

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE JULY 21, 2016 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, July 21, 2016, 7:00 p.m. at the Ada Township Offices, 7330 Thornapple River Dr., Ada, MI.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Leisman at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Easter, Lunn, Lowry, Leisman, Heglund, and Jacobs

Absent: Butterfield

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

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 16, 2016

Motion by Easter, supported by Jacobs, to approve the minutes of the June 16 meeting as presented.

Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Special Use Permit to allow an 1,800 Sq. Ft. Accessory Building, which is 600 Sq. Ft. larger than Permitted by Right, 10 Greentree Lane Ave NE, Parcel No. 41-15-26-227-003, Vermurlen Architecture for Kevinn & Janine Donovan

Edward T. Vermurlen, Architect, stated the proposed building will be designed to match the existing architecture of the present home. He then discussed the building elevation drawings and the proposed use of the building.

Brent Bajdek stated the property is zoned RR (Rural Residential), and the proposed use of the accessory building is for a garage and an indoor basketball court. He noted there is a retaining wall at the north front corner of the building that is permitted to encroach into the required 50 foot side yard setback.

Leisman opened the public hearing; with no comments he closed the public hearing.

Easter stated the plans do not provide any details regarding any exterior lighting that may be proposed.

Vermurlen stated cut sheets will be provided with the construction documents, showing the actual fixture to be used and their location on the building.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Easter, to approve the Special Use Permit to allow a 1,800 Sq. Ft. accessory building at 410 Greentree Lane Ave NE, subject to approval of exterior lighting details by the Planning Department. Motion passed unanimously.

Proposed Amendment to Sign Regulations in Commercial Districts, proposed by Ada Township Planning Commission

Brent Bajdek gave an overview of the proposed amendment to the sign regulations. He noted the proposed revisions were developed with input from the appointed subcommittee. He then went over the proposed changes for signs located in the C-1 village business district.

Heglund, member of the sub-committee, stated the subcommittee felt this was a good approach, to provide an overall allowed total wall sign area, and put more control in the hands of the building owner to decide how to allocate the allowed area among multiple tenants.

Easter asked if there was any conversation by the subcommittee regarding defining the rear-facing side of a building.

Lunn stated this became unimportant, since the proposed rules don't treat one side of a building differently from others. The owner determines how to allocate the allowed total square footage around the building perimeter.

Jacobs asked how the proposed rules address free-standing signs.

Ferro stated there is no change proposed in the rules concerning free-standing signs.

Leisman opened the public hearing. He noted he would be proposing postponing action this evening, and continuing the public hearing at the next meeting.

Randy Joppe, Owner, Homelife Kitchen & Bath, 8100 Fulton, and President of the Ada Business Association, stated there is some confusion in the business community as to what impact the proposed changes have on the business community. He asked if this was an increase or a decrease in the amount of signage square footage that is allowable, and what impact that might have on existing and future businesses.

Chris Elzinga, Heidi Christine Salon, stated their current temporary sign is 33 square feet, and the proposed amendment would reduce the allowable size to one-half this amount. He stated they are having problems with customers having difficulty finding them.

Alan Hartline, Kingma's Market, stated he is a little confused on what the implications are for his proposed store in Ada.

Paul Ortez, State Farm, stated he had to have a two-story building with two fronts to comply with the building design standards for the Village, so would think that should be considered in the total allotment of square footage. He stated his second floor will have a tenant, so he would like to have more flexibility in total square footage for signage because it will be important for the tenant to have adequate signage.

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, stated his building is under construction, and feels the draft rules work well for his building, but it might not work for smaller buildings. He stated that for the buildings fronting on Fulton St., such as Kingma's, Paul Ortez, and River Valley Credit Union, visibility of their signs from Fulton St. is important.

Leisman closed the public hearing.

Heglund asked what the current maximum size of a wall sign is. Bajdek stated 12 square feet is currently allowed, and the proposed rules increase this to 16 square feet. He also clarified that the allowed maximum area of all wall signs permitted is based on the ground floor square footage of the building.

