

**ADA TOWNSHIP  
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 A.M. by Chairperson Bob Kullgren, at the Ada Township office, 7330 Thornapple River Dr., Ada, MI.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Terry Bowersox, George Haga, Bryan Harrison, Jim Ippel, Bob Kullgren, Devin Norman, Walt VanderWulp, Ted Wright

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved by consent.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 2015 MEETING.**

Norman commented that the minutes did not reflect that staff indicated the parking study would be completed in a couple of weeks. Kullgren stated that could be added.

Norman stated the minutes did also not indicate that the reconstruction of Ada Drive is scheduled for 2017, and did not contain detail regarding the implementation tasks that were contained in a handout and discussed, including completing the parking study, review and approval of River St. design, and completing planning and design of public amenities.

Kullgren indicated the minutes would be amended to reflect that.

It was moved by Bowersox, seconded by Ippel, to approve the minutes of the August 17 meeting, subject to the corrections noted by Norman.

Motion passed unanimously.

**DDA FINANCIAL REPORT, 08/31/15**

Kullgren stated there was very little financial activity in August, other than Farmers' Market activity.

**PROPOSAL FROM PROGRESSIVE AE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTUAL PLANS FOR PUBLIC AMENITIES, INCLUDING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS.**

Kullgren presented a proposal from Progressive AE to facilitate a planning study involving stakeholders in more specifically identifying the public amenities that will be developed on land that will become public space as part of the Village redevelopment effort. Kullgren stated the Progressive AE team members assigned to the project were all part of the Envision Ada project team.

Kullgren summarized comments from Ferro regarding the proposed scope of work, and stated that Progressive AE has agreed to modify the proposal to address those comments.

Kullgren stated that the process is expected to result in preliminary recommendations to the DDA Board at the November meeting, and a final report presented for approval at the December DDA Board meeting.

Kullgren stated this proposal resulted from discussions between he, Haga, Ferro and our bond counsel regarding the need for more detailed information in order to develop and present to this Board, the Township Board and the public a proposed financing plan and bond issue for the public amenity projects.

Kullgren invited questions and comments on the proposal.

It was noted the proposal for the approximate \$19,000 expenditure on the project would be presented to the Township Board on September 28, with a request for cost sharing between the DDA and Township funds.

Harrison asked whether this process would conclusively determine proposed amenities in the next 90 days, or would the process continue into next year, after portions of the road network are completed and it is easier to visualize the space available for public facilities.

Kullgren stated the public amenities would be developed with a sufficient level of detail to more accurately identify estimated costs, and give the public a better idea of what is proposed.

Kullgren stated we will know the proposed physical location of the proposed River St. soon, which will allow us to visualize the space available for river corridor amenities such as the proposed amphitheater.

Harrison asked if a bond issue would require a vote. Haga responded that after the Township Board passes a resolution of intent to issue a capital improvements bond, there is a right of referendum to call for a public vote.

Kullgren stated the parking study outcome is an important consideration in this process, since there may be a need for public resources to address parking needs. Kullgren stated he has suggested that the public input process for the amenities study be combined with public presentation and input regarding the parking study and recommendations.

Harrison asked whether the parking study would take into account parking demand created by public amenities. Kullgren stated that would be discussed with the parking consultant.

Harrison commented the proposal boilerplate seems tilted in favor of the contractor.

Kullgren stated we would compare these provisions to the provisions that were agreed upon for the original Envision Ada contract, and ensure that those provisions are used.

VanderWulp stated we need to be careful in the planning of proposed private roads, with respect to who is responsible for maintaining them.

Wright stated we need to be careful that we don't convey a message of "bait and switch" to the public with regard to the amenities package. As an example, Wright cited the possibility of the location of the River St. resulting in no room being available for an amphitheater. He stated we should have known 2 years ago that a large area of land in the green space next to Fulton St. would be occupied by storm water storage area.

Kullgren stated we would know in short order where the River St. is located, and will be able to evaluate its acceptability.

Harrison asked whether storm water management for private development adjacent to the River St. would be handled on private land, and not pushed onto the public land. Kullgren stated he didn't think we were far enough into that.

Kullgren presented the square footage projections that have been developed by Rockford Construction for Amway, which are being provided to the parking consultant for analysis of future parking needs.

In review and discussion of the development layout and projections, concern was expressed by Wright that the private layout development and River St. location should not shortchange or compromise our riverfront public amenity goals.

Following discussion, it was moved by Bowersox, seconded by Harrison, to approve the Progressive AE proposal for a public amenities planning process, subject to revisions as requested in Ferro's communication, and subject to revision of the contract general provisions, with cost shared equally between the DDA and Township.

Motion passed by 7-0 vote, with Norman abstaining.

## **REVIEW OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTIONS**

In discussion of the square footage projections included in Ferro's communication, Kullgren stated he was struck by the substantial amount of commercial development depicted. Kullgren reviewed the summary square footage data for commercial and residential development contained in the table prepared by Ferro.

Wright stated we need to know and consider the implications of the projections for traffic generation and congestion in the Village.

VanderWulp expressed concern that the one-way portion of Thornapple River Dr. would create traffic problems.

Norman commented that the market will play a role in determining how much of the development depicted is feasible from a parking standpoint, and that if we get the amenities right, the market will figure out the rest of it.

Kullgren pointed out Ferro's cover memo invites Board comment and input on the projections, as well as public input. He stated that if our reaction is this is too much, that needs to be voiced.

