

Approved 8/6/12

Public Meeting of Casco Township Planning Commission
July 30, 2012, 6 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bruce Barker, John Stroud, Dian Liepe, Daniel Fleming, Paul Macyauski and David Campbell, **ABSENT:** Judy Graff is excused **ALSO PRESENT:** Patrick Hudson, Planner, and Janet Chambers, Recording Secretary, and 44 interested citizens.

1 Call to order and review of agenda

Chairman Barker called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM and reviewed the agenda. The special meeting is for the purpose of receiving public comments regarding proposed amendments to the Township Zoning Ordinance involving the addition of a new High Density Residential (HDR) district and amendment of Section 4.07 and 4.08, which would change the official zoning map. Chairman Barker explained that a decision could be made to recommend, or not to recommend, the change to the Township Board of Trustees.

2 Reading of notice, published in South Haven Tribune on July 15, 2012

Chairman Barker read the public notice.

At the request of Eleanor Jordan, 911 72nd Street, South Haven, the Planning Commission Members introduced themselves.

Chairman Barker read through the proposed zoning changes, inviting public comment after each section.

Chairman Barker read Section 9A.01 DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE, and asked Hudson to explain the purpose and intent of the proposed changes. Hudson explained that the new HDR District would have the same setback requirements as the existing MDR District, but in the proposed HDR District the number of allowed units per acre would change from 6 units to 10 units. Also, a number of uses were removed because they would take up too much space, such as churches, hospitals, clinics, convalescent homes, libraries and museums, ponds, public parks or recreation areas.

Martin Super, representing his parents Anna and Matt Super, 3766 North Shore Drive, South Haven (owner of parcel # 02-086-049-10) clarified what he felt that Hudson was saying. The reasoning for omitting the above uses is because it would be inappropriate to put something of that size in a HDR District. Hudson agreed.

Carol May, 7415 Washington, South Haven, asked what would be permitted uses. Barker stated it would be covered later in the meeting.

Martin Graber, 31 Lincoln, South Haven, asked what the square foot requirement would be. Barker stated that would be covered later.

Renee Langeland, 90 Euclid, South Haven, stated that many people in attendance wanted to know how Casco got to this point (of adding a HDR District). Chairman Barker explained that the PC was going over the Master Plan for the last two years and a developer was considering an apartment complex off of Baseline Road. The PC felt that if there were to be a HDR District, this would be the best area because it is near commercial zoning, and because water and sewer is available. At a public hearing in May, a change to all the property bordered by North Shore Drive, Blue Star Highway, Baseline Road and Euclid was considered (making it all HDR), but because of public response, the area along North Shore Drive was excluded from the change. The consideration of a HDR in that particular location was the result of a developer's request to build an apartment complex.

Hollee Graber, 31 Lincoln, South Haven, asked where the developer lives. Chairman Barker stated that the developer is Gary Jonna from Novi, MI. Graber stated that it makes a difference that someone who lives in the area.

Bob Baker, 54 Lincoln, South Haven, Michigan, questioned that if this meeting is the result of a gentleman's request in May, why is there still nothing specific down on paper? Chairman Barker said the site plan review would come before the PC and they would go through the whole thing at that time.

Chairman Barker read Section 9A.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL LAND USES, and asked that Hudson explain the section. Hudson stated that Bultje, the Township Attorney, told him that schools could not be listed as Special Land Use (SLU), because State Requirements say they must be listed as permitted.

Macyauski said he would like to answer an earlier question about permitted uses. He explained that, in the HDR District, the number of *permitted* and *special uses* were reduced because it was desirable to save room for homes, and the proposed HDR District would only be 20 acres.

Al Green, 87 Pershing, South Haven, asked if the PC has done away with green space. Hudson explained that only public green spaces would be eliminated, and there could still be green spaces within developments.

Chairman Barker read Section 9A.03 DISTRICT REGULATIONS and stated that the asterisk at the bottom referred to Baseline because it is the only major road pertaining to the area under discussion. He again asked Hudson to discuss the section. Hudson stated the proposed HDR district would be the same as existing MDR, other than the HDR district would reduce the size requirement of the 2 family dwelling, and increase allowed density.

