

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 17, 2015 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, December 17, 2015, 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 Easter, Butterfield, Lunn, Lowry, Leisman, and Jacobs

Staff Present: Planning Director Ferro

Absent: Heglund

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 2015 MEETING

Motion by Easter, supported by Lowry, to approve the November 19 Meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Special Use Permit, 2,700 Square Foot Classroom Addition, 750 Square Foot Greenhouse Addition, and related site improvements, 6206 Ada Dr. SE, Parcel No. 41-15-32-400-036, Ada Christian School

Brent Dykstra, AMDG Architects, representing Ada Christian School, stated the proposed plan is an outdoor education classroom project and related site features geared toward hands-on outdoor learning. Dykstra described the proposed building addition and added site improvements.

Jim Ferro stated schools are a special use in all residential zoning districts and this property is zoned R-2. He stated the addition is very small in relation to the existing building footprint, and it's also entirely internal to the campus, is not visible from any public roads, and has no impact on adjoining properties. He then went over the standards for approval of special use permits as listed in the zoning ordinance. Ferro stated the addition is not intended to increase the student capacity of the building with students being rotated into this facility on a scheduled basis so that all students are exposed to this new curriculum component. Ferro noted the project does not have any impact on parking demand or public utilities. He stated there are landscape enhancements in the vicinity of the classroom addition to provide a pedestrian linkage between the main building corridor and the classroom addition and outdoor space. Ferro added the Township's civil engineering consultant has reviewed the plans and, given the very minor increase in impervious area, believes the adjacent wetland that receives storm water from the site can also handle the additional runoff from the site.

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

Ferro stated the hearing notice was published and mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the campus. He stated staff has recommended approval not subject to any conditions.

Easter stated this is brilliant; wonderful planning.

Lunn stated it would be great if there was a cistern for storm water so you could do something to teach the kids about storm water.

Motion by Lunn, supported by Easter, to approve the request from Ada Christian School for the Special Use Permit with no conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Update on Parking Study

Jim Ferro stated the parking study was begun in June with the parking consultant doing actual vehicle counts in the village. He stated parking spaces were inventoried in public and private lots, as well as on-street parking. Ferro stated parking occupancy counts were done during the lunch hour and in evenings. A preliminary partial report was prepared which concluded that overall there is currently an adequate supply of parking in the Village overall. In July projections of future square footage in the village based on the Envision Ada redevelopment plan were prepared for the consultant. Within the last week we received a draft report with an analysis of the projected future demand in relation to supply, as well as some recommendations on how to best manage parking supply. He stated two major points are:

1. There was a pretty significant deficit projected of a couple hundred space range of parking in the shopping center area. One recommendation is the Township discourage future individual private use private parking facilities on new development sites, and to move toward a greater proportion of parking supply being on street and public off street shared parking to meet our parking needs.

Jacobs asked what they meant by discourage.

Ferro stated one way to do it is by zoning rules that would prohibit on-site restricted use parking facilities.

Leisman stated that a memo from the Planning Commission to the Board and DDA is in progress.

Ferro stated it has been drafted, hasn't been sent yet.

Leisman stated he believes we should put this as No. 1 under Unfinished Business at our meeting in January.

Easter stated by then we should have more information from our consultant.

Development Plan for 10,000 Square Foot Commercial Building on a Village Blockfront Lot in the PVM Zoning District, portion of 527 Ada Drive SE, Parcel No. 41-15-34-102-005, Dixon Architecture

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, presented a description of the proposed building. He stated the property has 204 lineal feet of street frontage on Headley St., and the building is 100 feet long. Dixon stated the zoning rules require that the building occupy 90% of the frontage on the street, and the proposed building is at 48.5%. He noted they have provided parking on the north portion of the lot for a total of 21 parking spaces. Dixon stated there are issues with the site that we just can't accommodate: 1. there is supposed to be a common shared drive with the adjacent property owners. However, because of requirements of the County Road Commission that common access drive has to be moved onto our property, thus cutting down our allowable area to meet the frontage requirement. We extended the building to 118 feet, and it should be 180 feet to meet the frontage requirement, which forced us to change the parking to 15 stalls. He stated they cannot meet all the dimensional requirements for the site according to the zoning rules, and they are requesting approval of a departure from those standards.

