

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MAY 18, 2017 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 18, 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 Leisman at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Butterfield, Easter, Burton, and Leisman

Absent: Jacobs and Lunn

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

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2017

Moved by Easter, supported by Butterfield, to approve the April 20, 2017 Meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Request for Rezoning from the Professional Office/Planned Unit Development (PO/PUD) District and R-2 Single-Family Residential District to R-4 Medium Density Multi-Family Residential/Planned Unit Development (R-4/PUD) District and Preliminary PUD Plan review, 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, explained that the proposed development would consist of 72 townhome units, which will be built as an apartment complex for financing purposes, but are intended to be saleable units. They have been to the Drain Commission, the Road Commission, Traffic and Safety, and conducted wetland studies and is here to request Planning Commission approval for the planned PUD. They have worked with Nederveld developing a plan for the project, from roads to drainage systems to traffic and safety of residents, and is comfortable with the proposed ingress/egress access points. A lot of time and thought has been put into the project.

Rob Berends, Nederveld, highlighted the project with a PowerPoint presentation. He stated the project is located north of Cascade, south of Ada Drive; 9.9 acres on the east side of the road. The parcel is comprised of four separate parcels, all under option with the developer. The plan has been submitted to the Road Commission and they approved the driveway cuts. A meeting was held last Thursday with the Kent County Drain office and consulting engineer Steve Groenenboom to discuss how the drainage is going to work on this site. They were satisfied that we will not have any adverse impact to the wetlands. The majority of the developed water will go to the detention pond at the southwest corner of the site and outlet to the storm sewer in the road. Sewer service is available in Spaulding Avenue, and a public water main will loop through the site. 234 parking spaces, which is 3.25 spaces per unit is proposed. A sidewalk at the south end of the site will be extended along the detention pond up to the first drive. A trail connection to the Consumers Energy property is proposed; it will be pursued pending approval to move forward. There are onsite wetlands that are regulated by the DEQ.

Leisman opened the public hearing.

Michelle Moore asked what kind of signage and lighting is proposed for the site.

John Kraus, owns property on west side of Spaulding Avenue, Spaulding Office Building 1025, asked about traffic control and how the traffic congestion is going to be addressed, where the ingress/egress is going to be; also if there will be acceleration and deceleration lanes; and what kind of modification is being proposed to Spaulding Avenue and requested by the Road Commission. Also, will the drainage pipe from the retention pond to the storm sewer handle additional capacity of storm water run-off.

Leisman stated we will have the engineer address these questions.

Bruce Riggs, 1040 Spaulding, stated the wetland does not rise that much, and the retention pond does not fill up that much.

Leisman closed the public hearing.

Rob Berends, Nederveld, stated that on the proposed signage we would simply look for a small ground mounted identification sign, similar to that at Burton Point, 4 x 8 on the ground. In regards to lighting, all the pole lighting will done just like a single-family residential subdivision.

Rob Berends, Nederveld, stated there is a left turn lane as you are headed south to turn left onto Cascade, and if you are headed north there is a center left turn lane to go into John's office park, once you get past that it's a short taper down. The Road Commission told us to take this three-lane section and extend it all the way through, and have the adequate tapers for southbound people to turn left. By the time we do the tapers for our two driveways it's not going to be very intrusive. We will have to extend the center left turn lane all the way through the project. As far as drainage goes, in 1991 they put in a 24 inch diversion pipe that goes out and is flat from Cascade Road back to the wetlands, and from there it's a 15 inch pipe all the way down Cascade to the intersection and then it discharges. The requirement was for us to make sure that even though this doesn't get that high, some of the water from the west side does come through; we did a storm water model over the last eight weeks that we provided to the Drain office and your engineer, and they reviewed it and were satisfied that we're doing the right thing to not have a negative impact to John or the church. We did a model with the entire project draining to the pond, and the result was for a 100 year storm it raised it three inches, but that was unacceptable because of the impact to the neighbors; so we had to take all our drainage to the south pond.

Leisman asked if Moore & Bruggink went over the drainage.

Ferro stated they did and we received the report, and there's a report submitted by the applicant.

Brent Bajdek stated amendments to the Township Master Plan were approved in 2016, which included the future land use map being amended to designate the subject property for either medium density residential use or office service use. The amendment also allowed for the medium density residential land use category of the future land use map to increase from a maximum density of six units per acre to nine units per acre. The proposed density of the site is 8.66 units per acre, and that acreage exclusive of public and private road right-of-way is 8.31 acres. The intended density of the site is in accordance with the recently approved Master Plan amendment. The proposed R-4 zoning district allows the site to be developed at the proposed density. The site layout proposes a variation from the conventional R-4 zoning district, rear yard setback standard of 30 feet to 20 feet to accommodate rear decks. There are two points of ingress/egress onto Spaulding Avenue, with an internal private access drive.

