

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2016 MEETING**

Draft

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, October 20, 2016, 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 Jacobs, Lunn, Lowry, Leisman, Heglund, and Butterfield

Absent: Easter

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

Public Present: Steve Teitsma, Progressive AE; Steve Witte, Nederveld; Jonathan Blair, Architect

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Lunn, to approve the September 15, 2016 Meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

None.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Resolution to Adopt Ada Township Master Plan, 2016 Amendments

Planning Director Jim Ferro stated the Commission held a public hearing on the amendments last month, and was ready to take action, but it was pointed out that State law calls for the plan to be adopted by a Resolution of the Commission and a resolution had not yet been drafted, so action was postponed. Ferro offered a proposed resolution for consideration by the Commission.

Moved by Butterfield, supported by Jacobs, to adopt the Ada Township Master Plan, 2016 Amendments as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Re-Consideration of Proposed Amendments to Sign Regulations/Report from Sub-Committee

Leisman stated the Sub-committee has not had a chance to consider the Planning Department's recommendations.

Moved by Lunn, supported by Jacobs, to table Re-Consideration of Proposed Amendments to Sign Regulations/Report from Sub-Committee. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Site Plan Review, Completion of Shared Parking Area and Access Driveways in the Ada West Commercial Condominium, Units 1-10, Parcel Numbers 41-15-28-479-001 through 010, 7128, 7155, 7159, 7163, 7167, 7175, 7177, 7179, 7181 and 7183 Headley St., Geld, LLC

Steve Teitsma, Progressive AE, stated the project is to build out the remainder of the common elements of the West Commercial Condominium. This second phase is to prep the remainder of the condominium, in addition to prepping for the Spectrum building, which is currently under construction. The site layout plan shows the full parking lot; four additional parcels were created along Headley Street, which are vacant lots; and this parking would be for those four units as well as the Spectrum unit, in addition to providing some parking for the Ortez, River Valley Credit Union, and Heidi Christine buildings. He stated there is more than enough parking per the ordinance requirements for the 10 different sites throughout the zone.

Teitsma described the grading and utility plan. An underground storm water retention system is proposed, which would be connected to the MDOT system in M-21. MDOT has requirements as to how much flow can be released into their right-of-way, so we need to offset that by providing retention on our site, which would be done under the parking surface. The landscaping would be provided on the interior of the parking lot, and predominantly along the M-21 right-of-way. Additional landscaping would be put in when the units are developed along Headley Street. The parking was arranged with a five foot setback from the right-of-way. Site lighting will be similar to the adjacent parking lot with LED fixtures on 20 foot light poles on the internal portions of the parking lot to light it for safety reasons. The perimeter of the parking will use the decorative light pole and fixture, which provides light for the sidewalk.

Ferro stated in the plans there is a detail provided for a perforated storm sewer and infiltration trench, but he sees no plan notes indicating where that will be used on the site. He asked if it will be used.

Teitsma stated it was used for the storm sewer on the Heidi Christine site to try to infiltrate as much storm water as possible. He stated they have not fully detailed out those pipe inverts and sizes, but he anticipates they will try to infiltrate here as much as we can.

Ferro stated the general parking layout conforms with our dimensional standards and the zoning rules with 62 foot wide parking bays; also it provides more than the minimum required internal island area. The number of canopy trees fall short of the ordinance standards with only 18 trees, and that standard could be met by showing future trees. Ferro stated there is one other parking layout standard that is not met, which calls for a 20 foot-wide greenbelt between the Fulton St. right-of-way and the parking area. Ferro stated this conflict could be resolved in either of the following ways: 1) re-design the parking lot with a 20 foot setback, which would result in the loss of a lot of parking spaces; 2) revise the zoning standards, or 3) seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Commission may want to approve the plan based on any of the three solutions taking place between now and when the parking lot is built.

Ferro stated the lighting plan is fine. The light fixture is a zero up-lighting that does not cast light beyond horizontal. As a condition of approval, the decorative streetscape fixtures along the south perimeter of the parking lot need to be constructed. He prepared a recommended approval motion subject to four conditions, plus a condition requiring the conflict with parking area greenbelt standards be resolved prior to construction.