Ferro stated the applicant has made it clear the primary issue is that the proposed layout creates a 100 foot long dead space west of the building. The code defines a village blockfront lot as one that is constructed with little or no side yard, and minimal front yard setback, thus creating a continuous street wall. He stated the applicant is requesting a departure from that standard in the PVM district, and the criteria in the ordinance for granting a departure are different from granting a variance.

Ferro stated there is also a standard in the form-based code that says that parking may not be located in the side yard unless the building meets the minimum building lot width and frontage percentage requirements of the code. Ferro also noted that the applicant does not have a signed parking agreement with the adjacent property owner that shares the driveway access, for sharing of the parking that is served by that driveway access.

Also, Ferro stated a revised memo received from the applicant regarding changes made to the first floor height, window dimensions and area, refuse facilities, exterior lighting, location of mechanical equipment, and landscape plans, which were concerns at our last meeting, have all now been met. He stated the challenge for the commission is to determine whether the proposed departure from the frontage percentage standards and those criteria are satisfied. One potential solution to consider is whether, through changes in circumstances in the future, an opportunity could present itself or be created through the efforts of the property owner to make the proposed parking on Headley Street available for future placement of an additional building. It could only happen if: 1. additional public parking supply were created; and 2. there would need to be an alternate means of access to Headley Street for the adjacent property owner who will have an access easement through the Dixon property for driveway access to Headley St.

He stated he has drafted a condition of approval that would approve a temporary departure from the minimum frontage standard with respect to the Headley Street frontage, provided the departure would be revoked if two criteria were satisfied.

1. Additional parking supply, with the number of spaces determined by the Township to be reasonably sufficient to meet the parking needs of the property, is developed by the Township in the future within 500 feet of the property.
2. The applicant would have to have the legal ability and authority to remove or relocate the shared driveway easement that runs through the property to Headley Street.

If both of those conditions were satisfied, then the property owner would be required to remove the parking west of the building, and the driveway access, and relocate the water and sewer services in order to make that land available for an additional building. Then if an approval went forward with that condition, there are two other conditions of approval: one, that would grant a departure without any conditions from the minimum frontage percentage on Ada Drive; and two, that the property owner is responsible for installing brick pavers and concrete sidewalk in the Headley Street right-of-way fronting the property; and have those completed before the building is occupied.

Dixon stated he am willing to go along with most of what Jim said, but he has some issues with the utilities, as he would want to be allowed to leave utility service in place; and would want five years to remove the parking.

Easter stated she thinks those are creative solutions to the problem.

Butterfield asked if there has to be a driveway at Ada Drive.

Ferro stated without the Ada Drive access they would have to have the Headley Street access.

Butterfield asked if Ferro was in agreement that Kent County is mandating an alignment for a future curb cut on the opposite side of Headley Street side.

Ferro stated he doesn't question what he is hearing from the applicant regarding that.