Leisman, the Planning Commission can vary setbacks as part of PUD plan approval.

Bajdek, correct.

Leisman inquired if the decks are backing up to other decks in the development.

Bajdek, the decks are for units along the eastern edge of the property.

Leisman stated so that would be justification for backing up to a Consumers Energy right-of-way as opposed to other houses.

Bajdek stated the PUD does allow variations for setbacks.

The internal private access road is 24 feet in width, and designed to align with the existing curb cuts on the west side of Spaulding Avenue. The DEQ did conduct a wetland identification review of the subject site and determined that approximately 1.28 acres of wetland within the review area are regulated by the DEQ due to wetland size and/or proximity to pond and stream drains; there are other unregulated wetland areas on site as well. The regulated wetlands is the expansive permanently preserved area located at the northeastern extent of the site, and extends northward. The other regulated wetland exists southwest of that wetland, so they're on the northern portion of the site.

Bajdek stated a detailed traffic impact study was determined not to be necessary, however, the requirements per the traffic impact study were addressed, and the findings indicated that projected traffic for the project will comprise less than 5% of the existing roadway volume along Spaulding Avenue. Parking requirements for the site have been satisfied; landscaping and site lighting details have not been provided yet, and are not required for preliminary PUD submittal. There are conformance standards that need to be met for a PUD plan and re-zoning, and it has been determined that the standards have been met and addressed.

Leisman stated there are 12 standards that have been discussed by the Planning Department.

Bajdek stated the subject site is isolated from existing residential neighborhoods north and east by a power corridor to the east and a permanently preserved open wetland space to the north. The proposed use of the property for townhome development is in accordance with the 2016 Township Master Plan amendment. An approval recommendation of the preliminary PUD plan and rezoning request is recommended to the Township Board, subject to seven conditions as stated in the staff memo.

Leisman stated is there feedback you would like to give the applicant of things you would like to see in the final plan.

Easter stated material upgrades like vinyl siding and some of the things we do in Ada. In developing the village the idea was to provide some housing for younger families so there would be lower priced housing, and I thought this could be a solution to that. But I understand the pricing is probably excessive for what a young family could be able to afford. She stated disappointment that this is not in that sweet spot of providing nice housing for young families at a price point that they could afford.

Butterfield stated on page 3 of the Staff Report it states "no other sidewalks are proposed to be constructed as part of the project by the applicant, staff is recommending connecting to the existing sidewalk located immediately south of the site", and I didn't see that as part of the conditions.

Leisman stated I was going to add that as No. 8.

Butterfield stated also they don't have permission yet for the easement that is owned by Consumer Energy, but is that something the applicant is confident that he will get.

Burton stated I agree with Sara about the fit and finish. She stated she thought these were all going to be sold as condominium units, and what we've got here tonight on page 1 it says "the units will be rented

and sold as the market allows,” and I was just wondering about the rented part of it, does that do anything to change the project in the eyes of the community; there’s no ordinance or zoning violations with renting, but as opposed to some of them being sold to families that will be permanent residents, not a turnover.

Ferro stated we don’t distinguish or treat different forms of ownership, whether it’s owner occupied or rental properties; it’s not something that’s within the scope of our jurisdiction or a decision-making factor.

Leisman stated it would be condominiumized from the beginning, and it’s just that some of the condominium units would be rented.

Ferro stated it hasn’t been clear to me whether the applicant intends to record condominium documents right away or whether that will happen later.

Wheeler stated it’s important to understand this ownership thing of what we’re asking the Planning commission and what we as developers do. He stated every one of the last 18 townhome projects we’ve done have been condominiumized and sold. Because of lender requirements we’re required to be able to make sure we make the mortgage payment. We have to build the project as one phase, it has a rental platform and a sale platform, and it’s best for home ownership. We’re trying to focus on a high quality development. But we do record the Master Deed and put the Bylaws together, and 60-70% of the people that rent do buy.

Ferro stated in multi-family development in our zoning rules we don’t have any distinction between condominiumized projects and ones that are not sub-divided in any way. Looking at the plan it could be a single ownership apartment development or it could be all condominium units surrounded by all common elements outside the buildings. It sounds like the applicant’s intent is to develop it as a condominium where everything outside the building footprint is part of the general common element, but has no physical impact on the project layout whatsoever.