VanderWulp commented we can have a pass-through town or a destination town, and these projections depict a destination town, not a pass-through town. Kullgren stated we are bound to be both. He stated we are limited in our transportation options by both rivers.

Ippel expressed concern that we not vary too much from the original Envision Ada Plan. That has already happened with the green space adjacent to Fulton St., and it sounds like that is a possibility with the riverfront green space. He is afraid that the plan will be changed piece-by-piece and in a few years, we won't recognize it. He asked whether this is under the purview of the DDA Board or the Planning Commission.

Haga responded this would be a function of the Planning Commission, in applying the form-based zoning rules. Haga responded that Ferro is in the process of getting the plan in front of the Planning Commission for review and adoption.

Kullgren stated the question before the DDA Board is whether the development depicted in the square footage projections conforms in a general sense with what we anticipated. What are our

individual views, and do we have a collective view?

Ippel suggested we may need to slow down the process in order to avoid having decisions made too quickly, without DDA Board input. He cited as an example the loss of usable green space on Headley St. due to storm water storage.

Ippel also expressed concern that individual development projects will result in creation of parking problems. He mentioned the Planning Commission's waiving of parking requirements for new restaurants on Ada Drive.

Kullgren stated that the graphic projection of building square footage is for use in projecting parking needs only at this point, and is not a specific development proposal. He stated we need to give the parking consultant some idea of what the mix and amount of various land uses might be.

Harrison suggested we should focus on our reaction to the scale of development depicted in the square footage projections graphic, and its relationship to the character of the community. Would we want to see what's depicted here in the next 5 years?

Kullgren stated the projections have been provided to the parking consultant. He added Ferro would be requested to provide an update to the Board regarding the status of the parking study, and a timeline for its completion.

Harrison suggested we have a process for communication to all concerned parties regarding the progress of these studies, and ensure everyone is brought into the conversation. He asked whether use of these square footage projections would be taken as an endorsement of the projections.

Kullgren stated he agreed with the need for communication, and that having the parking study in hand would be desirable. He stated he sees these projections as a starting point for evaluating parking needs, and nothing more.

Ippel requested that the following items be addressed: 1) that Ferro be requested to provide next month any information available regarding traffic projections for the Village; 2) that any future changes regarding infrastructure or green space to the plan be brought to the DDA Board, and 3) that when the parking study is completed, a joint meeting be held with the Planning Commission to discuss the implications of the projected buildout of the Village.

Haga suggested the Township Board be included in the meeting.

Norman requested that the draft minutes be provided as soon as possible.

Ippel suggested taking public comment at this time, before moving to the Farmer's Market discussion.

Jeff Hugger, owner Ada Grill, stated the scope of the parking problem is enormous, and needs to be addressed. He is concerned that in the future there will continue to be a lack of enforcement of the existing parking requirements. He emphasized that the need for parking in the future needs to be addressed.

Kullgren stated that it should be fairly easy to assess parking needs from an ordinance standpoint, in addition to the parking consultant's analysis. He also stated that the parking study needs to address problems that may currently exist with respect to parking, and suggest possible solutions.

Hugger commented that there is a lot of discussion regarding the old Ada and the new Ada. We need to not neglect the current core of the Village.

### **FARMERS' MARKET FALL FESTIVAL EVENT STATUS**

Jennie MacAnaspie distributed an updated budget for a fall festival event. She described the focus of the event being on a food tent, with a possible barbeque contest, a band, and a small artisan market, with a planned date of Thursday, October 22, from 3 to 9 pm. She proposed locating the event on current Headley St., using The Community Church parking area for parking.

Concerns were addressed with potential conflict from adjacent street construction, and blocking of Headley St., which is still officially open to local traffic.

Jennie stated locating the event in the church parking lot would take up needed parking, and she would like to locate the event close to the current Farmers' Market location.

Kullgren questioned whether the event needs to be carried out this year as a fund-raising event, in order for the Market to break even.

MacAnaspie responded that the Market is limited in its ability to generate additional revenue from its operations, without pushing the limit on vendor fees.

MacAnaspie stated that she budgeted income from beer sales based on the Township's experience with the Beers at the Bridge event. She stated she was seeking food donations to keep food costs as low as possible.

Kullgren asked whether the Artisan Market's success or lack thereof shed any light on this event.

MacAnaspie stated that the traffic at the Artisan Market has been low, and has deterred vendors from committing to the long term.

Wright commented that the Beers at the Bridge event was very successful due to its being well-planned, and held at a good location. He doesn't see Headley St next to construction activity being a good event location.

Jennie stated she was willing to move the event to another location or postpone it to next year.

Kullgren stated the budget appears to show the revenues being very close to expenditures, with the event basically breaking even. He stated unless we see the event being successful, we may be rushing it.

Jennie stated another challenge is the number of competing events on weekends during the fall.

Kullgren asked whether sponsors had been recruited yet and were committed. Jennie stated possible sponsors have been contacted, but no commitment obtained at this point.

Kullgren stated that the current environment in the community is chaotic, and to introduce another event with the construction activity may not be advisable. He suggested postponing the event until the dust settles.

Haga stated there is a lot of work in organizing this type event, including obtaining a 1-day liquor license.

Following discussion, the consensus of the Board was to not hold the event this year.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment, other than that made earlier in the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:15 am.

Respectfully submitted:

---