Leisman stated we have the recommended approval of the Planning Department with four conditions, plus a fifth one that would revise the plan to show trees installed along the south perimeter of the parking area, and six is the conflict with the greenbelt standards shall be resolved prior to construction through a zoning variance or amendment to the regulations.

Moved by Heglund, supported by Lunn, to approve the site plan for completion of the shared parking area and access driveway in the Ada West Commercial Condominium, subject to the following conditions:

1. The parking area and related site improvements shall be completed prior to occupancy of the Spectrum Health facility.

2. Storm water management design, issuance of a discharge permit by MDOT, and issuance of a storm water permit by the Township shall be completed prior to initiation of construction.
3. The compatibility of trees in the greenbelt with the overhead power lines shall be verified and any needed plan adjustments submitted for review by the Planning Department, prior to construction.
4. Completion of the parking area shall include installation of the decorative light fixtures shown on the plan, including the fixture between the Ortez Insurance River Valley Credit Union buildings.
5. Plans for development on condominium units adjacent to the south edge of the parking area shall include planting of canopy trees between the parking lot perimeter sidewalk and buildings, to contribute toward satisfying the internal parking lot landscaping standards for the parking area.
6. The conflict between the parking area setback from the Fulton St. right-of-way and the minimum greenbelt width standard shall be resolved prior to construction through either the approval of a zoning variance or an amendment to the zoning regulations.

Motion passed unanimously.

Pre-Application Conference, 25 Dwelling Units in 16 Buildings on 1.72 Acres, part of 7075 Headley St., part of Parcel No. 41-15-28-477-043, J. Visser Design

Leisman stated that J. Visser Design is a client of the law firm he works for. He stated he does not personally work on their projects. He stated he believes he can be fair in reviewing this project, but felt the relationship should be disclosed.

Bajdek stated J. Visser Design requested a pre-application conference regarding potential residential development on currently vacant land. The subject site is zoned C-1 Village Business, and can be proposed under two alternative zoning procedures: one, under the optional PVM District regulations, the village form-base code, or two, under the PUD zoning regulations. Development of the site is being proposed by the applicant under the PVM District regulations, the village form-base code.

Steve Witte, Nederveld, representing J. Visser Design, stated they will be introducing the project and, hopefully, getting some good feedback from the Planning Commission. He stated they hope to have the project reviewed under the PVM District, so they don't have to go through the PUD process. Witte stated that a swapping of land between the subject property, AGO's property, and the Big Steps Little Feet property is proposed, which will result in the proposed 1.72 acre development site. 25 residential units are proposed in 16 buildings - nine buildings will be duplex, and seven would be single unit buildings, which will have two bedrooms each; the larger units would have three bedrooms each. Access to the site will be from an 18 foot wide "alley" between the two rows of buildings, with an adjacent five foot sidewalk flush with the pavement. All the units would have two-stall garages.

Witte stated a water main will be extended down the private drive through the middle of the property to another water main that is connected to a hydrant beside the car wash. The sanitary sewer will come from M-21, and they are talking with Amway and Progressive AE about a joint plan to get sanitary service to this site. Storm water will be handled via underground storage either on the site or potentially on the site of the Ada West Commercial Center parking lot.

Witte stated J. Visser Design did some very nice renderings of the units, which he then described.

Bajdek stated the development is proposed as a traditional condominium development with saleable units; the creation of individual lots for the units is not proposed. The single-family units would be developed as "Village House" lots and the duplex unit sites as "Rowhouse" lots under the PVM District standards. He stated it appears most of the parameters as set forth with the PVM standards will be able to be met. He stated exceptions include:

- Minimum lot width of 40 feet for the single-family units;
- Maximum lot width of 32 feet for units 4-7 fronting Bronson Street; and
- Maximum front setback of 10 feet for units 7-14 fronting Bronson Street.

Bajdek noted that compliance with the PVM standards was assessed by assuming imaginary lot lines located at the midpoint between adjacent buildings, since there are no actual individual lots proposed to be created.