The HDR would require a developer to have at least two acres if pursuing a multifamily dwelling. Also, the multifamily dwelling is limited to a **maximum** of 20 units over two acres. Given that setbacks and parking requirements take up space, 20 units, in many cases, does not work. Hudson gave examples of developments (Park Meadows and a senior housing development) where, because of setbacks and parking, etc., the maximum of 10 units per acre was not feasible.

Carol May asked if there were copies of the changes that she and other citizens could have. Barker stated that if a recommendation to change the zoning was made to the Board of Trustees, there would be copies available. If the recommendation is made, it could be at the August 20th Board Meeting.

Eric Schlanser, 45 North Shore Drive, South Haven, asked if it would be possible for the 10 units (on 10 acres) to have 10 apartments each. Hudson replied that they must provide 400 sq. ft. for parking, and possibly an additional 100 sq ft. per unit for driveways. Schlanser asked Hudson for a realistic number of apartments there could be. Hudson stated that without a full site plan, he would have to guess about 80 or 100 apartments could be built on 10 acres. Macyauski asked Jonna, as a developer, to give his professional opinion as to how many apartments could be built. Jonna replied that on a 12 acre site, it would be between 8 or 10 per acre. Schlanser asked if Jonna was stating that on 12 acres, there could be 100 apartments. Chairman Barker stated on 12 acres there could be 100 apartments.

Martin Super said there is no need to dance around the numbers. If the Township thinks there would not be room for 10 apartments per acre, then don't say 10 per acre is allowed. Put a realistic number on it.

Chairman Barker asked for Commissioner's comments.

Macyauski stated that he has a problem with the front setback from the street. In Section 3.10 there is a setback from major roads (Blue Star and 109th) of 50'. He felt that for apartments, on any road there should be at least a 50' setback from front and side lines.

Discussion continued with possibilities of including Baseline as a major road, whether to include 2 family units in a 50' setback requirement or the possibility of deleting the asterisk on the HDR area. Patrick added that he had a recommendation from Bultje that the multifamily setback should be 50'.

Renee Langeland asked where the setback starts. Discussion ensued about how to determine where the setback starts.

Al Green, 87 Pershing, South Haven, asked about enclosed garages and dedicated fire lanes.

Hollee Graber asked if a side yard is 10' does this mean 10' on each house for a total of 20'. Chairman Barker said it would mean 20' total.

Macyauski was concerned that there are various terms being used such as setback line, lot line, etc., and it becomes confusing and people don't understand. Hudson replied that this is something Al Ellingsen has to deal with. Macyauski replied that when someone asks about setbacks, there is no standard language used.

Martin Super answered the question by explaining that property descriptions are not consistent. Some deal with metes and bounds, and others in a platted area deal with lot lines, so there is no good way to standardize the terms.

After much discussion, Barker said, in this case, there is a well defined road, not platted lots or metes and bounds. Terms can be addressed in the future, but for this meeting we are talking about a 50' setback for multifamily dwellings.

Fleming asked if the PC was differentiating between Baseline Road or roads within the development. Chairman Barker suggested leaving the asterisk in, and put 50' setback from Baseline Road and leave the 25' for other roads.

Langeland asked for an explanation of the discussion. Chairman Barker explained that the PC was thinking a 25' setback for single and two family, and 50' from Baseline for multifamily, with 25' setback from roads other than Baseline.

May stated that she felt there should be 50' from all roads, both Baseline Rd. and roads within the development. There will be lots of children running around, and 25' is not enough for any road.

Tricia Hennessy, 83 Pershing, South Haven asked if all four lots are owned by the same person. Chairman Barker explained that the South Haven Schools own parcels 02-086-047-00 and 02-086-049-15, where the proposed development is. Martin Super said that parcel #02-086-049-10 belongs to the Supers and they would like to request that their property *not* be included in the zoning change.

Hennessy asked if a traffic study was done.

