

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE APRIL 20, 2017 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, April 20, 2017, 7:00 p.m. at the Ada Township Offices, 7330 Thornapple River Dr., Ada, MI.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by Commissioner Butterfield at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Jacobs, Butterfield, Easter, Burton, and Lunn

Absent: Leisman

Staff Present: Planning Director Ferro, Planner/Zoning Administrator Brent Bajdek

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Lunn, supported by Easter, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously. Jacobs noted that under Public Hearings it states with a Sidewalk Height of 15.5 feet and it should be Sidewall.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 2017 AND MARCH 16, 2017 MEETINGS

Moved by Easter, supported by Lunn, to approve the January 26, 2017 and March 16, 2017 Meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Special Use Permit, Accessory Building with a Sidewall Height of 15.5 feet, in the RP-1 Zoning District, Treebrook Dr. NE, Parcel No 41-15-08-151-013, Philip & Sheri Vanderlugt

Ben Thomet, 1970 Pettis Ave., builder representing the applicant, stated we designed the building for a 14 foot overhead door because the client has a motor home that is over 12 feet. The building will look a lot like the house that is already there.

Brent Bajdek stated the property is Zoned RP-1 Rural Preservation, located at the northeast corner of Pettis Avenue and Knapp Street; with frontage along Treebrook, Pettis, and Knapp. The building will be 1,500 square feet, 30 feet x 50 feet, with a sidewall height of 15.5 feet, and the structure will be located behind the natural tree line along the southeast corner of Knapp Street. The zoning regulations limit the sidewall height of an accessory building to 14 feet for properties three acres or greater in all residential districts. A Special Use Permit is being requested for a sidewall height of 15.5 feet, in order to install a 12 x 14 overhead door to accommodate the recreational vehicle. The accessory building is proposed to be set back 50 feet from Knapp Street right-of-way, and 135 feet from the eastern property line; all other setback requirements have been met. Staff is recommending approval of the Special Use Permit based on a determination that the size, height, placement, design, and appearance of the accessory building would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area. One condition recommended is any exterior lighting on the building be of a non-glare style subject to approval by the Planning Department.

Butterfield asked if there is an association at Treebrook with any guidelines that would prohibit this.

Brent stated there is an association.

Jacobs stated every time we have someone who comes before us for one of these accessory buildings raising the height, is that just because we only see the ones that are raising the height or are there many other accessory buildings that do require approval of a height limit increase? She questioned whether we should consider raising the height limit.

Brent stated we have talked about the Planning Director making the determination on these.

Ferro stated we did revise the accessory building rules so that there were fewer requests by raising the maximum permitted square footage that's permitted without a Special Use Permit. There are plenty of accessory buildings with 12 or 14 foot sidewall heights that are built, so he is sure there are quite a few that the Planning Commission does not see.

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Lunn, to approve the request for a Special Use Permit to allow an accessory building with a sidewall height of 15.5 feet, located at 5630 Treebrook, subject to the condition that any exterior lighting on the building be of a non-glare style subject to approval by the Planning Department. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Revised Final PUD Plan, 13,104 Square Foot Commercial Building, Ada Hillside Center, 6739 and 6751 E. Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-28-330-004 and 005, Neller & Wesley, LLC and 6751 Fulton Associates, LLC

Andy Eckert, Concept Design Group, stated we were here a few months ago and the commission requested photo-simulations to visualize the proposed building character in comparison to existing buildings on the site. He noted those renderings have been prepared, and a letter from the adjacent property owner regarding the proposed project has been submitted.

Eckert stated the rendering shows the building fits in, with the existing matching window openings approximately the same size as existing buildings to meet the PUD requirements. We're looking at a cottage look with stone, and cedar siding which will grey over time. He stated the only significant change they are proposing is the roof slope. He stated there was a request from the adjacent owner to provide a stair between the upper and lower parking areas, which his client is not interested in doing due to the liability and costs. The adjacent property owner letter also requests that the deferred parking shown on the plan be required to be constructed now, and that the applicant opposes this, due to the high cost of a needed retaining wall.

Butterfield asked where the stairs were proposed.

Eckert stated in between the existing building and the new building.

Butterfield asked how people will access the upper area at this point.

Eckert stated the upper parking is mainly for the upper business use.

Easter asked if they would be able to enter the second floor from the back.

Eckert stated yes.

Butterfield asked if the open space between the buildings would be grass or other plants.

Eckert stated yes.

Butterfield asked if the proposed roof would match the existing in terms of color.