He stated proposed parking is limited to the driveways in front of attached garages. With limited driveway parking available, a guest parking area is recommended/suggested to be created onsite. Noise emissions from operations both existing and future at the AGO site is of concern. To mitigate noise, a buffer of fencing and/or wall along with landscaping material is necessary along the common lot line. Bajdek stated the dwelling units at the far northwest end of the property would appear to be undesirable locations due to their close proximity to the blowers located at the exit of the car wash and are recommended to be removed from the development plan.

Bajdek stated with minor modifications to the development plan, it appears the site could be developed under the PVM District regulations with minimal departures.

Jacobs asked whether the front of the rear units would face the alley. Witte stated they would. He stated decks would be located on the upper floor of the rear units, facing the alley.

Butterfield asked if there was room or if it had been explored to have a curb cut on Bronson, to accommodate additional parking between buildings.

Witte stated the Road Commission likes to limit curb cuts; it's fairly tight in there between the curb line and the sidewalk, and we're trying to hold that 10 foot building setback off the right-of-way.

Lowry asked if they had looked at a price range.

Jeff Visser, J. Visser Design, stated it's probably going to be in the \$350's or upper \$400's.

Butterfield asked if there are going to be any rentals.

Witte stated they are going to be marketed as condominium units for sale.

Jacobs asked if the road to the east would be used to get in, and whether it would require an easement.

Witte stated there will need to be an easement.

Jacobs asked who owns the road.

Witte stated Amway owns the one between the Post Office, and Big Steps Little Feet owns the drive that goes on the west side of this project.

Butterfield stated she likes the design.

Heglund stated they are sharp looking units, and he likes the character of them. As far as the land swap to get to 1.72 acres, how much land needs to be swapped?

Witte then showed a projection of the land and explained what would be swapped.

Leisman stated the plan should show once the land swap is done how close the access drive would be to the back of the units, assuming there is a development going in there.

Witte showed where the drive-thru would potentially go, and then where the existing drive is and where it would be re-located to.

Leisman asked Ferro if the proposed redevelopment of the AGO site would be completed prior to the proposed residential units becoming available for sale. Ferro stated he didn't know what that timing would be.

Witte stated there is a huge push for McDonald's and AGO to complete their project, so they are going to be preparing plans as fast as possible. He believes that would be done before the residential buildings get finished, and that construction of both sites will happen at the same time.

Leisman questioned where guests would park.

Witte stated they do not want to lose three units for guest parking. He stated they feel there is sufficient parking provided. He stated the Township regulations require 1.54 parking spaces per unit, we're at 4 parking spaces per unit – two in the garage and two in front of the garage doors. The owner is talking with Big Steps Little Feet about an arrangement that would allow use of their lot in the evening. They understand the noise issues and are going to be talking with the owner of AGO about solid landscaping and/or fencing along the boundary.

Leisman stated it's a nice project, it seems to fit, it gives more housing in the village; but he shares the Planning Department's concern over parking. He suggested the applicant work with the Planning Department before coming back regarding this issue; it makes a difference what they are recommending with respect to units.

Butterfield asked what would preclude people from parking on Bronson like they do for special events.

Ferro stated it happens on occasion now for special events. There really is no designated off street parking in very close proximity. There are a few spaces just south of the Ada West Commercial Center by Ortez Insurance and the River Valley Credit Union. He stated the Big Steps Little Feet lot is available in the evenings, and an arrangement could be made; it's not open at night, and it's close by.

Leisman stated if it's done as a PVM all we would need is a site plan review.

Ferro stated our ordinance standards are 1.5 per unit for one bedroom units, 2.2 for two bedroom units. He stated the PVM standards are premised on being in an area where you've got an on street parking supply nearby. We'll look at it closer, and if those areas behind the garage are deep enough to accommodate guests we can probably give credit for those.

(Leisman left at 8:00 p.m.)

Site Plan Review, 1,916 Square Foot Addition to Existing Office Building, 8066 E. Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-35-100-086, Jonathan Blair, for American International Foods

Jonathan Blair, Architect, representing American International Foods, stated we are proposing an approximate 5,000 square foot addition. The existing building is three floors of office use, and they are providing a complimentary building to the west that will also be office use on the second and third floor. He stated the first floor is proposed as a fitness and shower rooms for the staff. He also noted that the proposed addition is outside the flood plain. If there is any kind of lighting along the base of the building it would be minimal, landscape type lighting. Blair stated there is some existing pavement that encroaches across the site boundary onto adjacent Township-owned property, and there have been conversations on how to address that.