Greg Knisley, 7421 Baseline, South Haven, asked why the developer is requesting the zoning change if the property owner is the South Haven Schools. Barker replied that the developer has an option to purchase the land contingent upon the approval to build his project.

Chairman Barker read Section 9B.04A REQUIRED CONDITIONS FOR ALL MULTIPLE-FAMILY USES which requires a total of 15 ft. between buildings when more than one is located on a single site. This is a SHAES's (South Haven Area Emergency Services) requirement.

Graber asked how it could be 15' when the PC was just talking about 25'. Hudson drew a diagram on the chalkboard to show that the 15' between buildings applies to buildings within one development.

Chairman Barker read Section 9B.04B concerning screening requirements to make multiple-family use compatible with adjacent developments and zoning districts.

Matt Super asked what would happen when buildings have 15' between them, you sell one building and the development is split; now you only have 15' between buildings on separate lots. Martin Super answered that it was all academic, the buildings could all be interconnected and this does not have any bearing on the zoning, and asked that the meeting move along.

May asked if anyone had an idea of the Allegan County Sheriff's response time in the Casco area. A couple of citizens said there is a 35 minutes average.

Martin Super said that the fire protection is excellent, but police protection is a different story. He also presented reasons for opposing the rezoning of the property in question (*Attachment #1*), including concerns of the project changing directions in time, increased crime and lack of police service, past failures of high density projects, natural habitat, unforeseen problems such as flooding, inconsistencies with surveys reflecting citizens wishes for Casco, and suggestions of how the PC could gain public support in this issue.

Al Green obtained an Allegan County Sheriff's response times for Casco Township for January 2011 thru June 2012, from Jennifer Mitchell, CAP-OM, Supervisor of Administrative Operations, Allegan County Sheriff's office and gave it to Commissioners for their reference and to show the impact that increased density would have on security. Casco is at the furthest point of the Allegan County Sheriff's coverage area. Chairman Barker stated that Casco Township is aware that there are issues with security, but the PC is not discussing that issue tonight.

May stated that although the PC is not looking at a specific proposal, and is just looking at changing the density, increasing density has a definite negative impact on security. She recalled an incident where there were 25 unsupervised under aged drinkers, and it was called into the Allegan County Sheriff Department. The Allegan Sheriff department declined to come out stating distance as the reason. She stated that not knowing what the proposal looks like, the public is hesitant to have the increased density.

Chairman Barker said that Allan Overhiser and the Board of Trustees have discussed the security issue and are aware of the problem. He pleaded that everyone come to the August 20th Board of Trustees meeting and voice their concerns about security.

Martin Super asked that the public let Chairman Barker get back to reading the proposed changes so that we can get to the public comment part of the meeting. Chairman Barker thanked him and continued. He asked Hudson and the PC for general comments.

Macyauski stated that he would be irate if the Sheriff Department refused to come to a call. Casco citizens pay for security and it should be given.

- 3 **Public Comment Correspondence** Chairman Barker read a letter (*Attachment #2*) from Rosellen and Steven Sallen, 7434 Washington Street, South Haven, MI 49090, expressing their profound opposition to the rezoning proposal.
- 4 **Public comment on possible revisions to the Casco Township Zoning Ordinances, Sections 4.07 Schedule of regulations, & 4.08 Table of Permitted Uses; Chapter 9A HDR, High Density Residential District** Chairman Barker invited public comment.

May stated that there were a multitude of people calling in to the Township to voice opposition to the zoning change. She asked if they would need to do that in print to make it a matter of public record. Chairman Barker told her that they would need to send letters before the August 20th, 2012, 7 PM Township Board Meeting.

Rita Thorpe, 7414 Washington Street, South Haven, asked if it would be noted in the minutes that there was a large group of citizens at the meeting in overwhelming opposition to the zoning change. Chairman Barker passed around a paper for the public to write down their names and addresses, and the list would be included in the minutes. (*Attachment #3*)

Diane Schlanser, 45 North Shore Drive North, South Haven, said she did not understand why there would be a regulation that allowed 100 apartments on 10 acres if there really could not be 100 apartments on 10 acres. Hudson explained that there could be 10 units (each containing 10 apartments) but it would not be desirable project, and therefore the property owner would not get a good return on his investment.