Eckert stated we were looking at doing either a gray or dark brown roof.

Butterfield asked Brent to go over the recommendation.

Brent stated a total of 185 parking spaces are proposed for the site, which is six parking spaces less than the initially approved 191 parking spaces based on a higher total of building square footage in the original PUD. Bajdek stated the original approved plan provided 4.34 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area, and the proposed revised plan provides a slightly higher ratio, at 4.63 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. He stated if the 8 deferred spaces are constructed, there would be 4.83 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. He stated per Section 787884 of the Zoning Ordinance, "The Planning Commission may permit parking to be deferred if the parking space required results in an excessive number of unneeded spaces for the proposed use." At any time following approval the Planning Commission can require those parking spaces be constructed. As the applicant stated, the construction of those deferred parking spaces will also require the construction of an expensive retaining wall.

Eckert stated originally they were working with the client to see how much parking we could fit on there, but once the client saw the price for it he headed in the other direction.

Eckert stated by the area we're building we don't need those spaces, correct, based on our math for the parking.

Brent stated well you do need the deferred parking spaces, yes; we require them.

Eckert stated not based on the original PUD, which was 191 spaces for more area, and we are building less area.

Ferro stated you've lowered both the total square footage in the entire center, and the total parking supply, but the ratio of parking spaces to building square footage under your proposed revised scenario without the eight additional spaces is a higher ratio of parking per square footage than under the original plan. They've got more spaces per 1,000 square feet under their proposed revision than the original PUD plan had with a higher number of spaces and a higher square footage. So in that sense the parking ratio is better from what we originally approved.

Easter asked so why are we suggesting they defer those spots.

Ferro stated in the event it is needed in the future. What was required originally was a negotiated parking supply in relation to building square footage, and the zoning rules permit a maximum square footage on the limit of restaurants that can be put in the entire center; there's also a restriction on the upper floor of the western buildings that they can only be used for office space. All of the other space can be used for retail space. If there were all retail, restaurant, and office only in the upper floor of the western buildings, you could have the scenario where the parking demand might exceed the supply. It is up to the owners to manage the tenant mix to fit the parking supply. We have input from the other owners stating they think those eight parking spaces should be built now, not allow them to be deferred until later. Our recommendation was we are satisfied with not requiring those spaces to be built now, but in the event they are needed in the future the Township has the authority under the zoning rules to allow a portion of the parking to be postponed until it is determined that it is needed.

Easter stated so the owner has to potentially contain this to limit who he rents the space to. She asked if the owner is aware of this condition.

Eckert stated his concern was mainly that when the second restaurant use was added that somewhat created a strain on the parking, so he feels he's being penalized for the adjacent owner's building and the parking requirements of that restaurant.

Easter asked what our response is to that.

Ferro stated we approved, as an amendment to the PUD, an increase in the allowable square footage of restaurant space from 5,000 to 7,500 feet. When that request was made both property owners had the opportunity to weigh in and no one opposed that request.

Doug Taatjes, NAI Wisinski, stated his firm manages the property for the owner. Taatjes stated this project is dead on arrival if we're mandated at some point when the Township says add eight more spaces. We're building less than the original PUD approved with parking; we're building 4,000 feet less, which should require 10 or 12 less spaces. We cannot agree that at some point we're going to add those spaces; we just can't do it.

Ferro stated presently he does not think there is a parking problem at the center. We've got restaurant use that peaks at night, and most of the other businesses are closed for the evening.

Easter asked how can we accept this recommendation with the statement of the deferral of eight spaces. If we're saying there's not a need for these, but if in the future something happens, you have to spend that quarter of a million dollars to put these in, I don't know how as a business owner that you do that.

Ferro stated we view that as a compromise recommendation recognizing and giving some deference to the adjacent owner's desire to see those eight spaces required now. Ferro stated if the two owners cooperate in managing the overall tenant mix to fit the parking supply, they need to do that to ensure the center is successful, and there shouldn't be a problem.

Butterfield asked what would be a major trigger that would necessitate an increase in parking supply, another restaurant?

Ferro stated if we saw people parking along the highway trying to get into the place that would be a clear message.

Jacobs asked if the space where the pharmacy used to be could potentially be leased to a restaurant.

Ferro stated he doesn't know if that entire space would fall within the 7,500 square foot limit. He stated it probably wouldn't.

Butterfield stated then making recommendations for the final PUD, can we put some limitation on future use within the two properties that make up the entire business center.

Ferro stated we've already done that to the extent of the restaurant square footage limit and the restriction to office uses on the upper floors of the two-story buildings.