Jacobs asked for clarification that each building on Fulton would be allowed to have one free-standing sign and one on the building.

Bajdek stated one free-standing sign per property or parcel is permitted; no changes are proposed in this limit.

Ferro stated that there are provisions in the sign rules currently that allow one free-standing sign only for a “business center,” and this is a defined term in the zoning rules. He stated it has not been determined whether the Ada West Commercial Center is to be treated as a business center or as individual businesses for purposes of free-standing signs.

Leisman asked Brent to prepare a document with the actual text with the changes, a redline document. Leisman commented that he is sensitive to allowing the Fulton Street corridor to be dominated by signs.

Lunn commented that he did not believe that a larger sign is any more readable along Fulton Street, due to the speed of the traffic.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Easter, to table action on the proposed amendment to sign regulations and continue the public hearing to the August meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Review of PVM District Development Plan for 13,789 Square Foot Market/Grocery, portion of 400 Ada Drive and 7580 E. Fulton St., Parcel No.’s 41-15-34-126-011 and 017, GELD, LLC

Leisman stated this application was considered last month, and action was postponed pending some things to be worked out yet.

Ferro stated in June tentative approval was given to the development plan and several related departures from the PVM district standards. He noted final approval was postponed for a month with direction to the applicant and staff to work on proposed revisions for the form and size of the main entry to the building. Ferro stated the primary concern was the scale and proportion of the entryway violated a specific provision in the PVM district standards that prohibit a two-story height entryway, and that it was out of scale with the rest of the village. The applicant has since made some revisions, which were looked at by the sub-committee, feedback was given, and another round of revisions were made that now satisfy the concerns.

Easter stated she feels that what we saw fits very well with the spirit of what we are trying to accomplish, and it’s a very nice building.

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, stated we’ve taken the original design and made it fit scale-wise with the village. He stated the entry height was reduced from almost 30 feet to 22 1/2 feet, and the width was reduced from 30 feet to 20 feet. He stated we worked with a lot of people to accomplish this, the changes are an improvement, and he thinks it’s a win for everyone. He then explained the thinking behind the changes that were made.

Easter asked how the “wall of values” would be placed on a wall with windows.

Dixon responded they have not quite worked this out yet. He stated there could possibly be some transparency to the display so it is viewed from both inside and outside, or use of some vinyl graphics on the windows.

Ferro noted that vinyl graphics on a window is addressed in the sign regulations, and may enter into what the solution is for this display.

It was moved by Jacobs, supported by Easter, as follows:

1. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:

- a. The proposed development plan, as modified by the conditions of approval listed below, requires the following “departures” from the standards of the PVM district, which are hereby approved:
 - 1) Sec. 78-476(a) - Minimum frontage percentage.
 - 2) Sec. 78-476(b) – Primary entrances.
 - 3) Sec. 78-476(h) – Story heights.
 - 4) Sec. 78-476(g) – Windows on primary facades.
 - 5) Sec. 78-479(b) – Building walls (exterior).
 - b. The above departures result in a plan that complies with the spirit and intent of the PVM District to a greater degree than would be the case without authorization of the departures.
 - c. The proposed alternative is consistent with the purpose and intent of the PVM District.
 - d. The proposed alternative, in comparison to conformance with the PVM district standards, will not have a detrimental impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.
 - e. The proposed alternative is necessary and appropriate to accommodate a superior design of the proposed development.
2. The proposed development plan for a 13,789 square foot grocery market is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:
- a. The building and site improvements shall be completed substantially as shown on the plan set titled “Ada Market,” (civil drawings) dated June 9, 2016 and “Marketplace Square,” (architectural drawings) July 14, 2016 review set, except as modified in accordance with these conditions of approval.
 - b. Wall-mounted exterior light fixtures shall qualify as “full-cutoff” control of light emission. Fixture specifications shall be submitted for approval, prior to building permit issuance.
 - c. The condominium subdivision plan and bylaws for the Marketplace Square site condominium shall be recorded, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - d. The plan shall be modified to identify the limits of the 100-year floodplain on the subject property.
 - e. Floodplain development permits shall be issued by the Michigan DEQ and Ada Township, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - f. A storm water permit application shall be submitted and approved, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - g. Approval of the development plan does not grant approval of signs shown on the plans, which are subject to issuance of a sign permit.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Site Plan Review, 4,000 Sq. Ft. Commercial Building in C-2 Zoning District, 8120 E. Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-35-100-081, Walt Jousma**

Walt Jousma, owner, stated his space is 100% full, and he has clients for the proposed building.

