 ft side setback be reduced to 7 ft, and it was denied. He then states that the rules are clear in the Township Ordinances to what is allowed. He gives his opinion that leaving the decks off of the initial site plan was missed on purpose, as setbacks are a critical part for any developer, and believes the Township needs more clear, established enforcement. Mr. Dionne states that he will be upset if this PUD does get approved, as he spent four to five thousand dollars

redrawing an initial plan for his home that met the ten ft side setback after being denied a seven ft side setback. Member Katsma asked Mr. Dionne if he was denied by the Zoning Board, or Planning Commission as they have different standards to follow. Mr. Dionne states he was in front of the Zoning Board.

Ms. Aleen Leipprandt (49 Monroe Ave) came forward and introduced herself as an attorney with Hilger Hammond, a law firm in Grand Rapids. She states that she has been retained by some Cascade Township residents, some of whom are adjoining to this development. Ms. Leipprandt states that when the PUD was improved in 2016, it was done so on the basis of a condominium, and the building envelopes were considered also on the basis of a condominium, and how tight things are on the site. The PUD approval process takes into account the necessary perimeter setbacks of building envelopes. She shares her concern that the addition of the decks should not have been missed by the builder, or Staff that approved the original PUD. Ms. Leipprandt then states that the original square footage of these homes would be 2,700 square feet, with a garage of approximately 400 sq ft. She states that these properties are now being advertised as 5,000 square feet, with a three-stall garage. She continues to say that although the building envelope may still be the same, there has been substantial increases in garage size, and cement driveways along with the increase in square footage of the home. Ms. Leipprandt suggests that this Amendment be tabled until the Applicant can submit a new drawing with actual sizes of the decks, and how the decks will relate to the grading, drainage, and green space that was approved in 2016.

Mr. Ron McCollum (6660 Old 28th St) came forward to say that he would like to see changes to a PUD made only with an Amendment. He states that original plan had a detention pond that is now a retention pond, and the changes in the grading on the north and south side to not need retention walls are both changes made without amendments. Mr. McCollum expressed his concern that the project has changed from a condominium site to a sub division development without the proper Amendments, in some cases with Amendments being applied for after changes have been completed.

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

Member Rissi then stated that the developer made a comment about potentially not building the walls. Member Rissi stated that he had previously asked Director Peterson if this was possible, Director Peterson stated that the plan would have to be reviewed and could possibly lead to an amendment. Member Rissi then asked if there was merit in tabling this decision to give Director Peterson an opportunity to meet with the developer in order to add all proposed changes to one amendment. Chairman Sperla then clarified with Director Peterson that there are no other plans to be reviewed at the current time. Director Peterson confirmed.

Member Rissi then suggested the proposed decks need to have a specific size stated in order to be approved, Director Peterson stated that the setback of 25 ft in the rear, and 10 ft on the side is the normal parameter on any lot in the township for decks. Chairman Sperla stated that having more specific size measurements does have merit, however he will not propose that at this time. Director Peterson stated that if the

Planning Commission does decide to request more specifics, you will need to clearly state what items he is looking for in order for the Applicant to produce what Chairman Sperla is looking for.

Member Rissi asked if the addition of the decks is still within the approved building envelope. Mr. Guisti answered that no, it is not. Mr. Guisti stated that the approved building envelope is approximately 52' x 72', and the deck would extend 13' maximum outside of that envelope. Mr. Guisti clarified that the back of the house is 72 ft in width, the deck would run along 25 ft of that width, and extend a maximum of 13 ft further from the structure of the house. Member Rissi suggested that since only one house has been built at this point, the decks on the houses built in the coming future should fit into the approved building envelope. Mr. Guisti stated that would make the houses very shallow in depth. Chairman Sperla asked if this would affect houses on both the north and south side of the development, Mr. Guisti stated that yes, it will.

Member Krieter asked if each house will have a different style and deck style proposed since this is a site condominium, or if each home will follow the same basic plan.