Jacobs stated with respect to a restaurant use, in the new development that would be built those particular spaces would have only one building ingress and egress. She asked if that is allowable for restaurant use.

Ferro stated you could conceivably take two suites and use both entrances.

Jacobs stated but that would make it too big, wouldn't it exceed the 7,500?

Ferro stated he thinks two suites would exceed the 7,500.

Eckert stated to put the parking spaces in perspective, there are 123 spaces existing, we're adding 62 spaces; so we're adding one-third more for 13,000 square foot of building.

Ferro asked what the estimated cost of the 8 spaces is. Eckert stated \$200-\$250 thousand.

Ferro stated the potential future 8 parking spaces was shown on the plan that was originally submitted to us. It was proposed by the applicant; it's not something we added on. If it had come in without that parking shown originally he does not think we would have this issue at all. The plan they originally submitted labeled a 16 foot high retaining wall.

Butterfield asked if he would be comfortable without those eight spots.

Ferro stated, yes, based on the improved ratio of spaces to building area.

Butterfield stated next is the construction of the stairway, whose idea was that.

Ferro stated that was also requested by the other owner.

Butterfield asked how maintenance is served; there was concern over liability.

Eckert stated the stair would be on my client's property, and he's concerned it's a liability for him.

Butterfield asked if it was their suggestion that this could be approved with the third recommendation and not necessarily one and two.

Ferro stated I think you can do that, yes.

Jacobs recused herself from voting.

Moved by Easter, supported by Lunn, to approve the Final PUD Plan for the 13,000 square foot commercial building at Ada Hillside Center, subject to the following condition:

1. The Ada Hillside Center shall continue to be considered a "business center" for purposes of the sign regulations, based on a determination that the buildings in the center continue to have a unified style and appearance.

Motion carried unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary PUD Plan, Attached Townhomes (72 Units in 16 Buildings) on a 9.9 Acre Site, 1040, 1050, 1078, and 1090 Spaulding Ave SE, Parcel Nos. 41-15-31-451-017, 008, 009, and 010, John Wheeler and Michael Maier

John Wheeler, 7840 Conservation St., President of Orion Real Estate Solutions and developer of the project, presented the proposed plan. He stated the only thing that has changed since we were here last is we reduced the density by two units to allow a few more of the zero step units, and they met with the County Road Commission and obtained approval of a grading permit on the north drive so it lined up with the office park driveway on the opposite side of the road. He stated there was a request about the possibility of adding a sidewalk from our south drive to the south property line, and they are okay with that. We are requesting a public hearing for May 18th.

Ferro stated didn't you also shift the buildings further to the east.

Wheeler stated we did shift those buildings; that's correct. Also, there were a few modifications that we made to the very north building and submitted in the package last week. It flows better, it makes more sense to lose a couple of units, it wasn't a deal killer.

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Burton, to set a public hearing for the May 18, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary PUD Plan, 30 Commercial/Personal Storage Units in 11 Buildings totaling 56,070 square feet on 4.5 acre site, 4920 E. Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-30-300-020, The Caves, LLC

Tom Reed, owner, stated we'd like to set up a public hearing for May 18th.

Ferro stated the applicant has requested the Township Board grant an exception from the requirement that the property be connected to public sanitary service, which would require extension of over 1,000 feet of sanitary sewer main from Spaulding Avenue across the property owned by Amway to connect to the sanitary sewer. The initial resolution that would grant an exception that was considered by the Township Board at their April 10 meeting contained a couple of conditions of approval:

1. That the applicant submit his plan under the PUD regulations.
2. That the applicant agree to enter into an agreement consenting to a possible future special assessment district, in the event the Township ever wanted to initiate an assessment district to extend public sewer to serve the property.

Ferro stated Mr. Reed had some objections to the open-ended wording of that condition because it had no detail as to how cost would be shared among the surrounding property owners that would be served on the south side of Fulton Street. The Board postponed action on that exception request, with direction to staff and the Utilities Director to come up with a refined condition of approval regarding possible future sewer service extension.

Butterfield asked if that had been done.

Reed stated it's in the works, we're waiting word from your attorney.

Ferro stated we did not want that to hold up getting the Planning Commission process started to review this PUD Plan.

Butterfield stated when you were here the last time you had some ideas of people who might be interested in leasing this property for different things, have any of those ideas jelled.

Reed stated I don't think so; we have several people that are waiting for this to be done. We're dead in the water until we can work out what we're going to do with the bathroom situation, which is different from what we had requested originally.