Schlanser asked if that would mean 10 sewer hookups, and what the cost would be. Martin Super stated that Casco Township would negotiate that. Chairman Barker said the Water/Sewer authority would decide how much is charged. If someone puts in a subdivision, there is a reduction in the hookup cost. The developer would be charged about 50% (\$10,000/ hookup).

Diane Schlanser said that in the past a developer did not go through the proper channels, and until we solve the water/flooding problems we have, we should not approve more.

Dennis McKenzie, 7441 Washington Street, South Haven gave the PC a written request (*Attachment #4*) for information pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. He is requesting copies of all notes/inquiries by any private party to have the following parcels rezoned: #02-086-049-00 owned by Connie Schafer & Henry Hendrix; #02-086-049-10 owned by Matt & Anna Super Trust; and parcels #02-086-049-15 and 02-086-047-00 both owned by South Haven Public Schools. He also requests all studies the township has pursued to analyzing the impacts of this considered rezoning. He also requests copies of all minutes/notes relative to any Storm Water Examination/Study addressing the impact of this rezoning effort and planned development with regard to the unresolved West Wing flooding problems encountered by both Columbine & Washington residents that has existed for over 10 years.

Matt Martin, McKenzie, Schlansers and several others stated that there has been a serious flooding problem since the school was built. Matt Martin stated that his business is ½ of what it was before the school went in because of flooding at his campground.

McKenzie asked if anyone has checked into the flooding problem on Washington. Several people are impacted by flooding. He questioned what the township has done and how the problem will be solved. He asked why the Township is crafting a high density zone for a project that hasn't even been approved.

May stated there needs to be a feasibility study of traffic. The HDR District would be right next to the school. There are 200 cars coming in and out from the schools every day already and with another 100 or 125 right next to the school, traffic safety is a very big concern. She had a child who was killed in an accident. She stated that no one signed off about how the water would be handled at the school or the Columbine project and now there is a water runoff problem. There needs to be Police, Fire, and Engineering studies done before there is any zoning change.

Greg Knisley, 7421 Baseline, South Haven, stated that he lives two properties away from the proposed development. While the water and sewer is expensive, passing the zoning change to pay for the water and sewer is not a good reason. He stated that water and sewer go all the way out to 107th and questioned why all the development should be packed into the southwest corner of the township. He stated that the commercial property is on North Shore Drive. He discussed traffic on Baseline when school is coming and going. It's tough to get in and out of there. There needs to be a traffic light. He stated that he has walked Baseline many times picking up trash from the complex across the street. He said property owners are not the ones littering the trash, just the people in the apartments.

Harry Hendrix and Connie Schaffer, 735 North Shore Drive, South Haven, (owners of parcel 02-086-049-00) said there has been lots of discussion why it makes sense not to rezone anything right now. He said all citizens attending the meeting would support not changing the zoning. He went on to say that his family owned the property since 1980, before the middle school. He would like consideration given to his long standing and opinion. Rezoning would reduce his property value. He said he would not have bought the property for his retirement home if he knew the zoning would be changed. Their dream of building their retirement home on the property would not come true. He also said McKenzie's statement about "crafting" was a good choice of words. There are other appropriate places besides the southwest corner of Casco-- this place that already has challenges with drainage.

Martin Super asked Enders if he was asking not to be included in the zoning change. Enders replied that it would depend on what they do with the school property, and was unsure what would be in his best interest.

Chairman Barker said that if the rezoning went forward, it is Enders' option to stay in the change or be excluded from it. It would not change anything for him on his property if it is rezoned. Enders answered that if it is rezoned, it will take away his plans for a retirement home, and decrease his property value, and affect his ability to sell. Hudson told Enders that he would have to make a decision now, but if he goes with the rezoning it would not change his ability to put up a single family home. Connie Shaffer stated that rezoning would be taking away their dream.