Member Rissi asked about the depth point on Lot 6, and noted that it looks larger than the building envelope. Mr. Guisti stated that it is planned as a walk out, and will have to be modified, especially if anything is done with the retaining wall or grades in the back of the property. Mr. Guisti then stated that nothing can or will be done or changed without approval from the Township Engineer. Member Rissi asked Mr. Guisti if the deck size would need to be larger than 25' x 13'; Mr. Guisti answered no, they would not. Member Rissi clarifies with Mr. Guisti that the decks with the required setbacks would fit within the PUD Amendment Mr. Guisti is asking for today. Mr. Guisti answers that yes, they will fit.

The question was asked from a member of the public if Unit #5 will fit within the required setback. Mr. Guisti answered that yes, it will fit within the required setback after modifications of the depth of the unit, and the same will need to be done with Unit #6. Director Peterson clarifies that when Mr. Guisti mentions he will need to modify the unit, he is not talking about the building envelope, rather the unit placement inside that envelope.

A member of the public states that the completed unit (#8) is outside of the building envelope after the addition of the third stall to the garage. Director Peterson states he has been given different information from the applicant, but can be looked into further if needed.

Chairman Sperla states that a decision needs to be made in this matter. He adds that there can be a yes vote, a no vote, or a vote to table the matter until further information is gathered. Chairman Sperla stated that once a motion is made to table the matter, no further discussion can be held.

Member Rissi stated that there needs to be a solid reason to table, and perhaps that may be to verify whether or not the house is inside of the building envelope. Member

Rissi then adds that he believes the retaining wall issue of the wall(s) either being built or not needs to be further addressed, and a solid decision needs to be made.

Member Pennington states that he believes the dimensions of the decks, and impact to the building envelope needs to be more clearly defined. Member Pennington then also agrees with Member Rissi that the retaining wall issue should be firmly decided on.

Member Katsma asked Mr. Guisti how far along he is with having all of the grades set, and all of the other homes designed. Mr. Guisti state that where the houses sit is at grade, the southern slope of where the retaining wall will either be or not be is the only grading in question at this time. Mr. Guisti stated that all home designs will be the same, although possibly reversed to put garage towards garage. Color schemes may be different.

A member of the public states that he would like to have a survey done of the unit that has been built (#8) since it has not been verified, and since there is no plan for the deck that has already been built on it.

Chairman Sperla states that it is not the Townships responsibility to complete surveys.

Chairman Sperla asks if a motion if ready to be made.

Motion is made by Member Katsma to table this item based on comments heard at this meeting, and the need for further clarification as described below. Supported by Member Rissi. Motion carried 9 to 0.

Director Peterson asks for specifics on what is being asked to be clarified. Member Katsma states better clarification is needed on actual deck size and how it relates to the building envelope, and whether or not the elimination or changes made to the retaining wall will have an impact on grading of the site. Member Rissi states that he would like to add a survey of the lot (#8) that shows the house and the deck as it sits now, with the buildable envelope shown on the survey.

ARTICLE 7. Any other business

Chairman Sperla reminds the Commission there is a meeting with the Township Board tomorrow (May 21st) at 5:30 in the same location.

ARTICLE 8. Adjournment

Motion was made by Member Rissi to adjourn. Supported by Member Katsma. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Phil Johnson, Secretary

williams&works

engineers | surveyors | planners

MEMO

Date: March 11, 2019

From: Lynée Wells, AICP

To: Cascade Township Planning Commission

Re: Draft Master Plan Public Hearing

We have prepared the draft Master Plan for Cascade Township. The plan was approved for distribution by the Township Board, and has been publicly-available for comment for 63 days prior to this public hearing.

We have received comments related to adding a timeline for implementation action, which is attached to this memorandum.

Process.

At the June 3, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission should open the public hearing and consider comments. Once the hearing is closed, Commissioners may discuss and determine a course of action. A resolution recommending approval has been provided for consideration.

Should the Planning Commission desire to recommend its approval, we ask that a condition be added to include the implementation timeline (attached).

Following a favorable decision of the Planning Commission, the plan will proceed to the Township Board who has asserted its right to adopt the Master Plan.