Burton asked how is it different.

Reed stated we're going to have fewer bathrooms; we're going to be more restricted.

Ferro stated we'll likely be developing some recommendations regarding use restrictions that would be high water users.

Reed stated we have those restrictions built in to our facility already.

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Burton, to set for a public hearing at the May 18, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Pre-Application Conference, Zoning Ordinance Amendment Request to remove prohibition on

offices of health care professions in the Industrial (I) District, Valerie Dome, KAGH Property Management

Bruce Heys, 5393 Burton Street, stated they are here at the request of one a client to provide office space for medical office use within the Ada DDA as amended in 2016. He stated they have identified a property within the Industrial zoning district for a potential 16,000 square foot medical office building, and are requesting a zoning ordinance amendment that would allow healthcare professions in the Industrial district.

Bajdek stated the I District specifically excludes health care professions as a permitted use. He stated in the late 1990's a zoning ordinance amendment was approved that added several uses to that district with the majority of the uses ones that were already being operated for many years in the district. He stated that amendment specifically excluded offices of health care professions, banks, savings and loans, mortgage lenders, and other financial services.

Easter asked why those would be excluded.

Ferro stated the intent when we amended those regulations was to broaden the range of uses somewhat from what the pre-existing language was in the Industrial District. The previous use regulations in that district pretty much restricted it to manufacturing and distribution. He stated the intent was to limit the allowed uses to ones that did not have high traffic generation rates.

Easter stated I understand that, but why say these things can't be here. Ferro stated traffic generating characteristics - medical offices have a much higher rate of turn-over, and it's a higher parking generation rate and higher trip generation rate than general office uses.

Easter asked if that was an issue because of the availability of parking or access on Fulton being the issue.

Ferro stated to try to avoid having high turn-over uses along the Fulton Street corridor just to minimize turn movements on and off the highway, and promote the traffic-carrying capacity of the street being maintained.

Heys stated his understanding was that some of the industrial areas excluded medical professions to drive more business into downtown Ada, so that piece would develop faster and would be stronger.

Ferro stated the amendments to the Industrial Zoning District that added that language pre-dated the creation of the DDA and the Village redevelopment plans.

Easter asked what other businesses along Fulton Street are 16,000 square feet.

Ferro stated there are a lot of small building on small lots on the Fulton Street corridor. The largest one is the property that they're interested in putting a building addition on for medical offices.

Easter asked what is the existing building right now, what is the existing building we're talking about.

Bruce stated there is a clay pottery business, Geri Mateus Studios, 6352 East Fulton St. He stated it is adjoined on the west by the property developed by Jamie Ladd.

Butterfield asked if there is a more detailed definition of health care or is that just a broad catchall.

Ferro stated if you look at standard business classification codes you'd find what is included.

Easter asked what is the underlying purpose behind this proposed building? Is this the Metro version of what Spectrum is building, is that what we're talking about?

Heys stated we have a client that is interested in doing something similar.

Jacobs asked if it would provide 24-hour service.

Bruce stated no, it is not a 24-hour.

Butterfield asked as far as re-zoning could a condition be placed on the type of medical use.

Ferro stated submitting a plan as a PUD plan is one possibility. In a PUD plan you can mix uses among commercial and industrial districts.

Burton stated Heys said the Ladd property to the west is zoned C-2 PUD, and that does allow for health care professionals; so what kind of health care professionals are allowed there that aren't allowed under the Industrial.

Ferro stated that's an Industrial PUD, not a Commercial zoned PUD.

Easter stated I'm not interested in trying to maintain somebody's monopoly in the village to be a sole provider. That's not really our purpose. If the problem is traffic on Fulton then that's one conversation.

Butterfield stated this opens up the door to other businesses that will come before us because of the monopoly, so to speak.

Burton suggested the possibility of a zoning variance for this particular project, or does that set a dangerous precedent.

Heys stated the large building would stay in place, the northeast portion that extends to the north would be removed, and an 8,000 square foot, 2-story building would be added.

Ferro asked if any of the existing space would be converted to medical use.

Heys stated as of right now it would not. They have some small manufacturing and miscellaneous tenants in there.

Butterfield asked how parking would be handled.

Heys stated we've preliminarily gone through the engineering piece with an engineer, and we've laid out a total of 73 parking spaces that would be needed based on the amount of space and the use.

Ferro stated some evergreens are needed up front.

Jacobs asked if there needs to be any additional ingress or egress.

Bruce stated he doesn't believe so.

