



**ADA TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES OF THE TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2022 REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Ada Township Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 4:30 p.m. at the Ada Township Hall, 7330 Thornapple River Dr. SE, Ada, Michigan

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by McNamara at 4:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Members present: Burton, Courtade, McNamara, Nuttall, Smith

Members absent: 0

Staff Present: Bajdek, Said

Others Present: 10

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Burton, supported by Nuttall, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 7, 2022 REGULAR MEETING

Moved by Nuttall, supported by Burton, to approve the June 7, 2022, meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Request for variances for parking, driveway/road, and easement dimensions (sizes, widths, and lengths) and cul-de-sac requirements for a new residential development, 7535 and 7567 Fase Street SE, Mosaic Properties, Brad Rottschafer, Parcel Nos. 41-15-34-180-008 and 41-15-34-200-036**

Jack Barr, Project Engineer with Nederveld, presented the request for 7 variances and said that 4 were related to parking, and 3 were related to private roads.

Mr. Barr said the proposed development was in the PVM zoning district, with an underlying zoning classification of R-3 and that their PVM development plan has been submitted and is scheduled to be reviewed at the September 15 Planning Commission meeting. He said their intent was to create a development in a walkable community adding on to the existing downtown Ada area and shared that their challenge was the amount of limited space on the property due to flood plain and flood way

issues. He explained that based on the size of the property, there were only 7 acres that were developable/buildable, therefore he went through each of the variance requests and provided the details for their purpose (refer to applicant's narrative included in the packet).

Said summarized the staff report and stated that the project was intended to be a small, urban design, that offers a walkable community and provides a traffic-calming aspect with slower traffic on the internal streets. He explained that the PVM Overlay District requirements encourage creativity of design and mix of uses within its boundaries, and said that from a staff perspective, the project meets that requirement. Said also noted that per the Fire Chief's request, the applicant added a proposed fire lane connection to enhance emergency access and he pointed out the location on the drawing.

Said concluded that staff believed the criteria for the requests have been met and support approval of the variance requests.

McNamara opened the public hearing at 5:44 p.m. There was no public comment and the public hearing was closed.

Burton stated that she agreed with the staff analysis, that a development under those conditions where the space was limited within the PVM District and would be connected to the downtown area, that the Planning Commission should take a look at the current requirements (parking space sizes and driveway widths) and consider possibly amending the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

There was ZBA member and Planning Staff discussion regarding the zoning of the village area vs. zoning for the proposed plan and Said briefly explained the PVM Overlay District, the density allowed in certain areas/zoning regulations, and how it was related to road right-of-way. Said concurred that the Planning Commission could review the current zoning requirements and may find a need to amend.

Smith thanked the applicant and said the information in the application packet, narrative and maps, were very helpful.

Moved by Courtade, supported by Smith, to approve the variance requests as follows:

- Two-way parking aisle for parallel parking spaces of 20 feet (Sec. 78-786(9) requires 24 feet).
- To allow vehicles to back into the street for 9 perpendicular spaces (Sec. 78-786(8) prohibits design of off-street parking backing into street).
- Two-way drive aisle for parallel and perpendicular parking of 20 feet (Sec. 78-786(9) requires 24 feet for parallel spaces and 26 feet for perpendicular spaces).
- Parallel parking space dimensions of 8-foot widths and 22-foot lengths (Sec. 78-786(9) requires 9 x 23 spaces).
- Private road easement of 40-foot width (Sec. 78-804(c)(1) requires a minimum 66-foot width).

- A private road width of 20 feet (Sec. 78-804 (c)(5)(e) requires a pavement width to comply with County Road Commission requirements, which vary (varies from 28 to 30 feet for local roads) for new streets).
- To allow for a y-turn terminus drive (Sec. 78-804(d) requires a cul-de-sac or loop road for access).

Motion carried by roll call vote 5-0.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE – none

Said gave an update on the Master Plan process and noted that with all of the public meetings and the surveys completed there was participation from over 500 people in the community. He said the next steps would be goal setting and taking a look at various areas of the township and expect to have the official plans completed by next summer.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT - none

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Nuttall, supported by Burton, to adjourn meeting at 4:58 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith
Ada Township Clerk

rs:eb