For reference, the plan is available here: draft.cascadetwpvision.com. The plan is digital, but it can also be printed. Also, we realize that certain pages take time to load. Once the site is final, it will operate much faster.

As a reminder, this process which you have been a part of, has included extensive community input throughout this past summer and into the Fall, culminating with the community wide survey and the October Design Day. Since that time, we have focused on drafting a plan that addresses the most critical community needs and desires.

Plan Organization.

The Master Plan contains 4 themes, each theme has a goal, and a set of data, maps, and projects to be implemented. The themes are:

- Neighborhood and Partnerships

- Environment and Sustainability
- Transportation and Mobility
- Economy and Innovation

The future land use chapter has its own dropdown menu, with the map and the future land use descriptions. Note that there have not been significant changes, except around the airport, which includes some new future land use categories that correspond to the Airport's Master Plan. Other changes within the future land use section of the plan and the corresponding map include:

- modifying the Light Industrial category and changing it to Transitional Industrial
- Increasing the units per acre for Cascade Village, Community Mixed Use and Transitional Industrial by 2
- Renaming Village Commercial to Cascade Village

The public input chapter has all the findings from the community meetings and survey results. These findings informed the selection of the plan themes, and provided guidance for the development of the projects and implementation actions.

The implementation chapter contains the following:

- Overall implementation steps by theme, each containing a timeline, responsible party, and success indicators.
- Implementation for Cascade Village
- Placemaking Strategy (immediate implementation). The placemaking strategy include tactical, pilot projects that can be deployed lighter, quicker and in a cost-effective manner to test out some of the suggested projects within the plan. We have consulted with the Road Commission and their Commission members, and believe there is an opportunity to collaborate to deploy some of these pilot projects yet this summer.

We have attached an implementation timeline, which we request be included in the motion to adopt the plan.

Implementation

This page serves as an initial plan of action for the Township; implementing the goals, projects, actions, and future land use categories outlined during the process. Each implementation step is categorized into the plan themes as well as the Cascade Village sub area plan.

Responsibility & Partners

Primary responsibility for implementing this plan rests with the Township Board, the Planning Commission, and Township staff. Many entities and organizations will need to cooperate in order to fully implement policies, recommendations, and vision.

Transportation and Mobility

Strategy	Responsibility & Partners	Success Indicator
<i>PROJECT: TRANSIT + TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT</i>		
<i>Action: Strengthen the Township's relationship with The Rapid and extend the pilot trial for the bus service extension along 28th Street to Cascade Village and make the route permanent.</i>		
Work with The Rapid to make the Route 28 permanent and help increase awareness of the route with local employers and transit dependent populations	The Rapid, Township Staff, Downtown Development Authority, Township Board	Route 28 will be permanently established and existing ridership will be maintained or increase
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Expand The Rapid service to access 60th and Broadmoor to provide access to employers.</i>		
Work with communities and employers in the "four corners" area such as the City of Kentwood, Caledonia Township, Gaines Township, and Amazon to develop a successful transit model for the area	City of Kentwood, Caledonia Township, Gaines Township, The Rapid, Amazon, local employers, Township staff, Township Board	Transit service is established servicing the 60 th and Broadmoor area
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Establish a park and ride lot near the 36th Street and I-96 Interchange in partnership with the Michigan Department of Transportation and the Gerald R. Ford International Airport.</i>		
Work with the Michigan Department of Transportation and the Gerald R. Ford International Airport to develop a park and ride on MDOT or airport property	Michigan Department of Transportation, Gerald R. Ford International Airport, Township staff, Township Board	A park and ride lot near 36 th Street and I-96 is established and constructed
Timeframe:Long		