Motion by Lunn, supported by Jacobs, to approve the Development Plan proposed by Dixon Architecture for 527 Ada Drive SE, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the plan is based upon a finding by the Commission that the criteria for granting a) a temporary departure from the minimum frontage percentage standard specified in Sec. 78-476 of the zoning ordinance, with respect to the Headley Street frontage, and 2) a temporary departure from the prohibition on off-street parking being located in a side yard contained in Sec. 78-478, are satisfied, and temporary departures are hereby approved, provided that, in the event that 1) additional public parking with a number of spaces determined by the Township to be reasonably sufficient to meet the parking needs of the subject property is developed by the Township in the future within a radius of 500 feet of the applicant's property, and 2) the applicant has the legal ability and authority to either remove or relocate the shared driveway access easement to Headley St. benefitting the JH Realty Partners and Peninsular Oil & Gas properties, the 12 western-most parking spaces shown on the plan and the driveway access to Headley St. shall be removed or relocated by the property owner, and the public water and sewer service lines shall be relocated by the property owner, in order to provide vacant land along the Headley St. frontage suitable for placement of an additional building on the subject property, placed within the minimum and maximum front setback lines along Headley St., thereby achieving a lesser degree of departure from the minimum building frontage standard of the PVM district.
2. Approval of the plan is based upon a finding by the Commission that the criteria for granting of a departure from the minimum frontage percentage standard specified in Sec. 78-476 of the zoning ordinance, with respect to the Ada Drive frontage are satisfied, and the departure is hereby approved.
3. The property owner shall be responsible for installation of brick pavers and concrete sidewalk in the Headley St. right-of-way fronting the property, in accordance with the Townships plans and specifications for the Headley St. re-construction project. These improvements shall be completed prior to occupancy of the building.

Motion passed unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Site Plan Review, 10 Unit Commercial Site Condominium, portions of 7130, 7214 Fulton St., 7171 Headley St., Parcel No's. 41-15-27-352-001, 28-477-031 and 036, Geld, LLC

Steve Teitsma, Progressive AE, presented the proposed site condominium. Teitsma summarized development sites that have already received zoning approval, including the Heidi Christine Salon site, the River Valley Credit Union site and the Ortez State Farm Agency site. He stated that the applicant has concluded that the best approach to creating individually-owned building sites for the overall planned commercial center is to develop a site condominium that gives the flexibility of creating common element for shared parking, with building areas around the perimeter. Teitsma described how public utility services would be provided and how storm water management would be handled, with subsurface detention.

Ferro stated there are ten condominium lots proposed with nine potential buildings, with all of the parking located in the general common area. Ferro stated site condominiums are a form of real estate ownership

that is permitted in all zoning districts in the Township, and the zoning regulations require site plan approval of condominium subdivisions by the Planning Commission before the documents that create the condo units are recorded with the County Register of Deeds. Ferro noted the zoning rules require three conditions must be satisfied for each condo unit:

- (1) Each site condominium unit must comply with minimum lot area, minimum lot width and required front, side and rear yards.
- (2) Each site condominium unit shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of the zoning district in which it is located, including, but not limited to use regulations, minimum floor area of dwellings and maximum building height.
- (3) All public and private utilities shall be placed underground.

Ferro stated even though one of the drawings shows conceptual building footprints on each condo unit, what is before the Commission for approval tonight is only the condo unit and general common element boundary layout. Ferro stated it is anticipated that the development on each unit, with the exception of Unit 10, will be under the planned village mixed-use form base zoning regulations. He stated Unit 10 is probably going to be submitted as a PUD plan as an alternative for this property. All of the condo unit dimensions, except for Unit 10, comply with Village Shop Lot standards in the PVM district.

Ferro stated the exact parking layout is also not the subject of the Commission's review tonight.

Ferro stated there are two vehicular accesses proposed – one from Headley St. and one from the existing north-south service drive to the west.

Ferro pointed out that the proposed east-west driveway access to the site is immediately adjacent to the parking spaces shown on Unit 10, and he believes there should be separation between the two. In addition, he stated that the pedestrian walkway shown extending east-west through the site should be extended along the east-west access drive, to connect to the north-south service drive, at a pedestrian crossing, and should be extended to connect to the building entry on Unit 10. Ferro stated addressing these two issues – separation between Unit 10 parking and the east-west driveway, and extending the pedestrian walkway, may require modification to the Unit 10 boundary. Ferro suggested postponing action may be appropriate until that is addressed.

Ferro also suggested that the design of the north-south service drive intersection with Fulton St. should also be examined for its adequacy, based on the amount of new development proposed.

Ferro stated he has reviewed the parking demand calculations submitted by the applicant, and believes the parking supply is sufficient.