Bajdek stated this is a 4,000 square foot cement block building proposed to be constructed at the rear of the Ada East Business Center, with a finished floor elevation of 637 feet. The new building is situated behind the eastern most building of the center, located in a flood plain boundary, and near the wetlands; a floodplain fill permit has been obtained from the DEQ, and a Township floodplain permit is also required. Bajdek noted the building is proposed to be used for storage purposes with five overhead doors along the north face of the building. There is adequate parking on the Ada East Business Center site. No information has been provided in regards to lighting, however if it is desired, only shielded light fixtures should be used. In regards to storm water drainage, it will be controlled through construction of a storm water catch basin in the asphalt area between the proposed building and the existing building to the northeast. The existing grade of the pavement is proposed to be lowered; a two-foot retaining wall is proposed for the existing building.

Bajdek reviewed the conditions of approval contained in the recommended motion.

Leisman asked whether there was any issue with the proximity of the proposed building to the building on the adjacent property to the east. It was noted by Jousma that there was inaccuracy in the Kent County aerial photography with respect to the location of the adjacent building in relation to the property line, and the two buildings will be separated by 11 feet.

Following discussion, it was moved by Heglund, supported by Lunn, to approve the site plan for a 4,000 square foot commercial building, subject to the following conditions:

1. A revised site grading plan be submitted and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. The submittal of a revised drawing/detail to reflect the shortened retaining wall as currently proposed.
3. A storm water permit application submitted to the Township, and a permit issued, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
4. A floodplain permit application submitted to the Township, and a permit issued, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Any exterior light fixtures on the building being fully shielded on all sides.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. **Final PUD Plan, 24,396 Square Foot Medical Office Building, 7128 E. Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-28-479-010, Unit 10, Ada West Commercial Condominium, Spectrum Health System**

Ferro stated there are very few changes in the proposed plan compared to the approved Preliminary PUD Plan, and not a lot of additional detail because of the amount of detail that Spectrum provided in their preliminary plan. There have been changes and improvements in the landscape plan; and a change in the utility plan for providing water service.

Ferro stated approval conditions contain the following provisions that relate to the Final PUD application:

1. The Final PUD Plan application shall include plans for additional and detailed landscaping.
2. A lighting plan shall be submitted as part of the Final PUD application.

Mike Baker, Nederveld, stated the changes from the previous submittal are: 1. there is a single monument sign at the corner of the access road and Fulton; 2. the water service to the building is going to come from the main in Headley St. extended north along the east side of the north-south service drive; he noted the Township has determined that the main does not need to be looped at this time; 3. this plan shows the right-turn lane that will be added across the front of the gas station property; 4. the landscaping plan provides 4-inch caliper deciduous trees to balance with the proportion of the building.

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, stated we're getting into the interior drawings; the roof height was increased by 10 inches to accommodate the elevator, but we are still within the maximum permitted height; dumpster enclosure information was provided; exterior elevations changed marginally with some windows aligning with rooms on the inside.

Leisman stated one of the recommended conditions of approval is that the exterior lighting shall be reduced to a minimal level as needed for public safety and code compliance, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. He asked whether the applicant is agreeable to this condition.

Dixon stated the building lighting will be downward cast. He stated turning off some of those lights in the evening could be accomplished. Dixon stated parking lot lighting will be running on a separate system from the building lighting, for the shared parking area serving the entire center.

Jacobs asked if the free-standing sign had been previously approved.

Ferro stated preliminary plan approval did not approve signs, and what was shown by the applicant in their preliminary PUD submittal conforms with the current C-1 District regulations. He stated this is the first free-standing sign that has been proposed in the entire center.