Jacobs stated when we approved McDonald's and we carved out a specific area in the village for a drive-thru, can we do the same thing and say it looks like a space issue so you can't have any other drive-thru within so many feet.

Ferro stated it would be unusual to establish a spacing requirement for medical offices. He stated he has never seen a spacing requirement for medical offices.

Butterfield asked if there is currently signage for that existing facility, is it on the building.

Ferro stated it has very little signage right now. Even Mateus Studios doesn't draw customers; it's strictly a production operation that ships product to retailers. We have sign rules, and abide by the sign rules and that wouldn't be an issue.

Ferro stated this is a Pre-Application Conference so there is no action to be taken. We might want to look into what our medical office trip generation rates are.

Butterfield stated wouldn't that be calculated by the number of doctors that are in that facility.

Ferro stated there are probably different ratios that can be looked at, square footage or number of physicians.

Easter stated if we're worried about traffic generation that would be the way that we could try to contain that, by limiting the size of the building, or the services provided, or the number of doctors occupying that building.

Lunn stated assuming this is just normal day time hours.

Ferro stated he mis-spoke earlier, and the PUD rules don't allow commercial district uses in a PUD in the Industrial district.

Ferro asked what will happen to the truck dock.

Heys stated they would like to keep that.

Ferro stated to it seems odd to mix a medical office use with industrial uses on the same site. He noted this is one of the few sites that is suited for manufacturing use; it's larger than a lot of the other sites in the Industrial District.

Easter stated she would think the medical community wouldn't be thrilled about being connected to a property that was manufacturing, and had a loading dock right there.

Heys asked if the preference from the Commission is that you're open to the concept but it would be more well accepted if it were a completely separate property.

Butterfield stated also to somehow control the size because traffic is an issue. Is there any research that would tell us x number of cars per hour per doctor, or if it's just blood draws and x-rays that maybe there's more traffic that goes in and out. We're trying to protect the highway, and a lot of cars coming in and out of it is going to be a problem.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER/STAFF REPORTS

Short-term Rentals

Bajdek presented information he has collected regarding regulation of short-term rentals in other communities in Michigan. He stated he has found very few examples of other non-resort communities that have adopted regulations permitting this use in residential areas. Grand Rapids does and their ordinance enacted in 2014 requires the residence to be owner occupied.

Bajdek noted John Barr, who brought this to our attention, was present, and he provided a few examples as well, but none of those examples are in the state of Michigan. In Arizona it is a state law that all cities are required to allow short-term rentals.

Easter asked if there are identified issues with B&B rental properties.

Ferro stated the news articles distributed shed light on what some of the issues are in some communities. If you read the article by the attorney from Mika Meyers, his bottom line seems to be that to some degree this activity is happening whether you regulate it or not, and local communities might be better off regulating it than simply not addressing it.

Easter stated regulating it means you can do it but under these conditions.

Ferro stated there are a lot of variables; requiring that it be an owner occupied home, limits on number of days per year that short-term rental can happen. We might want to distinguish different parts of the Township on a geographic basis or character and density basis, and location basis. There are a lot of different ways to approach it. The stage of regulating them seems to be focused primarily on resort communities, destination communities, and it will probably filter to other communities.

Jacobs asked if our ordinance is silent with respect to short-term rentals.

Ferro stated it's prohibited by virtue of the definition of the term "hotel/motel".

Bajdek stated "hotel or motel means a group of buildings on the same lot containing sleeping or dwelling units for public accommodation. The term shall include any building or group of buildings designated as motor lodges, transient cabins, or by any other title intended to identify them as providing lodging for compensation to transient or resident guests."

Ferro stated we don't exclude lodging from the community entirely.

Bajdek stated hotel/motel are only permitted in our commercial district, and its permitted in the C-2 General Business District as a permitted use.

John Barr, 8081 Fulton, stated the reason he wants to do this is because he travels for work and when he is gone for a week or two he can rent out his house while he's gone. He has seen that the best way townships and cities regulate it is through inspections and permits, whether it's a yearly inspection just to make sure the property stays safe or up to fire codes, and permits to regulate the number in an area.

Easter stated she thought the problem was imposing on a neighbor, so she doesn't see how inspections help us offset that problem. Permits speak to the regulations, you can do this but here are six things you can't do and your renters cannot do these things. She asked Jim, would you feel comfortable coming up with those recommendations.

Ferro stated it'll take some time. Part of the issue local governments face on it is when travelers stay at a lodging establishment they have a certain expectation that someone is overseeing this and giving it this blessing as meeting certain standards. If we're going to permit rules in place, it puts a certain burden on us to oversee it and do the type of things he stated.