<i>Action: Continue work with the CSX railroad, the Grand Valley Metro Council, and regional townships and municipalities to work toward a long-range commuter rail connecting Lansing, Grand Rapids, Cascade Charter Township and Holland.</i>		
Maintain a seat at the table regarding discussion future planning for commuter rail	CSX, Grand Valley Metro Council, State of Michigan, neighboring townships, City of Grand Rapids, Kent County, Township staff, Township Board	A commuter rail line is established connecting Lansing, Grand Rapids, Cascade Charter Township, and Holland
Timeframe:Long		
PROJECT: FREIGHT + RAIL		
<i>Action: Support the continuance of freight rail service in and through the Township.</i>		
Maintain communication with CSX and local employers who rely on freight rail service regarding existing and future needs; advocate for continuance of rail corridor	CSX, freight rail reliant businesses, Township staff, Township Board	Freight rail will be maintained in the Township
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Maintain truck route corridors which support the shipping needs of business and industry.</i>		
Maintain communication with the Kent County Road Commission and local employers who rely on trucking service for existing and future needs; advocate for existing or expanded truck routes	Kent County Road Commission, trucking service reliant businesses, Township staff, Township Board	Truck routes in the township will be maintained
Timeframe:Short		
PROJECT: TRAILS + PATHWAYS		
<i>Action: Establish dedicated pathway links to Lowell Township, Caledonia Township, Grand Rapids Township, and the City of Kentwood.</i>		
Identify existing or future nonmotorized pathways near Township boundaries in adjacent communities and work with neighboring jurisdictions to establish connections	Lowell Township, Caledonia Township, Grand Rapids Township, City of Kentwood, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Pathway links to Lowell Township, Caledonia Township, Grand Rapids Township, and the City of Kentwood will be established
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Connect trail and pathway system to all Township Parks.</i>		
Identify Township parks which are underserved by nonmotorized access and plan for preferred future trail extensions	Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	All township parks will be connected to the non-motorized pathway system
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Expand the pathway system into the southeast quadrant of the Township.</i>		

Identify preferred routes and destinations for future connections or loops into the southeast quadrant of the Township	Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	The pathway system will be expanded into the southwest quadrant of the Township
Timeframe:Long		
<i>PROJECT: STREETS + ROADWAYS</i>		
<i>Action: Adopt a Vision Zero street safety policy and support and advocate for changes and improvements in street design.</i>		
Work with the Kent County Road Commission and Michigan Department of Transportation in drafting policy language to define a Vision Zero policy in the Township	Kent County Road Commission, Michigan Department of Transportation, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Vision Zero policy will be adopted by the Township and fatalities and injuries related to transportation crashes will be eliminated or reduced
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Modify the Cascade Road and Old 28th Street cross-section in Cascade Village to promote walkability and traffic calming.</i>		
Work with the Kent County Road Commission and Downtown Development Authority to construct a street cross-section which is reflected in the Cascade Village Master Plan vision	Kent County Road Commission, Downtown Development Authority, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Cascade Road cross-section will be modified per the recommendations in the Cascade Village Master Plan; walkability will be improved by traffic slowing and pedestrian improvements
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities on bridge in Cascade Village by adding pots and planters or bike lanes to separate vehicles from the sidewalk.</i>		
Work with the Downtown Development Authority and the Kent County Road Commission to install pots, planters, and bike lanes	Kent County Road Commission, Downtown Development Authority, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Pots and planters and/or bike lanes are added; more pedestrians and bicyclists are seen using the bridge
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Modify the Thornapple River Drive cross-section near Cascade Village by adding street trees and a sidewalk to promote walkability and traffic calming.</i>		
Work with the Kent County Road Commission and Downtown Development Authority to construct a street cross-section which is reflected in the Cascade Village Master Plan vision; incorporate as a city to take control of the street system	Kent County Road Commission, Downtown Development Authority, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Street trees and a sidewalk are added; traffic is slowed and more pedestrians are seen utilizing the sidewalk
Timeframe:Short		

Action: Install sidewalk crossings in known conflict areas so that residents have safe access to services, parks, and regional trails.