Jacobs asked how that relates to the "business center" definition in the zoning rules. She asked whether a free-standing sign for Spectrum would preclude free-standing signs for other buildings in the Ada West Commercial center.

Ferro stated that was a good question, and the answer hinges on whether the Ada West Commercial Center condominium is considered to be a "business center."

Leisman stated he viewed the entire condominium as being a business center.

Ferro stated that a case can be made that individual signs would be consistent with the character and appearance of other areas in the Village.

Easter stated this is something we need to work out. Jacobs stated this appears to be open to interpretation and needs to be resolved.

Leisman stated condition 10 could address the monument sign.

Ferro stated this shall be subject to issuance of a sign permit in conformance with the sign regulations.

Leisman stated we have nine written conditions, and wonder if we should add at the end of paragraph eight: Exterior lighting should be reduced to a minimal level as needed for public safety and code compliance between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., "subject to approval of the Planning Department". Then we add a paragraph 10 about the monument sign. He asked when construction will begin and when they would be done.

Jeff Meyer, Spectrum Health, stated River Valley's new building is being built and they are going to vacate their existing building the second or third week of September; so if they do that we would be ready

to start demolition, and start construction by early October. Construction will probably take about a year to complete.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Easter, to approve the Final PUD Plan, for a 24,396 Square Foot Medical Office Building at 7130 East Fulton St., Unit 10, Ada West Commercial Condominium, subject to the following conditions:

1. The building and site improvements shall be completed substantially as shown on the plans consisting of 10 plan sheets titled "Spectrum Health Ada I.C.C.," with a revision date of 7-12-16, architectural plans prepared by Dixon Architects submitted June 30, 2016, and site lighting plans and fixture specifications submitted July 8, as modified by these conditions of approval.
2. Construction plans and specifications for the water main extension shall be subject to review and approval by the Township Utilities Director, and issuance of a DEQ permit, prior to initiation of construction.
3. Proposed pedestrian lighting shown on the plan shall match the fixture specification of the fixtures on new Headley Street, or an equivalent fixture approved by the Township, and shall be installed by the applicant or the condominium association prior to occupancy of the building.
4. Parking area improvements in the general common element in the Ada West Commercial Condominium and the extension of the 8 foot-wide non-motorized trail along Fulton St. from its current western terminus to the north-south service drive shall be completed prior to occupancy of the building, and shall be subject to review and approval of a final construction plan by the Planning Commission.
5. A storm water permit application shall be submitted and a permit issued by the Township, prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. The eastbound right-turn lane on M-21 at the north-south service drive intersection shall be completed prior to occupancy of the building.
7. The applicant shall place pavement markings on the north-south service drive to delineate separate northbound left-turn and right-turn lanes and a southbound entry lane, at the M-21 intersection, as recommended by the Township's traffic engineering consultant, prior to occupancy of the building.
8. Exterior lighting shall be reduced to a minimal level as needed for public safety and code compliance, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., subject to approval of the details by the Planning Department.
9. Wall-mounted light fixtures shall not direct light in a vertically-upward direction.
10. The monument sign shown on the plan is not within the scope of the PUD approval, and is subject to conformance with the sign regulations.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. **Review of PUD District Development Plan for a 22,001 Square Foot Mixed Use Building, portion of 400 Ada Drive SE, Parcel No. 41-15-34-126-017, proposed Unit 2, Ada Marketplace Square Condominium, Geld, LLC**

Steve Teitsma, Progressive AE, stated we're referring to the proposed building as B-2. This will be a 22,000 square foot building, mostly two floors, with a portion 3 stories. He stated they are proposing a parking lot to the rear of the building, accessed by a temporary access drive off Ada Drive. Utility service will be from Ada Drive. Teitsma noted storm water drains to the islands in the parking lot, and ultimately to an existing pond adjacent to the Thornapple River. The building occupies roughly 90% of the site area of the parcel. He stated they are proposing village style lights around the perimeter of the parking lot, along the walkways. Teitsma stated the construction of the Kingma's Market and Building B-2 would occur concurrently.