Leisman stated but it would as far as condition seven because part of reviewing the Master Deed and Bylaws is to determine that it complies, for example, with the Township’s private road maintenance agreement requirements, those types of things.

Ferro stated it also is difficult to apply our private road rules to the development, too, because whether this is a condominium or an apartment development there is no need for an access easement for the entire road because it’s not serving multiple ownerships. If you read our private road rules it says a private road is any “road, drive, lane that serves more than one lot or dwelling unit”, so this does have more than one dwelling unit. The way our private road standards are written and the dimensional standards and the limits on number of units were tailored toward large lot rural development where we were concerned with private road networks being excessively long, and cul-de-sacs in low density rural areas. The layout here is entirely suitable for a multi-family development with 36 units per access; and the dimensional standards all comply with our private road rules.

Leisman stated the project is consistent with the Master Plan amendment to what was designed for this project; and I’m okay with the seven conditions. I would like to add at the beginning of condition three that “prior to consideration of the zoning preliminary PUD plan by the Township Board, the Township attorney shall give an opinion that the maximum number of units served by a private road in Section 78 804 can be waived as part of a PUD approval under the current ordinance.” That way if they say it’s an issue it’s not insurmountable, but it might mean that we have to amend the PUD portion of the ordinance to allow for it.

Leisman stated following up on condition eight: “the final site plan shall be revised to show the sidewalk running along Spaulding, plus all signage, lighting, and landscaping.” He stated the other thing under condition seven it should also say: “the condominium documents shall be recorded prior to construction.”

Moved by Easter, supported by Burton, to recommend approval of the rezoning request and the Preliminary PUD Plan to the Township Board, subject to the following conditions:

1. All public and private utilities serving the development shall be underground.
2. Construction plans and specifications for public water and sanitary sewer service shall be subject to review and approval by the Township Utilities Director prior to initiation of construction.
3. Prior to consideration of the rezoning and preliminary PUD plan by the Township Board, the Township attorney shall give an opinion that the maximum number of units served by a private road in Section 78-804 can be waived as part of a PUD approval under the current ordinance. A private road permit application and private road construction plan shall be submitted subject to review and approval of the Planning Department prior to the initiation of site improvements.
4. A storm water permit application shall be submitted by the applicant, and the storm water permit shall be issued by the Township prior to initiation of site improvements.
5. A complete landscape plan shall be provided as part of the final PUD application, and shall be subject to approval of the Planning Commission.
6. Exterior lighting on the site shall be of a residential quality and character; a detailed layout plan and fixture specification shall be provided as part of the final PUD application, and shall be subject to approval of the Planning Commission.
7. The condominium master deed, subdivision plan, and 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 construction and prior to their being recorded with the Register of Deeds.
8. The final PUD plan shall include a sidewalk running along Spaulding Avenue and all signage, lighting, and landscaping.

Motion carried unanimously.

Request for Rezoning from the Industrial (I) District to the Industrial/Planned Unit Development (I/PUD) District, and Preliminary PUD Plan review, 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, The Caves, stated the project is a storage facility consisting of 30 units ranging from 1,500 to 5,400 square feet. We have a print facility in Cedar Springs with 18 units that is all built out and fully leased. The spaces can have a small office, and there are a wide variety of uses.

Leisman opened the public hearing.

Mark Moore, 4891 E. Fulton, with property across from the project site, stated that the project has already started and that his biggest concern is with lighting and green space; also wondering about the signage that will be erected.

Ron Hall, 4815 E. Fulton, stated with office space in the buildings makes it sound like it could become an office plaza instead of just a storage and would like to know the hours of operation, and whether there will be any outside storage or will it all be inside the buildings.

Reed stated there will be no outside storage.

Leisman closed the public hearing.

Reed stated it is not intended to be an office where we expect to have businesses running; our parking is very limited by design because we don't want to have outside storage and the temptation for people to leave things out. There will be a very low volume, not a lot of people coming and going. Regarding lighting they are downward projecting, LED style. We want to be very inconspicuous, a small sign by the road; we originally requested a sign, but I don't know if I want a sign. As far as hours of operation, people are allowed to come and go whenever they want; we have some that come during business hours, and some come in the evening and on weekends. We're not anticipating having people there in the middle of the night. The traffic is pretty low.