Work with the Kent County Road Commission, Michigan Department of Transportation, and Downtown Development Authority to study conflict areas by utilizing the Michigan Traffic Crash Facts query tool and improve pedestrian crossings, install signalization, add bulb-outs, and narrow streets	Kent County Road Commission, Michigan Department of Transportation, Downtown Development Authority	Sidewalk and pedestrian crossings are improved or installed where indicated by the conflict area study; streets are narrowed in pedestrian corridors
Timeframe:Short		

Economy and Innovation

Strategy	Responsibility & Partners	Success Indicator
<i>PROJECT: PLACEMAKING + ATTRACTION + RETENTION</i>		
<i>Action: Designate and create a central community green or gathering space with the understanding that human innovation and collaboration is encouraged by happenstance interactions and places worth caring about.</i>		
Adopt and construct the 2016 Cascade Gathering Space Plan	Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee, Downtown Development Authority, Township staff, business owners, stakeholders, Township Board	A community green which is regularly utilized is built and becomes the central gathering space of the surrounding area
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Redevelop Cascade Village to be a walkable and authentic community destination as a placemaking, talent attraction, and retention strategy.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit the type of development which is reflected in the Cascade Village Master Plan vision and future land use designation description	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Cascade Village redevelops into a central gathering space that is adored and embraced by Township residents for being walkable and inviting
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Create an anti-discrimination policy protecting vulnerable populations as a tool to address talent attraction and retention.</i>		
Utilize best practices and local advocacy groups to establish an anti-discrimination policy which addresses vulnerable populations	Local advocacy groups, local employers, Township staff, Township Board	An anti-discrimination policy is adopted by the Township

Timeframe:Long		
<i>PROJECT: DEVELOPMENT + REDEVELOPMENT</i>		
<i>Action: Leverage the cluster of tech companies locating near the Four Corners area and work with the airport to promote land available for development.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect the changes to the future land use map that impact airport properties and work with regional economic development organizations to help locate sites for potential employers	The Right Place, Township staff, Township Board	Airport and other area properties for sale will be occupied by new employers
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Reduce parking minimums to encourage infill development in underutilized surface parking lots.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow for additional flexibility in minimum parking requirements	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Infill occurs in underutilized parking lots
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Establish a mixed-use node near the Four Corners area to house workers and create a walkable, connected community.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow for and encourage more compact, walkable, mixed use development in a transitional context with density bonuses for attractive mixed use buildings	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which encourage compact, walkable, mixed use development in the area around the four corners; mixed-use development subsequently occurs
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Acquire underutilized property along the Thornapple River to encourage redevelopment.</i>		
Approach the existing owners about an option agreement to purchase the property should the existing owner consider selling; assist the existing owner or lessee in relocating their business; sell the property for redevelopment	Downtown Development Authority, Township staff, Township board	Underutilized property is purchased and sold for redevelopment; redevelopment subsequently occurs
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Expand utilities to areas planned and/or zoned for high intensity development where gaps or pinch points exist.</i>		
Work with DTE, Consumers Energy, the City of Grand Rapids, and other utility providers in identifying areas where service improvements	DTE Energy, Consumers Energy, City of Grand Rapids, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Utilities are expanded to fill gaps and pinch points

are required for expansion or increases in density		
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Receive and maintain status as a Redevelopment Ready Community (RRC)</i>		
Follow the best practices for the RRC program and maintain a list of prioritized redevelopment sites	Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC), Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Redevelopment Ready Community status is gained; best practices are followed and the list of prioritized redevelopment sites is maintained
Timeframe:Short		

Neighborhoods and Partnerships

Strategy	Responsibility & Partners	Success Indicator
PROJECT: PARKS + GREENSPACE		
<i>Action: Provide permeable edges to parks and natural areas by increasing the number of access points.</i>		
Amend applicable park master plans to include non-motorized connections and identify areas along park boundaries which are ideal for easements other forms of access	Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Park master plan(s) are amended; edges of parks are made more permeable by the installation and construction of non-motorized pathway connections
Timeframe:Short		
PROJECT: ORGANIZATIONS + RELATIONSHIPS		
<i>Action: Encourage the collaboration between the Kent District Library, Forest Hills Public Schools, and the Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee regarding the interconnectivity and collaboration between neighborhoods and neighborhood assets and services.</i>		
Establish a schedule of annual recurring meetings where each organization updates the others on goals and objectives for the year; work with each organization to share resources on common goals and initiatives where they overlap	Kent District Library, Forest Hills Public Schools, Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	A schedule of annual reoccurring meetings is established; the listed entities meet at least once a year to update each other regarding goals and initiatives; collaboration is maintained
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Identify local philanthropists or benefactors who are interested in partnering, sponsoring, or investing in the Township's vision.</i>		
Work with stakeholders from the master plan process on identifying local benefactors and approach them regarding the vision that was created for	Master plan stakeholders, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Local philanthropists and/or benefactors are identified; projects from the vision are sponsored or invested in

