

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 15, 2017 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, June 15, 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, Burton, Lunn, and Leisman

Absent: Jacobs and Easter

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

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2017**

Butterfield stated there were a few comments made that were attributed to her that she did not make. She will submit an email to Ferro with the changes.

Leisman noted that the minutes were rather extensive.

Moved by Butterfield, supported by Burton, to approve the May 18, 2017 Meeting minutes subject to the changes. Motion passed unanimously.

**V. PUBLIC HEARING**

None.

**VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

**Site Plan Review, Land Division Creating 5 Lots in the RP-1 District, 3333 and 3345 Egypt Valley Ave. NE, 6052 3 Mile Rd. NE, and 3204 Pettis Ave. NE, Parcel Nos. 41-15-05-200-008, 41-15-05-200-021, 41-15-05-400-017, and a portion of 41-15-05-100-045, Darren and Jill Herweyer**

Darren Herweyer stated the property is at 3333 Egypt Valley, and that he is proposing five splits to the property, which meets the RP-1 five-acre minimum. He explained the requirements that have been satisfied.

Leisman asked if there are any plans for a gated entrance.

Herweyer stated there is a gate, and his horse farm is there. The gate will be improved and widened to the 22 foot wide restrictions, so the driveway will be widened to the 22 and the 66 foot easement.

Bajdek stated the property consists of four parcels, 3333 and 3345 Egypt Valley, 6052 3 Mile, and 3204 Pettis. The eastern portion known as 3204 Pettis was recently incorporated into the tract of land due to a property line adjustment. The applicant proposes to create five parcels, all of which would meet the five acre minimum requirement in the RP-1 Rural Preservation 1 Zoning District. Setback requirements for

all existing buildings, the home, the accessory building, horse barn and riding arena have been met. There are eight standards that need to be met to grant a land division. Bajdek stated in No. 4 it states the Road Commission was not contacted, but since the writing of the memo the Road Commission has been contacted; a site inspection was conducted and it was determined the current drive location is okay, however some improvements will be necessary. A type B entrance is necessary; it appears there will be some difficulty in meeting the 10% maximum allowable grade along the proposed course of the road. Since writing of the memo, a variance request has been submitted. The lots in the private road layout conform to all applicable zoning regulations.

Approval of the land division is recommended subject to three conditions.

Leisman asked if there would be signage on the road or lighting along the drive.

Herweyer stated there is no lighting on the private drive. We are in discussion with potential lot buyers regarding lighting. The lights we're proposing are low power style lights, not pole lighting, more decorative than functional.

Leisman stated you wouldn't object if there was no lighting signage, and all fixtures shall be cutoff.

Herweyer stated he had no objection to that.

Leisman stated we could say any lighting of the signage shall be approved by the Planning Department.

Herweyer stated the way the current drive is set up that wouldn't be an issue because there are no neighbors in front, and anything that we did would be very small LED's.

Ferro asked if he planned to give the private road a name and address. He stated if you want to name the private road the name has to be approved by the County Road Commission.

Motion by Lunn, supported by Burton, to approve the Land Division Creating 5 Lots in the RP-1 District, subject to the following conditions:

1. A Township private road application complies with the Kent County Road Commission requirements, and provide for construction of the emergency vehicle turnaround area as shown on the plan shall be submitted and issued prior to recording of the land division.
2. Required private road and driveway access improvements shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits on lots A, B, C, and D.
3. The grade of the private road shall not exceed 10% or a variance request granted from such requirement.
4. All lighting fixture shall be cut-off fixtures and any lighting of signage shall be approved by the Planning Department prior to construction.

Motion carried unanimously.

**Request for Special Use Permit for 21,000 sq. ft. of Additional Building Space and Parking Lot Expansion to the Existing Church Facility, 655 Spaulding Ave. SE, Parcel No. 41-15-31-177-001, Keystone Community Church**

Randy Wassink, founder of Keystone, and President of the Board, stated Keystone has experience solid consistent growth over the past four years. He explained that they now have three services with 1,100 to

1,200 attendees per service, which causes a lot of congestion in the parking area. A 45% growth in attendance has occurred within the last three years with many services being over 100% capacity. An execution of the Master Plan that was developed in 2004, which included the doubling the auditorium size and the children's area, and additional parking with a connection to the existing road in the West Village development is currently proposed.

Darrell Dehann, Integrated Architecture, Architect and Project Manager, stated the auditorium seats around 450, and the proposed plan would be for 980 seats along with a studio meant for smaller speaking engagements and worship type settings with 126 seats. There are now four classrooms with eight proposed. The church has about 24,000 square feet and proposed is adding 20,000 square feet, mainly in the auditorium, a studio, and the classrooms. A secondary entry to the church is proposed to alleviate some of the congestion at the current main entry. The exterior being planned in context with what is there. The expansion will be the same as the present auditorium, which is a pre-cast concrete skinned envelope, and carried into the studio seating. The classroom space will be the same with metal siding.

Ron Barrens, Nederveld, stated the site is currently served with sewer and water; they were sized for this expansion and there is no additional need for any additional services to the building. There is a 100-year detention pond adjacent to Ada Drive to accommodate all the expansions, so all the infrastructure is in place. The drive connection would be in the turnabout area, for Sunday use only, with a gated access point. The parking is currently at 1.85 with a count of 278, and they are proposing to construct 534, which is 1.71 times the ordinance. The storm water treatment area can be contained at Ada Drive but we would have to do a pre-treatment before it was released to the wetlands because the capacity of the storm sewer was not anticipating that at that location. The DEQ has confirmed the boundaries.

Leisman asked if there are any green spaces in the parking.