Bajdek stated the development was originally submitted to be reviewed under the traditional site plan review process. The proposed review under the Township's plan unit development PUD zoning regulations has been determined to be the best process by the Township and the applicant to adequately address waste water requirements, and use concerns. The site layout satisfies conventional (I) Industrial Zoning District standards, which includes manufacturing as a permitted use by right. In reviewing approval of the proposed development under the PUD zoning regulations uses on the property could be restricted to preclude uses that would generate significant quantities of waste water. It is proposed by staff that the uses permitted in the PUD shall be limited to uses by right in the (I) Industrial District, with the exception of certain uses as stated in the staff memo.

Bajdek stated the PUD zoning rules also allow the Township to impose limits on the total number of units in the development that may contain bathrooms. The site is located within the Township utility service area, while connection to the public sewer system is required for properties within the utility service area, connection to public water is optional. The applicant has submitted a request to the Township Board to grant an exception from the public sewer service requirement; that request is scheduled for consideration at the June 12th meeting. The developer is proposing well and septic service for the property due to the cost of extending public utilities and the low rate of waste water generation that is projected from the development. A limit of five units are permitted to have bathrooms in the entire development, including shared common bathrooms is proposed. Documentation from the Kent County Health Department has been provided, which indicates willingness to approve a shared on-site waste disposal system for the proposed development, subject to documentation of soil conditions and a satisfactory system design.

Bajdek stated in regards to storm water management the Township's consulting engineer has determined that the proposed storm sewer and detainage system is designed in accordance with the Township's storm water ordinance, however, additional information is required before it can be recommended. Also, regarding site lighting it was noted by the applicant that full cutoff zero lighting fixtures are proposed, wall mounted above each service entry door. Lighting specifications have been submitted. Regarding signage it is a separate review, however, in the Industrial District one free- standing sign would be permitted for the site, 40 square feet in area at a height of five feet, and five feet from the property line.

Bajdek stated there are certain performance standards that need to be met to grant a PUD plan and rezoning approval; it has been determined the applicable standards have been met. Approval recommendation of the preliminary PUD plan and rezoning request is recommended to the Township Board, subject to six conditions.

Leisman asked in "the uses in the PUD should be limited to uses by right in the industrial district, for example, commercial automotive and other motor repair and body shops", are those allowed in the I District now.

Reed stated no.

Leisman stated so that's why they're not listed; this means they can only do what is allowed in the Industrial District.

Ferro stated it might be advisable in the statement "offices are prohibited" that there could be an exception that states "provided each unit is permitted to have a finished office space not to exceed 225 square feet, 15 x 15."

Burton stated we are being asked to approve the rezoning and preliminary plan, and recommend approval to the Township Board; then the Township Board decides if they are going to give the deferment to be connected to the Township sewer system.

Ferro stated if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the plan those two items would be on the Board agenda.

Burton asked what if they don't approve the deferment of the sewer extension.

Leisman stated from our standpoint it's a condition of approval, so we would not be recommending approval.

Burton stated my only concerns are aesthetic issues, but it's not going to be very visible.

Butterfield stated you will not need the visibility to market the units since most are spoken for and questioned if the tenants will be similar to the existing tenants in Cedar Springs.

Reed stated that the tenants will be very similar to those in Cedar Springs. There are many hobbyists who do different things in Cedar Springs; we have a lot of local businesses who rent the space for extra space.

Butterfield asked if what they are going to do with the space is part of the decision making process.

Reed stated very much so; we have a list of restricted uses above and beyond what you have.

Leisman stated the project seems unique, but consistent with the Industrial PUD. I would like to add a condition that "all lights shall be cutoff fixtures as shown on the final plan; and all signage shall be shown on the final plan."

Butterfield asked what about landscaping.

Ferro stated landscaping is a final PUD submittal requirement.

Leisman stated we've done this before with industrial developments that are located close to residential areas where there could be some impact, and we've placed some quiet hours for manufacturing for things that would occur at night.

Ferro stated we've got manufacturing fabrication or processing of goods is in the prohibited uses list.

Easter stated what if you were a woodworker and that was your hobby, the dust evacuation system and saws could make quite a bit of noise, yet you would be able to do that in this property.

Ferro stated on that size property it's far enough away from residences that it wouldn't create any problems. One item that might be added is prohibition on outdoor storage of vehicles, equipment, supplies, trash.