Cascade Village and the Township		
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Increase transparency by recording Township Board, Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals and other meetings and/or hosting them in locations throughout the Township.</i>		
Install a permanent audio visual system in the Township Hall to record public meetings live to Facebook, the Township website, and other platforms; create a rotating schedule to host the meetings at locations throughout the Township	Township staff, Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, Township Board	All public meetings at the township are livestreamed and recorded; the Township Board rotates around the Township hosting meetings in new locations
Timeframe:Long		
<i>Action: Actively engage property owners in Cascade Village to familiarize them with the Village Plan, promote shared parking, and discuss implementation ideas.</i>		
Work with the Downtown Development Authority to reach out to property owners in Cascade Village	Downtown Development Authority, Township Staff, Township Board	
Timeframe:Short		
PROJECT: HOUSING + AFFORDABILITY		
<i>Action: Permit attached residential infill, including retirement housing, near transit stops, services, along existing or planned pathways, and within walking distance of Cascade Village.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect the increased use mix created by the Community Mixed Use future land use designation	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which allow for residential infill and retirement housing near transit stops, services, along pathways, and within walking distance of Cascade Village
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Study the feasibility of permitting accessory dwelling units in zoning districts that permit single-family dwellings.</i>		
Study best practices and policies of neighboring communities, conduct a survey addressing accessory dwelling units specifically to gather public input on the topic	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Best practices and examples are studied; survey is conducted regarding accessory dwellings
Timeframe:Medium		
PROJECT: FORM + DESIGN		
<i>Action: Require a grid pattern of development where allowable by topography and natural features to enhance connectivity, walkability, and pedestrian safety in neighborhoods.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Control Ordinance, and other applicable documents	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which require or

and policies to require or incentivize a grid pattern of development		incentivize a grid pattern of development
Timeframe:Long		
<i>Action: Install pedestrian-scale lighting where neighborhoods connect to services, transportation corridors, and parks to promote safety and eyes on the street.</i>		
Utilize Michigan Traffic Crash Facts to identify where pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle incidents are high and work with neighborhoods to identify important connectors to Cascade Village and parks; work with the Kent County Road Commission, Michigan Department of Transportation, and Consumers Energy to install pedestrian-scale lights	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Pedestrian-scale lights will be installed where pedestrian and motor vehicle incidents are high, reducing pedestrian fatalities; pedestrian-scale lights will also be installed near important connectors with amenities and services
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Work with the Kent County Road Commission to minimize pavement widths of streets in neighborhoods to slow traffic and encourage walkability.</i>		
Continue the conversation with the Kent County Road Commission regarding reducing the standard for street widths; encourage residents to contact the Road Commission regarding their concerns	Kent County Road Commission, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Pavement street widths will be reduced, subsequently slowing vehicles down and making neighborhood streets safer and more walkable
Timeframe:Short		
<i>Action: Amend the DDA, TIFA, and Parks and Recreation Plan to include the Village Plan recommendations.</i>		
Work with each respective board, committee, and authority to update the planning documents	Downtown Development Authority, Planning Commission, Cascade Township Parks and Recreation Committee	Each plan will reflect the recommendations from the Cascade Village Master Plan
Timeframe:Short		
PROJECT: INCORPORATE + TRANSFORM		
<i>Action: Study the feasibility, and pros and cons of incorporation as a city to facilitate control and design of roadways.</i>		
To incorporate as a City, the Township must first identify the proposed city boundaries; then circulate the petition for signature by those residents of the territory to be affected by the incorporation	Voters of the Township, Township Attorney, Township staff, Township Board	Cascade Charter Township will be incorporated into the City of Cascade