Teitsma reviewed the overall phasing plan submitted for the overall Marketplace Square development, and pointed out how buildout was anticipated in relation to the construction of River Street and the connecting street between Ada Drive and River Street.

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, stated the lower level is open glass; above is the brick; the architecture is similar to that on Mackinac Island and Beaver Island; different colors, canopies and lighting; trying to have a real interesting pedestrian environment by breaking down the building mass into small components. The lower level has 75% glass transparency on Ada Drive, and 77.7% on the new street side. Exterior lighting will be a collage of different lighting for each building. Dixon noted mechanical units would be placed on the roof of the building.

Ferro stated the subject property is quite a contrast to the Kingma's Market site in that this is a conventional rectangular building site, square to the road frontage, making it much easier to conform with the PVM District standards. There are fewer departures from ordinance standards proposed for this building, with two departures proposed – site coverage by building and pavement, and minimum frontage percentage, which is only 1 foot of building length shy of compliance.

Ferro stated he based parking demand calculations on the uses of space shown on the floor plans submitted, resulting in a total parking demand of 72 spaces, before adjustment using the reduction factor in the PVM district standards, which lowers the required parking to 28 spaces. He noted the plan proposes 42 spaces. He also pointed out his calculations do not include common circulation area in the building.

Ferro stated there will be on-street parking in the vicinity in the future that is not included in his space count. Ferro noted the ordinance standards are tailored to isolated sites where there is no on-street parking, and they are not tailored to a downtown area. He stated that the required parking reduction factor contained in the PVM district standards may be somewhat of an excessive reduction. He stated he believes the parking provided is adequate.

Ferro stated he found a conflict between the landscape plan submitted for the overall Marketplace Square condominium and the landscape plan submitted for the B-2 building. He noted the current plan shows evergreen trees in a parking lot island, and he questions whether evergreens should be used in a parking lot island.

Teistma stated the reason they are is because the ordinance has an evergreen requirement in the landscape greenbelt standards.

Ferro stated in our landscape requirements a greenbelt is defined as area between parking and road right-of-way. There's also language in the landscape standards that says they are only required in the C-1 District on frontages facing M-21, so green belt standards don't apply at this site.

He stated the areas shown shaded on the plan are going to be temporary green spaces where the grade will slope down between the new parking area that has a raised elevation, and the current parking area that's in the flood plain, so that's green space that will disappear eventually when the next phase comes along.

Under this proposed plan the access will become a very circuitous route to get to Gravel Bottom or River House or the dentist adjacent to Gravel Bottom. He suggested getting rid of a portion of the islands so that access can be maintained south of the new parking lot to get to the east portion of the existing parking lot.

Teitsma stated he thinks that's a good solution to chop off the end of the islands, pave it, you lose eight parking spaces for those business owners.

Leisman stated a condition should be that temporary access lanes shall be subject to approval of the Township Planner.

Ferro stated he drafted an approval motion that is two parts with findings regarding the criteria for granting two departures being satisfied, and conditions a. through i. are pretty much boiler plate. Not boiler plate is c - Consumers Energy has said we need to have space for ground mounted electrical transformer cabinets on these building sites, and a place needs to be found for that; so a condition is that the cabinets should be identified on the plan. The other one not boiler plate is condition h. when the connector street that's shown being completed in phase 4, along with the future River Street that is the permanent shared access drive to the parking area shall be installed, the temporary access drive should be removed.

Leisman stated on page 10 of the conditions after i. maybe we should add "nor final approval of a landscape plan for this building or this site condo parking lot", as it sounds like there are some issues with landscape.

Ferro stated they are not major issues.

Leisman stated I think we should maybe add a j. to address access to the other businesses, "a temporary access lane shall be subject to approval of the Township Planner".