Barrens stated yes, and pointed out where the islands are.

Ferro asked if the re-location requires any approval by the condo association formally.

Barrens stated Randy has been in contact with them.

Butterfield asked if the height has changed at all.

Ferro asked if there has been any contact with the Drain Commissioner's office or review of the storm water plan by them.

Barrens stated no; we have not submitted those and we can do that next week.

Ferro stated he would contact them to see if they want to look at the new plan.

Butterfield stated it seems in the past there were some complaints about parking for ballfields and soccer games, and will this new parking alleviate any of that.

Leisman stated at the next meeting he would like them to address the lighting in the parking area when the church is not being used.

Motion by Burton, supported by Butterfield, to hold a public hearing next month for discussion of the additional building space, and parking.

Motion unanimously approved.

## **Review of Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, Revision to PUD Regulations, to Modify Permitted Variations from Conventional Zoning Standards**

Ferro stated at the last meeting approval was recommended for the Knoll Condominium Development on Spaulding Avenue. One concern that was expressed and incorporated into conditions of approval was that legal counsel should be consulted on whether a variation from private road standards may be permitted and approved as part of a PUD plan. The Township attorney concluded that the PUD rules do not allow approval of variation from the private road standards. The statute says “in a land development project designated as a PUD regulations relating to the use of land, including but not limited to permitted uses, lot sizes, setbacks, etc., shall be determined in accordance with the PUD regulations.” In our PUD regulations, the Description and Purpose Statement says “except as expressly modified by approval of a PUD rezoning and plan, the provisions of the underlying zoning district may remain in full force and effect.” There is language that says “either lot area, lot width, setbacks, building spacings, building height and maximum building footprint size may be varied in a PUD.” In the standards for approval is a statement that says “design of private streets shall comply with the requirements applicable to private streets as provided by this chapter.” The conclusion we reached was the zoning rules don’t permit approval of a modification of the private road standards. Ferro stated he drafted a proposed amendment to the PUD Regulations that modifies a couple of sections, adding language that says “regulations pertaining to signs, off street parking, loading spaces, and public street access, and private roads and driveways may be varied in a PUD.”

He also stated he modified the standard for approval to delete two sentences: “the design of public streets shall conform with the requirements of the County Road Commission;” and “design of private streets shall comply with the requirements applicable to private streets as provided by this chapter.”

Leisman stated so you get to the density of the development on Spaulding that you wanted of the number of units, and asked what is the status of that.

Ferro stated the it has not gone to the Township Board yet.

Leisman stated the idea being you amend the ordinance first.

Ferro stated that was discussed with the applicant and a calendar was prepared and gone over with the applicant.

Leisman stated the major change would be under Section 2 78449, Regulations Pertaining to Private Roads and Driveways. He asked what is the specific section that says the PUD doesn’t have to comply with the maximum number of units on a private road.

Ferro stated in 78-449 it says that “regulations pertaining to public street access and private roads and driveways contained in Article 28 may be modified.”

Leisman stated the other one is (I), if you delete a reference to county road standards and delete the applicable private street standards, does that mean they can go in and put an inch of tar on the sand; what are the regulations on that.

Ferro stated that wouldn’t apply to them unless modified. That isn’t the change to the private street standard, that’s a change to the standards for approval of the PUD plan; there is no amendment to the private road rules proposed.

Leisman stated the second sentence “design of the private street shall comply with requirements for private streets”, by deleting that is there a risk that they don’t have to do that unless...

Ferro stated we could leave the sentence there and say “, unless modified.” Another approach could be to add some standard for allowable modifications, some required finding by the Commission.

Leisman stated when the Township adopted the original limit, the length of private roads, the idea was to limit private streets.

Ferro stated when the limits were put in the ordinance on length and number of units that was during a time period when we were seeing a lot of low density PUD’s with large lots, and very long private road cul-de-sacs. We weren’t thinking about or had in mind a more dense situation like this where the limits on number of lots that we put in the standards don’t apply very well for the number of dwelling units. There is no problem with what’s proposed in this development, considering the fact that the Stone Falls development to the north has 210 apartment units on a single access, and no one has ever thought that creates any hazard or any traffic congestion problem.

Burton stated confusion over wanting more public roads in the future, and private roads.

Leisman stated that amendment was put in because there was so much development going on, large residential developments done as site condos, and the developers just threw the roads in, and down the road there were maintenance issues, flexibility issues, etc., so Ada Township started putting limits on the extent to which private roads could be done.

Ferro stated the problems we seem to have are private roads that pre-date the private road standards where there are no maintenance agreements, there are no legal obligations for property owners to chip in.

Leisman stated it’s a good policy for the Township to encourage public roads, especially when they’re talking large developments. Maybe if it was a smaller dense apartment complex versus a spread out residential neighborhood. The long term plan would be to encourage public streets as much as possible.

Ferro stated another thought is actually modifying the definition of what a private road is.

Leisman stated he would like the Planning Department to address the issues at the time of the public hearing; the overall policy of long term large lot residential developments having public streets that connect to each other.

Ferro stated it’s difficult for Townships to plat out a public road in advance of development.

Burton stated in the Township the County would take care of the roads, so we’d have to deal with the county for every new public road, which isn’t easy.

Lunn stated the density is 70-75 for fire and safety, right.

Ferro stated another option would be to change the limits on number of zoning units served by either a single access or two accesses.

Motion by Lunn, supported by Burton, to set a public hearing on PUD Regulations.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ferro passed out copies of the final Parking Study Report, and the Parking Committee Report.

## **IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Butterfield, supported by Burton, to adjourn at 8:00 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jacqueline Smith  
Ada Township Clerk

JS/dr