Blair stated the proposed addition would have an agricultural character, and be interesting and fun. It will complement the building that is there now. He stated they are exploring alternative facade materials.

Bajdek stated the proposed addition meets all C-2 zoning district standards. It does not generate the need for additional onsite parking; adequate parking currently exists. Some pavement associated with a few parking spaces encroaches into the E. Fulton Street right-of-way; existing pavement also extends onto Township owned property immediately to the west of the subject site, with some of it being used for parking purposes. This encroachment existed at the time the adjacent property was acquired by the Township. All existing and proposed improvements to the site are located outside the Grand River floodplain boundary. No storm water detention is necessary due to the small increase in the footprint of the building. Runoff from the building expansion project will flow across existing pavement to the wooded area of the site and then into the Grand River. As the applicant stated there is concern regarding the existing well being in proximity to the proposed northwesterly addition. The exterior building materials will consist mainly of glass and metal features. Bajdek reviewed proposed conditions of approval.

Moved by Jacobs, supported by Lunn, to approve the site plan for a 1,916 square foot building addition at 8066 E. Fulton St., subject to the following conditions:

1. Any exterior light fixtures on the building shall be fully shielded on all sides.
2. A utility signoff from the Kent County Health Department for onsite well and septic, prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The pavement encroachment onto the adjacent property owned by Ada Township shall be addressed through one of the following mutually-agreed upon methods, prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - 1) acquisition by the applicant of property from the Township to accommodate the encroachment.
 - 2) completion of a revocable license agreement with the Township to authorize the encroachment.
 - 3) completion of a permanent easement agreement with the Township authorizing the encroachment.
 - 4) removal of the encroachment by the applicant, if desired by the Ada Township Board.

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER/STAFF REPORTS

Ferro stated the annual Michigan planning conference will be held next week in Kalamazoo. He stated he would be attending a session regarding modifying sign regulations to conform to the recent Supreme Court case.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sarah Andro, owner of Saburba café, stated Thornapple River Drive is not a pass-through street anymore with Headley being the new main road, so now her business has little to no visibility, and business is down 20% to 50%. She stated she wishes to have signs both in front on Thornapple River Dr. and on Headley Street, a permanent, lighted sign that will draw customers in, equivalent to what is in the front of our businesses. She stated the Grand Salon also would like to have a second free-standing sign on Headley St.

Ferro stated Sarah's property does extend back to Headley Street, and if the property owner does put another building on the Headley frontage, the parking lot will still have access on an easement through the church property. He stated both businesses qualify as business centers under our definition, which gives them a certain sized free-standing sign, but only one per property is currently permitted.

Paul Jones, owner of Blimpie, stated that when his lease was renewed, the property owner told him he would be willing to install a second sign on the Headley St. frontage.

Andro stated when the lot does get developed behind her building it will be two to three stories and they will have zero visibility at that point from Headley Street.

Butterfield asked if a second sign for the new building could be shared with the existing building. Ferro stated that was a possibility, if the rules are changed to allow 2 freestanding signs for a single business center.

Jacobs stated if we are re-visiting the sign ordinance, do the proposed rule changes affect this geographic area? Ferro stated yes, the amendments strictly deal with the C-1 District, which they're part of.

Jacobs stated it would seem fair to permit two freestanding signs on lots that have double frontage and access.

Ferro stated if you look at the language of the draft he prepared, it says the maximum number of free-standing signs is one on a lot or parcel that has frontage on one street or on a corner lot, and if it's on a double frontage lot having access to both streets two free-standing signs are permitted. This carves out a separate provision for double frontage lots with access on both streets.

The second one could be required to be smaller, if the Commission felt that was necessary, but since they aren't both visible at the same time, there may not be any reason to have separate size limits.

Jacobs asked for clarification as to which properties the double-frontage provision would apply to. Ferro stated it would apply to the Grand Salon property, The Community Church property, the Blimpie-Saburba property and the McAleenan property.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Heglund, to adjourn at 8:21 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith
Ada Township Clerk

JS/dr