In discussion, Commission members expressed concern with how we manage overall parking demand and supply in the redevelopment process. The uncertain status of whether a parking structure will be developed was also discussed.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Easter, as follows:

1. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:
 - a. The proposed development plan, as modified by the conditions of approval listed below, requires the following "departures" from the standards of the PVM district, which are hereby approved:
 - 1) Sec. 78-476(a) - Minimum frontage percentage.
 - 2) Sec. 78-476(a) - Maximum lot coverage.
 - b. The above departures result in a plan that complies with the spirit and intent of the PVM District to a greater degree than would be the case without authorization of the departures.
 - c. The proposed alternative is consistent with the purpose and intent of the PVM District.
 - d. The proposed alternative, in comparison to conformance with the PVM district standards, will not have a detrimental impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.

- e. The proposed alternative is necessary and appropriate to accommodate a superior design of the proposed development.
2. The proposed development plan for a 22,001 square foot mixed use building is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:
 - a. The building and site improvements shall be completed substantially as shown on the plan set titled “Ada Marketplace Building B2,” (civil drawings) dated July 13, 2016 and “Ada Marketplace Building B2,” (architectural drawings) dated June 23, 2016, except as modified in accordance with these conditions of approval.
 - b. Wall-mounted exterior light fixtures shall qualify as “full-cutoff” control of light emission. Fixture specifications shall be submitted for approval, prior to building permit issuance.
 - c. The plan shall be modified to identify locations of mechanical equipment and private utility equipment pads/pedestals, in accordance with PVM District standards.
 - d. The condominium subdivision plan and bylaws for the Marketplace Square site condominium shall be recorded, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - e. The plan shall be modified to identify the limits of the existing and proposed 100-year floodplain on the subject property.
 - f. Floodplain development permits shall be issued by the Michigan DEQ and Ada Township, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - g. A storm water permit application shall be submitted and approved, prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - h. Upon completion of the north-south private connector street between Ada Drive and the future River St., the permanent access driveway to the shared parking area shall be installed, and the temporary access drive to the north-south street shall be removed.
 - i. Approval of the development plan does not grant approval of signs shown on the plans, which are subject to issuance of a sign permit, nor final approval of a landscape plan for this building or the shared parking lot, which is subject to approval by the Township Planner.
 - j. A temporary access lane extending east-west on the boundary between the proposed new parking area and the existing parking serving McDonald’s, Gravel Bottom and the Riverhouse restaurant shall be provided, subject to approval of the layout by the Township Planner”.

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER/STAFF REPORTS

1. Draft of Proposed Amendment to PUD Regulations, concerning restaurants with drive-in facilities in C-2 Zoning District

Ferro stated the proposed draft would allow for a PUD plan to be proposed for a restaurant that has drive-through service windows as a design feature, subject to compliance with a number of standards. Currently, in a PUD you can’t propose a use with a design feature that’s not permitted normally in the C-1 or C-2 District, and we don’t currently permit restaurants with drive-thru service windows in either of those two districts. Under the current zoning rules that type of restaurant can’t be proposed in a PUD

either. He stated this proposed amendment would carve out a separate provision that would allow a restaurant to have the feature of one or more drive-through service windows to be included in a proposed PUD plan. He noted this has not yet been scheduled for a public hearing. He stated one possibility would be to assign a committee to look at this and refine it with the goal of having something in the next month or so, in order to hold a public hearing in September.

Easter stated she thought the last conversation we had there were some people on the Planning Commission who said never ever, ever, and it sounds like we're saying yes, maybe. We're changing the rules, and I was under the impression that in the Charrette, and the conversations we had it was never, ever, ever.

Leisman stated the draft we got from the property owner proposed a special land use as a way of doing it. Over the years we've had about five different interested parties. Jim and I met with Township Board members and the Township attorney and looked at, if the Township was going to do it what would be the best way to do it. Our job is to make recommendations, and this is a preliminary draft. He stated he would like to have a sub-committee to work on that, so this is a work in progress. Leisman stated he, Jacobs, and Easter would work on the sub-committee with the Planner.

Lunn suggested there be limits on the hours of operation.

2. Communications from Plainfield Township-Master Plan Update Distribution

No comments.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ferro stated there will be a public hearing on our proposed Master Plan amendment at the September meeting.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Easter, supported by Lunn, to adjourn at 9:30 p.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith
Ada Township Clerk

JS/dr