Norm Fouts, 09200 68th Street, South Haven, said that if Enders and Shaffer remove their property from the rezoning area, the proposed rezoning could not be done because it would become spot zoning.

Pete Klan, 7438 Washington Street, South Haven said he was in Land Planning for over 50 years. In 2003 all that was talked about was low density in the area. In 2004 it went to medium density, now in 2012 there is talk about dropping an area of high density into it.

Al Green asked how South Haven Public Schools can sell property that belongs to taxpayers. Macyauski said that the school has the authority to sell.

Fleming asked if it is true that if Hendrix and Schaffer withdraw their property from the rezoning area, the property could not be rezoned because it would be considered spot zoning. The PC and Planner were unsure, and would need to check into it.

Hendrix stated that he and Schaffer would like to exclude their property from the proposed rezoning.

Tom Mucha, 749 North Shore Drive, South Haven, said similar things are going on in the South Haven City limits. As development has been done the water situation had become horrible in front of houses on North Shore Drive. When the city was asked why the water was there, they said they have a sewer problem. When asked when it would be fixed, they were told there is about 5 years of needed repairs. The City of South Haven's problem is not nearly as bad as Casco. He mentioned similar developments that have failed and wondered, as a past developer, why a developer would want to build in a location where several similar developments have failed.

Eric Schlanser asked why it is in the Master Plan to develop this particular area. Liepe answered that "if" there were to be a high density area in Casco, it would be in that corner of the township because it is close to South Haven and has water and sewer. Chairman Barker added that the roads and utilities are there. Liepe again stressed "if" you were to have HDR district, that would be the area.

Macyauski said it is important that a high density area be close to the schools, commerce, and hospitals. He said he heard the name "low income housing", and doesn't think it has anything to do with low income, government subsidized housing. He said he has heard the words "affordable housing" associated with the proposed apartment project.

May stated that there have been 3 similar projects that have failed already, and there is no jurisdiction on what happens after they fail. She said her house was built on weekends, on Washington Street, where there is peace and quiet. If she had wanted to live by 450 people she would not have built there. Now they are looking at having their dream for retirement crushed. She emphasized that the people do not want this and questioned why Casco would consider it at all. She asked that everyone write a letter, in print, to the Township Board stating that this is not their vision for Casco.

Martin Graber said, as an environmentalist, why are we taking down all those trees that are supplying our oxygen. He pleaded that developments go out further where there are not so many trees to be cut down. He also stated that after hearing what has been said tonight, he doesn't see how the Board could possibly add the High Density Residential area.

Anna Super said that no one in the room would oppose senior housing, single family, or duplexes, but not a large apartment complex.

Cindy Human, 39 Lincoln Avenue, South Haven, said the point has been made over and over again, "If" we are ever going to have high density..... Yes, it is in the Master Plan, but we don't have a need for high density. Why take down trees and upset home owners.

Martin Super said that it is not within the PC's ability to approve this. It is within the PC's ability to say they do not recommend this.

Liepe stated that the amount of single young people might be one reason to have high density apartments. One thing we do not have in Casco is a place for young adults. On the other hand, I have heard concerns about water and drainage. I would like to look at that prior to a zoning change.

Stroud said the PC is here to support the people. They say they don't want it. Why do it.

Fleming said he would like the flooding problem looked into. The technology for the way water runs is pretty simple. Also, look into the spot zoning issue.

Macyauski said the flooding issue was the lack of due diligence on the part of the PC when the School was built. Barker stated that the City owns the school and it did not come before the Planning Commission. Macyauski went on to say that flooding issues can be simple issues to solve most of the time, but somebody has to take responsibility for it. He stated that he is quite pleased with the development in Casco. He also said that the issue of spot zoning needs to be put to rest before going any further.