Easter stated she's not so sure that's true; if it's a AirBnB this is a cottage industry. She thinks the way the AirBnB's kind of control that downward spiral is the way that people make reviews; they self-regulate.

Ferro stated there's an issue with who they complain to.

Easter stated they complain to AirBnB, and AirBnB then regulates that.

Barr stated a lot of cities and townships require there be a designated property manager. He would use family or close friends or relatives that could respond within a half hour if there is a problem, and their phone numbers be on file with both the township and the police department and printed and listed at the residence.

Easter stated if that's the case then that would require some potential intervention from us, then that would be why we would charge permit fees, to help offset that expense.

Ferro stated yes, and then we'd have resources to carry that out.

Easter stated what are we going to do about it if somebody complained.

Barr stated it's still my house and I can kick whoever is there out if they're causing a problem. With B&B you sign a contract, you write your own contract. If somebody causes a disturbance you can give them a warning, if it happens again they're gone. It all depends on how you write the contract.

Easter stated so maybe we would want to approve that contract. If this is something we are going to do we would want to see it, review it...

Jacobs asked if I have a home that I'm going to lease out because I'm going to transfer for two years, do I have to get a permit from the Township.

Ferro stated no.

Jacobs stated so under landlord/tenant law if you have a tenant on your property and you want them to leave you can't just make them leave. There is a process you have to go through, and I'm wondering how that works and what the Township involvement is.

Barr stated if there is a reoccurring problem you could pull the permit, or suspend the permit temporarily; there are a lot of different options.

Lunn stated but to issue those permits, do those inspections, requires resources to do those. The Township currently doesn't have those resources.

Ferro stated that's certainly something the Township Board would be concerned is what burden is this going to put on the Township, what is it going to take to manage it.

Lunn stated there are a lot of people who live in a neighborhood who aren't going to want a new neighbor every night.

Ferro stated that's something that could be taken into consideration in drafting rules, and not allow it in areas with dense neighborhood characteristics.

Butterfield asked if this is adopted are there any additional things like fire, safety, and police.

Barr stated most communities require a fire department inspection, but that could be offset by the permits being given.

Jacobs asked what is the closest community to us that has adopted some sort of regulation.

Bajdek stated the City of Grand Rapids, and the resort communities, Holland, Saugatuck.

Easter stated I don't see how the issues you're walking into are any different in South Haven than they are in Ada. If people from the outside come in and short-term rent a piece of property, whatever issues you're going to have are going to be the same as they would be in other communities.

Ferro stated it's a lot to think about.

Easter asked if this is a question we could put out to the community.

Ferro stated it would be a good one.

Burton stated can't we do that on the new web site.

Easter stated this can be Pandora's box and we have to be very aware of what we're doing here and what we're opening up. I think it would be a great question to ask the community.

Ferro stated we could do an ordinance amendment and hold a public hearing, I'm sure we'd get public input.

Easter stated in the meantime we could look at what restrictions have other people put on this type of ventures. If we were going to do something like this, we have the right to pull the permits at any time; a property owner pays \$1,000 for the permit and he's got an unruly renter and we pull it he's out his \$1,000, so he's going to be a little more careful about who he rents to.

Barr stated exactly. It could be suspended for a month or two.

Bajdek stated we did send Mr. Barr a zoning violation letter because we received a complaint from the neighbor, and we stated he was in violation based on our definition of hotel/motel.

Ferro stated South Haven did research on police complaints and found they didn't get any higher rate of complaints from nightly rental properties than they did from owner occupied properties. Maybe we could draft some ordinance language and put it in bullet form as a range of alternatives for different standards and different provisions.

Butterfield stated are we doing this just because one gentleman has a job that takes him away for a couple of months at a time; this would be a lot of work for us and is that how we want to function.

Ferro stated we do know it's a nationwide phenomenon. I can't say that I've seen a lot of demand or interest for it here.

Butterfield asked if entertaining this idea is a good or bad thing for the changes in the community.

Ferro stated I've heard Jacobs say we should explore it further, that it's something the public needs to have an opportunity to weigh in on either as something they want to be able to do or something they don't want to see other people do. I don't view it as a real high priority, we'll try to move the process forward, but I think it's worth exploring further.

Barr asked if they would like him to draft an ordinance.

The consensus of the Commissions was they would be interested in seeing a draft set of regulations prepared by Barr.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Burton, to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith
Ada Township Clerk

JS/dr