Timeframe:Long		
<i>Action: Change zip code name (preferred last line) to Cascade from Grand Rapids by working with the U.S. Postal Service.</i>		
Follow USPS procedures and policies regarding a request for a preferred last line change	Township Attorney, Township staff, Township Board	The preferred last line for mail going to certain Cascade Charter Township zip codes will be "Cascade, Michigan"
Timeframe:Medium		

Sustainability and Environment

Strategy	Responsibility & Partners	Success Indicator
PROJECT: UTILITIES + INFRASTRUCTURE		
<i>Action: Install public water and sanitary sewer into areas of the Township consistent with Township utility plans.</i>		
Permit intense or dense development only in areas which are currently served or planned to be served by public water and sanitary sewer	Township staff, City of Grand Rapids, Planning Commission, Township Board	Development within the utility service boundary is connected to both water and sanitary sewer where available or desired
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Permit solar energy collectors in the Township at both the private and utility scale.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow for utility scale and private solar installations	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which allow for utility scale and private solar installations
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Encourage green infrastructure in new developments that discourages site run-off.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to offer incentives for green stormwater infrastructure	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which encourage green stormwater infrastructure during site design
Timeframe:Medium		
PROJECT: PRESERVE + PROTECT		
<i>Action: Increase residential density where water and sewer are present to encourage alternative modes of transportation and discourage the inefficient pattern of spread-out development and infrastructure.</i>		
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect increases in density prescribed in the future land use plan	Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board	Zoning Ordinance contains standards which reflect the densities outlined in the future land use plan
Timeframe:Medium		
<i>Action: Create an inventory of significant natural features, vistas, and viewsheds and develop an overlay which protects these assets.</i>		

<p>Utilize topographic, wetland, and hydrographic data and a community survey to determine significant or prized natural features in the Township. Amend the Zoning Ordinance as an overlay to protect these features through buffering or incentives</p>	<p>Members of the public, Township staff, Planning Commission, Township Board</p>	<p>The Township will have a significant natural features inventory which reflects the objective and subjective input from data and the public; the Zoning Ordinance contains standards which establish a natural features overlay which protects the features indicated in the natural features inventory</p>
<p>Timeframe: Long</p>		

- Short 1-3 years
- Medium 3-5 years
- Long 5-10 years

CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP

COUNTY OF KENT, MICHIGAN

At a regular meeting of the Township Board of Cascade Charter Township, held at the Cascade Township Hall, on the ____ day of _____, 2019, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: _____

ABSENT: _____

The following preamble and resolution were offered by _____ and seconded by _____.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE TOWNSHIP MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act provides for the preparation and adoption of master plans and amendments therein for the use, development and preservation of lands in the Township;

WHEREAS, the Township Planning Commission prepared a Township Master Plan with the involvement of community stakeholders after a community survey, design workshop, and community input meetings;

WHEREAS, on **DATE**, the Township Board adopted a resolution asserting the Board's right as a legislative body to approve or reject the Amendment;

WHEREAS, on or about **DATE** the Township mailed copies of the Master Plan to the municipalities contiguous to the Township and the West Michigan Regional Planning Commission, thereby commencing the required 63-day comment period;

WHEREAS, on **DATE**, the 63-day period for comment on the Amendment by the contiguous municipalities and others ended;

WHEREAS, on DATE, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map, after publication and mailing of notice as required by law, and following the public hearing the commission members recommended that the Township Board approve the Master Plan.

IT IS, THEREFORE, RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Township Board hereby approves the 2019 Township Master Plan, submitted at this meeting of the Board.

2. The Township Board expresses its appreciation to the Planning Commission for its efforts in the preparation of the Master Plan. The Planning Commission secretary is requested to attend to the distribution of copies of the Master Plan to the contiguous municipalities and the other entities entitled by law to receive such copies.

3. Upon this approval, the Master Plan is effective as of the date hereof.

AYES:

NAYS:

RESOLUTION DECLARED ADOPTED.

Susan Slater, Township Clerk