Chairman Barker said that this is the first time in 20 years that a Master Plan or Zoning Ordinance have water and sewer to consider. It has driven how we act as a township and the decisions that we have to make. The PC has tried to incorporate it over the last years. The Master Plan started over the last two years. Sometimes there was good attendance, sometimes not. It's not always pretty, but the whole spirit is to get input from everyone. In that regard he invited Gary Jonna to speak.

Jonna addressed the issue of storm water and runoff on the proposed site. Water will be trapped in basins and runoff will be controlled at the same rate that exists now. There will be sedimentation control. Elaborate standards will be in place. He assured everyone that his development on this site will not increase flooding. Casco did not have a multifamily ordinance in the community. All social and economic groups should be accommodated. His rental housing will be reputable, attractive, with pride and well managed. The fact is that the township book has a chapter for manufactured housing. There has to be housing that will appeal to everyone. Everything does not look like a snapshot of today. Meijer stores are built; along Lake Michigan magnificent housing has been built. The next cycle will occur, more jobs, additional family units. There needs to be housing to accommodate. Jonna said he has been trying to get his project approved for 6 months. He has answered many questions. His project is consistent with the Master Plan. He has been in a lot of rooms like this (with public opposing his project). Professionals have been involved at every level in a high quality fashion concerning security, and flooding, etc. The particular site has water and sewer, access to Blue Star Highway and is between two freeway exits. If everybody would drive down Baseline, on the South Haven side are senior housing and other projects. The Preserve at Woodland Harbor cannot be compared to this development. There is a lack of high caliber *rentals*. It would be a place for seniors or families next to the schools. He said he is not pursuing low income housing, but high quality, attractive, well built rentals. Jonna has been a Real Estate Developer for four decades and he does not take comments personally, but notes concerns and has respect for everyone's opinion.

Chairman Barker said the respect shown during the meeting is to be commended. The PC's job is to make some decisions. Everyone's input is important. He appreciated how everyone listened and showed respect to one another. That kind of discussion is what we need. He went on to say he urges everyone to attend at least one meeting a quarter to keep up with what is going on and give input.

Campbell said he has three concerns. Security is a major concern. The ability of the roads to handle the traffic flow is another. The third question is ***the impact on adequate drainage in the neighborhood.*** ~~If~~ If the school owns the property, has it been annexed into the City of South Haven? Could it be annexed into the City? Hudson answered there would be a problem annexing the property into the City because of property in between the parcels.

Chairman Barker said the attorney can get the information on spot zoning. Drainage and water needs to be addressed.

Macyauski addressed Jonna's statement that Casco doesn't have an area for multifamily dwellings, but in the MDR district multifamily homes are allowed.

Hudson said the argument could be made that while the use was allowed, the restrictions were effectively exclusionary (allowing 6 family dwellings, not 10). Macyauski said if there were 10 family dwellings allowed, someone would want 15.

Chairman Barker said he does not have any major concerns about the roads. He does have questions on security and the type of support that would be possible from South Haven Police. If we get into high density, there is going to be more activity and this requires some response. Allan Overhiser has talked about it many times.

Hudson said he was in Transportation for 15 years before becoming a planner. Capacity, service, width of pavement, width of shoulder and amount of traffic, are things the Road Commission should be able to figure out based on number of daily trips.

- 5 **Resolutions requiring Planning Commission action:** Chairman Barker suggested that the PC not make a recommendation to the Township Board of Trustees at this time. He will check with the attorney on the spot zoning issue and if we need to have a high density area. Hudson will check on the traffic issue for the area. Security and water drainage will need to go before the board. Discussion on this will continue on August 27th at 6:00 PM.

A motion was made by Macyauski, 2nd by Campbell to adjourn. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.

The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission will be August 6th, 2012, at 7:00.