Ferro stated that in general the site layout provides an orderly and suitable layout for future development, subject to the issues he previously mentioned.

Ferro reviewed the six recommended approval conditions in his staff report, for consideration either tonight or at a future meeting. He stated an alternative to postponement would be adding a condition allowing minor modifications to be made to the boundary of Unit 10.

Steve Dertz, Amway Corp., stated the applicant wishes to complete and record the condominium documents soon, as Heidi Christine's Salon cannot move into their new building until the condominium is approved and the condominium documents are completed.

Butterfield asked whether use of the parking area by the public should be addressed.

Ferro stated he did not believe we are in a position to mandate the parking be publicly-accessible. He stated that one thing he hasn't seen is how the condominium documents are worded with respect to any restrictions in use of the parking by all condo unit owners. He stated his expectation is there will be no restrictions on use of the parking within the development by the condo unit owners, other than the 15 spaces shown located on Unit 10. Ferro stated that he has heard language from the applicant that makes it unclear whether the intent is for the parking to truly be unrestricted use among the condo unit owners.

Steve Dertz stated two of the businesses have requested that enough parking be supplied so that their business needs can be met, but they are not going to police, tow, mark or cordon off any of their parking spots. He stated it is a general free-for-all.

Leisman asked if there was a condition stating that the condo documents shall not restrict the parking in the limited common area to the condo owners, would that be acceptable? Dertz stated it would.

Ferro stated the language he has heard in the past is that Heidi Christine's has "dibs" on a certain number of spaces, and to him, it implies something other than shared use parking.

Dertz stated that the condo documents are being written as limited common elements – 36 spaces for Heidi Christine and 86 for the proposed medical building, and we have much in excess of both of those.

Ferro pointed out there is nothing on the drawings submitted by the applicant that identifies any limited common element. He stated we are applying reduced parking standards to the overall development based on the premise that it is going to be shared, and that it therefore needs to be legally shared in the wording of the condo documents.

It was moved by Jacobs, supported by Lunn, to approve the proposed site condominium plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The site condominium Master Deed and Bylaws shall be submitted to the Township for review and approval, prior to being recorded with the Kent County Register of Deeds, and prior to issuance of building permits for additional buildings on the subject property. The condo documents shall provide for common parking for all condo unit owners, except for the 15 spaces shown on Unit 10.
2. A Township storm water permit application shall be submitted and approved, prior to issuance of any building permits for construction on individual units, and prior to construction of future parking area phases.
3. Construction of future phases of the shared parking area shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission, either in a separate zoning application or as part of the development plan application for an individual unit.
4. Plans submitted for review/approval of future parking area expansion shall include proposed landscaping.
5. Submittal of plans for development on Unit 10 shall include an analysis of the need for improvements/changes to the north-south service drive/M-21 intersection, prepared by a licensed traffic engineer.
6. Approval of the site condominium survey plan does not constitute approval of conceptual building footprints and building uses depicted on each condominium unit on the Site Grading and Utility Plan, Sheet C300 and the Site Layout/Parking Plan, Sheet C200.
7. Minor modifications to the boundary of Unit 10 may be made, subject to approval of the Planning

Director.

Motion passed unanimously.

Leisman requested staff review the site condo rules for possible changes for the February meeting.

Development Plan Review, 3,636 Square Foot Office Building on a 4,119 Square Foot Village Shop Lot, portion of 7214 Fulton St., Parcel No. 41-15-27-352-001, Paul Ortez State Farm Office

Ken Dixon, Dixon Architecture, stated Paul Ortez would like to construct a two-story 3,636 square foot office building to the west of the River Valley Credit Union, with him occupying the second floor, and a vacant tenant space on the lower level. Per the zoning ordinance there are entries on both sides of the building, with the design being reminiscent of a village home. Dixon described the proposed building materials and character.

