

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MINUTES OF THE MAY 20, 2021 REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 20, 2021, at 7:00 p.m., at the Roselle Park Resource Building, 1010 Grand River Dr. NE, Ada MI

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Butterfield, Carter, Easter, Heglund, Jacobs, Korth

Absent: Burton

Staff Present: Buckley, Ferro, Suchy

Others Present: 7

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Easter, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE MARCH 30, 2021 SPECIAL MEETING**

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Carter, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**V. PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Request for Special Use Permit to Allow an Accessory Building with a Sidewall Height of 12 feet, in Excess of Maximum Permitted 10 feet, per Sec. 78-20(5) of the Zoning Regulations, 6252 Knapp Street NE, Parcel No. 41-15-08-426-019, Steven W. Baird

Applicant, Steve Baird, 6252 Knapp Street, presented his request for a Special Use Permit. Mr. Baird stated that it has been his desire to build a hobby shop for retirement to have the opportunity to work on his interests in woodworking, car/truck restoration, some metal fabrication, as well as additional storage for travel/utility trailer and full-size truck. Mr. Baird described the proposed 1,200 sq. ft. building and explained the conflicts with the sidewall height restriction of 10 ft. Mr. Baird referred to the drawings he submitted and said with the requested 12 ft. sidewall height it would allow for the storage trusses for the upstairs storage (with 10/12' pitch) and maximize all of the inside space for future needs and potential activities.

Ferro summarized the staff memo included in the packet. Ferro stated the proposed building is a 30' x 40' accessory building with sidewall height of 12 ft. The rules/regulations permit a 10 ft. sidewall height with no approval required, and also provide that the Planning Commission can authorize a sidewall height greater than 10 ft. with a special use permit process. Ferro said the standard for the Planning Commission to use for deciding whether to authorize greater than 10 ft. sidewall height is whether the size, height, design and appearance of the building will be compatible with the character of the surrounding area. Ferro shared details of other accessory buildings in the area and said the proposed building would be inconspicuous.

Korth opened the public hearing at 7:22 p.m. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Korth referred to the letter submitted from Dave Hayhurst, at 6248 Knapp St., a neighbor of the applicant. Korth stated that Mr. Hayhurst appears to be the most directly impacted neighbor and his letter is very supportive of the application.

Korth stated that a 10 ft. door is needed for this application and you need a 12 ft. sidewall to do a proper rolling door.

Butterfield said that given that the one neighbor most affected was in support, she would be in favor of approval.

Moved by Heglund, supported by Carter, to approve the Special Use Permit, subject to the following condition:

1. Any building-mounted exterior lighting shall be of a non-glaring style, with the fixture specification subject to review and approval by the Planning Department staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

Motion passed unanimously.

## **VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none**

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Final PUD Plan, 3 2-Family Dwellings and 1 1-Family Dwelling on a .6 Acre Site in the VR/PUD Zoning District, 7518 & 7524 Fase Street, Parcel Nos. 41-15-34-179-002 & 003, Ufuk Turan

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, 523 Ada Drive, presented the Final PUD Plan request, on behalf of Mr. Turan. Dixon went over the history of the application. Dixon stated that at the Preliminary PUD meeting there were conditions required to be met and those changes were made. Dixon provided details on landscaping plans, lighting, elevations, stormwater maintenance, and driveway design.

Ferro summarized the staff memo and said the Preliminary PUD approval was subject to conditions to be met and refinements were made that were requested. Ferro went over the details of refinements made; shifting the easternmost building to protect the large oak tree, more detailed landscape plans, elevation drawings, details of the storm water management system, and revised driveway openings.

Ferro recommended approval of the Final PUD Plan, subject to the conditions listed in the staff memo.

There was board discussion regarding favorable details on the renderings, shared positive comments about the design allowing more diversity, and alternate landscaping options with a softened transition between the old existing building and the new ones.

Korth pointed out a discrepancy in the architectural drawings concerning the fireplace chimney materials, with masonry being shown on one drawing and not the other.

Dixon stated that the design of landscape is negotiable.

Moved by Carter, supported by Easter, to approve the Final PUD Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approved PUD Plan shall be carried out in substantial conformance with the following documents submitted by the applicant, except as modified by these conditions of approval: Plan sheets C-201, C-205, C-300 and C-400, dated May 12, 2021, prepared by Nederveld, and Sheets A1.1, A2.1, A4.1, A4.2, A4.3, and A5.1, dated April 28, 2021 and Sheet L1.1, dated May 11, 2021, prepared by Dixon Architecture.

2. The Landscape Plan Sheet L1.1 shall be modified prior to issuance of any building permits by removing the proposed Capital Pear trees and adding a canopy tree of minimum 2 ½” caliper in the front yard of each of the 3 westernmost home sites of a species approved by the Planning Department.
3. A storm water permit application and accompanying construction plans for a storm water management system that discharges to the existing storm beneath Fase Street, shall be submitted, subject to review and approval of a permit by the Planning Department, prior to initiation of site improvements.
4. Floodplain development permits shall be issued by the Michigan EGLE and Ada Township, prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. The submittal and subsequent approval of either a Land Division Application or Condominium Documents, prior to issuance of any building permits. If the lots are to be established as a condominium project, the condominium master deed, condominium subdivision plan and condominium bylaws shall be submitted to the Planning Director for review and determination that they are consistent with the approved plan and these conditions, prior to their being recorded with the Kent County Register of Deeds.
6. The landscape plan shall be modified to provide evergreen screening between the westernmost building and the Georgie’s Consignment Shop property.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Final PUD Plan for 16 Single-Family Home Sites on 4 Acre Site, in the R-3/PUD Zoning District, 7699 Fase Street SE, Parcel No. 41-15-34-402-008, Chuck Hoyt, on behalf of TPR 7699 Fase Street LLC

Applicant, Chuck Hoyt, presented details of the updated plans. Hoyt said he provided new plans to include the addition of a 5 ft. sidewalk, storm water management infiltration system, lighting, architecture, and landscaping. Hoyt said he reviewed the staff memo provided and accepts the conditions listed as part of an approval.