The next special meeting of the Planning Commission will be August 27th, 2012 at 6:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Janet Chambers, Recording Secretary

Attachment #1: Martin Super, July 30, 2012, Re: HDR

Attachment #2: Letter from Rosellen and Steven Sallen, July 30, 2012, Re: Opposition to rezoning

Attachment #3: Public in Attendance 07-30-12

Attachment #4: Dennis McKenzie, July 30, 2012, Re: FOIA

Rezoning concerns presented to Casco Township Planning Commission 7/30/12

By Martin Super on behalf of Matt & Anna Super 7366 North Shore Dr. (adjacent property owners)

We oppose rezoning of the property in question to the R-5 zone for the following reasons:

#1. Pandora's Box

Once zoned R-5 just about anything can be built on the property. Any "visions" or "plans" of the developer can easily be changed to allow for low-income housing, subsidized housing, or any other undesirable development.

#2. Crime

It's a fact; cram people together into a small area and your crime rate skyrockets. There are a few low-income residences already in the area. Jensen's campground has had over a dozen break-ins by people on foot. We do not need more. The fact we are the farthest parcel away from the Allegan County Sheriff's Department means our response time is horrendous. We are being told to support this development to increase property value. What happens if it becomes a low-income development? How will that affect value?

#3. Past Failure of High-Density

Rentals in the South Haven area have never worked as anything other than low-income, high-crime areas. Those who can afford to own; do. Those who cannot; rent. Affordable housing is on the other side of I-196.

Lifestyles of South Haven and Lighthouse Village was a development proposed exactly as this one. What actually went in, and what was proposed, were two different things. The development failed miserably and now the property is a ¼ finished eyesore. This is only two miles away from the parcel in question. High density housing should be in city centers with adjacent commercial and employment opportunities, and a close and active police / emergency services force.

#4. Community Atmosphere

Despite new home construction, the natural feel of the neighborhood has been maintained. Deer, fox, turkeys, and all manners of wildlife live in the area. An R-5 zone would totally destroy that natural habitat. This land can be developed without destroying the neighborhood and making it into a "dead zone".

#5. Unforeseen Consequences

We did not oppose the construction of the new schools in the area. However if we knew that it would flood the campground every Spring we might have. If we have similar issues with this development, who will defend us? Maybe we can avoid these issues now?

#6. Notes from the Master Plan.

Goal: The Township should preserve its rural character in future planning while protecting natural resources. (PG 4)

Objective: Utilize overlay zoning for the entire length of the Lake Michigan shoreline, limited to the bluff face and a limited distance inland, to protect both the rights of property owners and the adjacent owners.

Goal: Casco should emphasize its role as a rural residential community for seasonal & year-round residences. (PG 5)

Objective: Direction will be given to developers of multiple units/multiple parcels to preserve open space, natural features, wetlands, and wildlife. Township leaders will clearly communicate to developers the Master Plan vision, goals and objectives including minimum development criteria enforced by strong zoning.

IMPLEMENTATION (pg 19)

-Zoning Ordinance revisions: "The Township Zoning Ordinance must be updated". "In addition, available tools such as planned unit development"

MOST IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS (PG 52)

- Low Crime Rate (#1)
- Quiet (#2)
- Attractive Surroundings (#3)
- Privacy (#4)
- Rural Atmosphere (#5)

MAJOR PROBLEMS

- Too Much Development (#3)
- Long Range Planning (#5)

HOUSING NEEDS (PG 53)

1. Moderate \$ Single Family
2. Senior
3. High \$ Single Family
4. Low \$ Single Family
5. Condos (low)
6. Low Income (very low)
7. Manufactured Housing (very low)
8. Apartment (very low)

Suggestions to gain our support:

- #1. Add "Planned Unit Development" (PUD) into the Zoning ordinances.
- #2. Have the developer create a development plan to be reviewed at a public hearing.
- #3. Have the plan include what the people of Casco Township want: Moderate Single Family, Senior, and High Single Family residential. We would support high-density for Senior housing ONLY.
- #4. Have the development plan reject low-income housing and subsidized housing. Create a section of the plan to deal with negative effects on surrounding property owners.

#5. Include a section in the development plan to hold the developer and any associated companies responsible for cleanup and restoration of the property if the development fails during construction or while in an early phase.

#6. Have the development plan include detailed infrastructure plans so that neighboring properties are not affected.

#7. Attach the plan to the deed of the property and re-zone to a PUD.