Moved by Butterfield, supported by Burton, to recommend approval of the rezoning request and the Preliminary PUD Plan to the Township Board, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approval of a Resolution by the Township Board granting an exemption from the public sewer service requirement.
2. That the uses permitted in the PUD shall be limited to uses permitted by right in the Industrial (I) district, with the exception of the following uses, which shall be prohibited:
 1. any manufacturing, fabrication or processing of goods
 2. Professional and administrative offices, including legal, architectural, engineering, accounting, data processing, insurance, real estate, securities brokerage, financial planning and investment advisory services, provided each unit may have an office space not to exceed 225 sq. ft.
 3. Vehicle fleet storage, maintenance and fueling facilities
 4. Offset printing, including ancillary activities such as photocopying and facsimile transmittal services
 5. Commercial photographers' studios, including ancillary portrait photography services as a secondary activity
 6. Churches
 7. Day care centers
 8. Public and private use heliports.
3. A maximum limit of five (5) units permitted to have bathrooms in the development, which includes any common shared bathrooms.
4. All public and private utilities serving the development shall be underground.
5. A complete landscape plan shall be provided as part of the Final PUD application, and shall be subject to approval of the Planning Commission.
6. A storm water permit application shall be submitted by the applicant, and a storm water permit shall be issued by the Township, prior to initiation of site improvements.
7. All lighting fixtures shall be shown on the final PUD plan.
8. There shall be no outside storage.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ferro stated the applicant submitted a light fixture spec that I'm not certain it meets the standard that was expressed in the conditions. That fixture should be subject to staff approval.

Motion by Butterfield, supported by Burton, to amend the original motion to add to Condition #7 after "all lighting fixtures shall be shown on the final plan ... that the fixtures shall be subject to staff approval."

Motion carried unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Review of PVM District Development Plan for 4 “Village House” Lots on .465 Acres in the Village Proper 2 (VP-2) Transect Zone of the PVM District, 645 Ada Drive SE, Parcel No. 41-15-34-104-007, J. Peterson Homes

Joel Peterson, J. Peterson Homes, stated we previously talked about what we could do with this property to maximize its use in relation to the building across the street. We’ve decided to go back to the overlay district, which is a use by right in the PVM; and we’re trying to create four village type homes. It’s a relatively simple plan with one ingress/egress point off Bradfield, and every garage rear loading from there. These are all single family homes, designed as spec condominiums, with one step up to your main floor. He stated we’d like a little flexibility as far as design goes.

Leisman stated he would like to see the property.

Bajdek stated the site is zoned (VR) Village Residential within the PVM Overlay District as a Village Proper 2 Transect Zone. One story and two story designs are proposed with two elevation options. The architectural elevations and floor plans have been submitted, and they convey the intent, mass in scale, and architectural style and materials for the planned single family homes. However, as the applicant stated their build-out may vary due to customization. Review and approval of a development plan by the Planning Commission is required for projects proposed to be developed under the PVM District regulations. The single-family unit sites are being proposed as Village House lots; the PVM District dimensional standards for Village House lots have been met, as well as the architectural standards; no departures are necessary. Vehicular access would be by a private road or alleyway, 20 foot right-of-way width, from Bradfield and no access from Ada Drive, although all four of the site condominium unit lots would have public road frontage. There would only be one curb cut located in the same location as the existing one. Access to the garages would be from the alleyway only. There is a non-motorized pathway that exists along the Ada Drive frontage with three of the proposed homes having direct connection to the sidewalk and stairways; there is no connection to the path from the fourth home, however it is recommended.

Bajdek stated the site will be serviced by public water and sewer; parking requirements have been met, and there are two off-street parking spaces being proposed, however, only one of the units would allow for driveway parking. The landscape plan has been submitted; there is no street lighting proposed; wall-mounted exterior lighting fixtures on the single-family units are to be the only lighting for the site. The proposed development allows the site to be developed in character with the village; approval of the development plan is recommended subject to six conditions.

Noelle Divozzo, Bronson Street, stated it is a little hard to tell from the elevations, but it looks like the houses are really squeezed in there; it does not look like it is quite in keeping with the rest of the village.

Leisman stated if there are no departures and these are just homes being built it wouldn’t even come to us. The reason for the setbacks, etc., is because they meet the PVM standards.

Butterfield asked what is the PVM standard for total square footage build-out on .465 acres; how many square feet are each of these.

Ferro stated the minimum lot size is 4,000 square feet, and the lot width is 40.

Easter asked when you first brought this to us how many units were you thinking you might squeeze in.

Peterson stated in our original conceptual we did two in back, three on the side, and four in front, so there was nine. These are homes and none have been approved in the village as far as we know. We worked hard with the staff to make sure we're meeting all the requirements.