Ferro stated that the additional details to the development plan have been provided that include the sidewalk with a striped crosswalk, the “Due Care Plan” submitted to the State, and more specific landscape plans were submitted with the canopy trees re-located behind the sidewalk. Ferro pointed out that one deficiency of the landscape plan is that a specific species list was not included and will need to be provided prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ferro recommended approval of the Final PUD Plan, subject to the conditions listed in the staff memo. Ferro went over the list of conditions.

There was board discussion regarding street lighting, setbacks for construction of an accessory building, and the functionality of the dog run area.

Hoyt described details of the essential elements of the proposed homes.

Easter expressed her excitement for more living spaces and shared her appreciation to Mr. Hoyt (and his team) for a job well done.

Moved by Carter, supported by Jacobs, to approve the Final PUD Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approved PUD Plan shall be carried out in substantial conformance with the following documents submitted by the applicant, except as modified by these conditions of approval:

Plan sheets C-205, C-300, C-400, C-401 and L-201, dated 5-10-21, prepared by Nederveld, Inc., and Sheets P-1, P-2 and P-3, dated 4-21-21, prepared by Omega Construction.

2. The landscape plan Sheet L-201 shall be revised to identify species of plant materials, prior to issuance of any building permits.
3. The General Notes on Sheet C-205 shall be modified to add the following:
  - Construction of accessory buildings on lots 1-8 shall be subject to the zoning ordinance standards applicable to the VR district, and construction of accessory buildings on lots 9-16 shall be subject to the standards applicable to the R3 zoning district.
4. A storm water permit application and accompanying construction plans for the storm water management system shall be submitted, subject to review and approval of a permit by the Planning Department, prior to initiation of site improvements.
5. Construction plans for public water and sewer main extensions shall be subject to issuance of required State permits and approval by the Utilities Director, prior to initiation of site improvements, and prior to issuance of building permits.
6. The condominium master deed, condominium subdivision plan and condominium bylaws shall be submitted to the Planning Director for review and determination that they are consistent with the approved plan and these conditions, prior to their being recorded with the Kent County Register of Deeds.
  - Homes with 3-garage stalls shall be permitted on lots 8 and 16 only.

## **VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER / STAFF REPORTS**

1. Proposed Amendment to Sign Regulations for the C-1 Zoning District, to increase permitted number of “projecting signs” from one to two, under certain circumstances

Ferro stated due to a recent inquiry from a business owner in regards to wanting to install two projecting signs instead of one, staff is proposing a draft amendment to the sign regulations. Currently only one projecting sign is permitted in C-1 village Business zoning district.

Ferro said there are a lot of businesses with store frontage on two different sidewalk frontages. Ferro stated it is staff’s opinion that projecting/blade type signs are an effective alternative to a larger sized wall sign and add a vibrant streetscape.

Ferro referred to the draft amendment in the packet and said the key wording is, “One projecting sign per non-shared entrance to a business or two projecting signs per business, whichever is greater.”

There was board discussion regarding the current number of signs allowed, different options for multiple signs for a business with multiple entrances, and the set standard for the square footage requirement within the sign regulations.

In further discussion, the Commission concurred that the language/verbage of the proposed amendment needs more research and Ferro would refine the language for the Commission to review at the next regular meeting.

**2. Proposed Amendment to Sign Regulations, to add an exemption from regulation and permitting for wall murals that do not contain commercial speech or content**

Ferro stated the township has been approached about the possibility of an artistic mural being installed on the south wall of Beyond Bill and Paul's building at 551 Settlers Drive. Ferro referred to the information included in the packet regarding the artist and the specific location of the proposed mural; the wall is on the Beyond Bill and Paul's building, adjacent to a driveway access to the parking lot.

Ferro stated that our current sign regulations do not contain any provisions specific to non-commercial works of art such as murals.

There was board discussion about the contents allowed/appropriate in the mural, the timing-when they would want to install it, and whether legal counsel input is required to be sure murals are not in violation. Commissioners were in favor of the mural art samples included in the packet.

Korth suggested postponing further discussion regarding the two proposed amendments until the June 17 meeting, at which time the public hearing would be scheduled.

In further discussion, the Commission concurred with the Chair's proposal to schedule a special meeting for Tuesday, June 1, at 3:00 p.m. to consider the PUD Pre-Application Conference for the 7500 East Fulton St. property.

**3. Planning Commission Annual Report**

Ferro referred to the annual report included in the packet and said it is a summary report of the Planning Commission activities within the past year.

**VII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Glen and Julie Jandernoa, 681 ~~Geenslate~~ Greenslate, expressed concern about their unpleasant experience in the new development at Riverpoint of Ada. Mr. Jandernoa stated that they are relatively new in the community and want to be able to offer some type of input for people moving into the new development on Fase Street which is by the same developer of Riverpoint.

Ferro suggested Mr. and Mrs. Jandernoa schedule an appointment with the township manager and himself to discuss their concern.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Carter, supported by Easter, to adjourn meeting at 9:06 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jacqueline Smith, Ada Township Clerk

rs:eb