

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 19, 2006 MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, October 19, 2006, at the Ada Township Offices, 7330 Thornapple River Dr., Ada, Michigan.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order by Korth at 7:30 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairperson Korth, Commissioners Burton, Butterfield, Gutierrez, Hoeks, Lowry and Sytsma.  
Absent: None. Also Present: Planning Director Ferro, Scott Gregory

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Sytsma, second by Hoeks, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion by Hoeks, second by Sytsma, to approve the September 21, 2006 Meeting Minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**                      None.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**                        None.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. Request for Extension of Preliminary PUD Approval for Ada Center, 490 and 496 Ada Drive, Scott Gregory**

Scott Gregory spoke stating he thus far has not asked for final PUD approval due the need for negotiations and an agreement with a current tenant with an existing lease. The lease is up for renewal in November and the tenant seems to be at a point where it is ready to move. For this reason, he is requesting an extension of the preliminary PUD approval.

Ferro stated he had provided Commission members with the ordinance language that pertains to Preliminary PUD extension requests. Ferro stated Gregory did request this extension prior to the expiration of one year. Ferro also spoke regarding the preliminary recommendation resulting from the Ada Village Design Charrette that the placement of the building on this site should be moved forward to the street frontage, and that this recommendation may be a consideration in deciding whether the PUD Plan approval should be extended. It may be advisable to wait for completion of the Charrette process to make a decision on this final PUD extension Ferro noted he also spoke briefly with legal counsel on this and would be willing to get written communication from legal counsel if the Commission would like, as to whether the Charrette process recommendations can be considered in making the extension decision.

Hoeks stated that one of the areas pointed out by the leader of the Charrette consultant team is that the placement of this building has a tremendous impact on the Village character. If this building was moved closer to the street, the whole area could be redeemed by some additional landscaping or possibly other shops that could be built on the street, etc. Hoeks stated he would like to have this action deferred. Hoeks asked the applicant how much he has invested in this at this time. He would like there to be fairness for the Charrette process and for Mr. Gregory. Hoeks concluded stating he would like to wait until after they get the results from the Charrette process.

Burton stated she completely agrees with Hoeks. She asked if it is possible to delay action on this extension at this time.

Butterfield also agrees and questioned what would need to be done to move the building forward closer to the street. Ferro stated there are two hurdles – one being the property is in the flood plain and the other is the owner’s goal of keeping the existing building in operation while the new building is being constructed.

Korth stated he recalls discussion that the older building could remain but it would be awkward to get to with the new building being constructed.

Lowry and Gutierrez also stated they support deferring this until the Charrette process is complete. This building is going to be a focal point and the Commission needs to make sure this is done right. Sytsma stated this cannot even be revisited until the end of February, due to the moratorium that is in place. Ferro pointed out that the moratorium resolution contained an exemption for developments that already have Preliminary PUD approval.

Gregory stated his understanding was that an extension would be automatic upon submission of a letter requesting an extension prior to expiration of the one year.

Korth stated he realizes this has been a long process, but the Planning Commission has spent a lot of time looking at community development. The location is absolutely critical to enhance and further develop what is already considered a pristine part of this community, which is the stretch of Ada drive between the trestle and Thornapple. If this is not done right, it will always feel like a race track through there. Korth stated he also agrees this should be deferred.

Motion by Hoeks, second by Lowry, to postpone action on Scott Gregory’s request for extension of preliminary PUD approval for Ada Center, at 490 and 496 Ada Drive, noting that the extension request was submitted within the one year time frame required by the PUD regulations. Motion passed unanimously.

## **VIII. REPORTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS, BOARD LIAISONS, COMMITTEES AND/OR STAFF**

### **1. Ada Village Design Charrette**

Gutierrez suggested everyone attend the meeting on October 30th in order to make comments and suggestions. The Commission discussed many different issues – issues relating to the agenda item above for Ada Center and access issues, options for the Buttrick Ave. intersection, Camelback Bridge, and speed limit on Thornapple River Drive.

### **2. Draft Plainfield Charter Township Master Plan, Draft Vergennes Township Comprehensive Plan and Notice from Grand Rapids Charter Township of Intent to Update Plan.**

Ferro stated the Township has received copies of proposed new Master Plans from Vergennes and Plainfield Townships. Distribution of these to surrounding communities is required by law, and the Township has the opportunity to review and comment on these plans. Korth suggested that e-mailed copies of both plans be provided to the Commission members for review.

**3. Discussion of Code Enforcement.**

There was discussion regarding violations of township ordinances and fines associated therewith. Korth stated they have the ability by enforcing the site plan. The rules are very clear. Why should there even be degrees of enforcement. Put the burden on them to react as opposed to the Township. It should be clear-cut and the enforcement policy needs to be followed.

Ferro pointed out that it is not the Township's policy to issue citations for ordinance violations as a first step in the code enforcement process, unless there is a clear public health and safety issue involved, or there has been a previous history of violations with the same party. Our routine practice is to use informal procedures as an initial means to seek ordinance compliance, including personal contact and written communication.

Hoeks asked about the status of the barn off Michigan. Ferro believes the owner intends to apply for a variance and this may be on the November ZBA agenda.

A meeting was scheduled on November 8th at noon to work on the Master Plan.

**IX. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Hoeks, second by Sytsma to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.