Butterfield stated it's a nice transition to the residential area.

Burton stated it's very attractive.

Leisman stated on Condition #6 should be added "prior to construction."

Ferro stated this plan is a lot more compatible with the adjoining residential use to the north where the previous plan had a two-story building five feet from the lot line; this has 35-40 feet of yard and a detached garage.

Moved by Burton, supported by Butterfield, to approve the development plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Documentation shall be provided that the first floor elevation of the single-family homes will be a minimum of 2 ½ feet above adjacent sidewalk/pathway grade, as required by Sec. 78-476 (i).
2. A determination by the Planning Department, prior to issuance of a building permit for each new home, that conformance with PVM District Architectural Standards has been adhered to.
3. A storm water permit application and accompanying construction plans for the storm water management system shall be submitted, subject to review and approval of the Planning Department, prior to initiation of site improvements.
4. A complete landscape plan shall be submitted, subject to review and approval of the Planning Department, prior to issuance of any building permits.
5. Wall-mounted exterior lighting shall be of a non-glaring style, subject to approval of the Planning Department.
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 construction and prior to their being recorded with the Register of Deeds

Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER/STAFF REPORTS

Staff Report

Ferro stated the Parking Committee has finished its work and the report was finalized last week, and copies will be emailed. He stated he just received the corrected final draft of the parking study update report. Also, we are working on a joint work session date with the DDA Board and Township Board, hopefully June 6 or 7.

Easter stated it sounds like at the last meeting for the parking that we were moving away from large structures, I thought they did a great job of identifying where is the biggest need, and the thought was why don't we find niches in close proximity to where the need is. Is that where the final report has landed.

Ferro stated we shouldn't try to find one centralized solution, whether it be one large surface lot or a parking structure, that the character and scale of the village, and the needs for parking would better be met by smaller scattered lots that are less visually obtrusive.

Burton asked if there were some of the business owners on the parking committee that were so vocal about needing parking, and are they in agreement with a consensus.

Ferro stated there were two members of the DDA Board on the committee, Walt Vanderwulp and Brian Harrison. One major concern Walt expressed was that he didn't feel it was appropriate to count parking spaces that will be adjacent to the park along the river front as part of the parking supply. If it's public parking, it's open for anyone to use whether they are a park user or customer of a business across the street.

Butterfield stated the street is private so will the parking be private.

Ferro stated our contract between Amway and the Township requires that there be a public access easement on that street.

Leisman stated I feel better about what we're being asked to do without the parking garage, having gone over the report with the understanding that some additional smaller lots will be required as the village continues to develop.

Butterfield asked if there is language in there about time limits on parking.

Leisman stated there is talk about over time moving toward the process of having management mechanisms.

Burton asked if the small pocket parking lots are going to be developed as the block of business buildings develop, or do we have to start purchasing additional property for these.

Leisman stated the recommendation is to start doing it now. It does say additional lands should be secured now.

Butterfield asked if there was conversation about some of it being paid parking.

Ferro stated, no. The consultant did recommend we have parking duration limits for key locations that are high turnover, high demand areas to deter employees from parking long term on the closest in spaces, and the committee did not make any specific recommendation on when or how that should be implemented, and felt that should be up to the Township Board. She recommended three hour parking limits on Ada Drive, and on the closest portions of parking along Bronson Street closest to Ada Drive, and new Headley Street.

Burton asked how the Township is going to purchase additional property for parking.

Ferro stated in our big picture financing plan we have a place holder of a million dollars for parking. Even if it means some land acquisition that should be sufficient to build some spaces. The ability to do that is premised upon completing successfully about a four million dollar philanthropic campaign to raise money for the two park spaces, in order for the Township to have sufficient funds available for parking.

Bajdek stated there are some handouts regarding short-term rentals. There are two State and House bills that seek to mandate that all short-term rentals are residential use of property, and permitted in all residential districts. There is also a draft ordinance from Mr. Barr which was emailed last night, and we have not had a chance to review it.

Burton stated we need to contact these guys and say no way.

Leisman stated you should come back at either the June or July meeting with some recommendations on what is proposed, and the status. Also, we need to have our packets earlier or we can't do our job.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Arija Wilcox, Keller Williams, explained that she is the listing agent for the RiverPoint of Ada development and wanted to introduce herself to the Board.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Easter, supported by Butterfield, to adjourn at 9:00 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith
Ada Township Clerk

JS/dr