Steve Teitsma, Progressive AE, stated the site meets all of the requirements of the form base code in the PVM District, with one minor exception, that being the percentage of lot coverage, which exceeds the maximum limit by a small amount. Teitsma stated utility services to the site are already in place, through the Headley St. construction project. Teitsma also described the proposed landscape plan.

Ferro stated the plan complies with all of the PVM District standards for a village shop lot, except for the site coverage standard. He stated this standard is exceeded by a little over 100 square feet, and is very minor in nature. Ferro noted the parking supply is built into the initial phase of the shared lot. He recommended approval of the plan subject to the three conditions in his memo.

Butterfield asked if there are any plans for a sidewalk from Headley Street to the parking lot.

Teitsma stated yes, between the River Valley Credit Union and the future corner lot, and there will be another connection on the west side of the access drive.

Easter asked if there are any lighting issues.

Ferro stated this plan shows the decorative light that will be put in between the two buildings.

Motion by Easter, supported by Jacobs, to approve the development plan, based upon a finding that the criteria for approval of a departure from the maximum site coverage standard is satisfied, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the development plan does not grant approval of signs shown on the plans, which are subject to issuance of a sign permit.
2. The condominium Master Deed and Bylaws shall be submitted to the Township for review and approval by the Planner as to conformance with the zoning regulations and conditions of approval, prior to being recorded with the Kent County Register of Deeds, and prior to issuance of a building permit.

Motion passed unanimously.

Final PUD Plan Amendment, Addition of 34 Parking Spaces to Existing Office/Distribution Site, 390 Spaulding Ave SE, Parcel No. 41-15-30-451-005, Optio Data, LLC

Jack Barr, Nederveld stated his client is looking to add 34 additional parking spaces for their staff. A landscape plan and setback plan have been submitted. Barr stated there are a couple of retaining walls

they will need to build; there is no change in utilities; trees will be planted to be in compliance with the landscape ordinance for parking lot landscaping.

Ferro stated the use and development on this property is subject to an old litigation settlement that states development is subject to final PUD plan approval by the Township. Since this business has grown, employment has grown, and the parking demand has increased. Ferro stated the parking supply is expanded through a combination of adding spaces to existing pavement on the site, as well as adding new pavement in scattered areas of the site, increasing the parking supply from 70 to 104 spaces. Ferro stated this plan has been reviewed and the number of spaces complies with the settlement agreement, but does exceed the percentage above the minimum parking requirements that requires Planning Commission approval. The zoning regulations state if you exceed the parking standards set forth in the zoning rules by more than 25% it requires approval by the Planning Commission. He stated our review also indicated that there need to be five barrier-free parking spaces, and only two were shown on the plan. It was also reviewed for types of trees contained in the landscape internal parking lot islands, and what are shown are ornamental trees, and the zoning rules do call for canopy trees. Approval is recommended subject to the two conditions noted in the staff report - 1. The Planning Commission finds the parking may exceed 125% above the standards specified in the zoning rules; and 2. The landscape plan be modified to provide canopy trees in the parking lot.

Leisman stated it shows the lighting that would be relocated, and asked if there is a cutoff fixture requirement.

Ferro stated there is cutoff lighting on the site, and I don't know if any new ones are proposed, but there are two being relocated and reused.

Leisman suggested it would be appropriate to add a condition that any additional exterior parking lot light shall be cutoff fixtures.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Butterfield, to approve the Final PUD Plan Amendment for construction of an additional 34 parking spaces, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Commission hereby grants an exception for the minimum parking standards being exceeded by more than 25 percent.
2. The plan shall be revised to provide required canopy trees for the landscaped islands, as well as the required number barrier free parking spaces.
3. Relocated or new exterior lighting shall be cutoff fixtures. Motion passed unanimously.

Development Plan Review, Riverpoint of Ada, 50 Attached and Detached Condominium Units on 16.17 acres, 626, 634, 640, 660, 680, 690 Ada Dr., 7358, 7384 Bradfield St., 7245, 7325 High St., 630, 636, 638, 646 Mars Ave., 7390 Rix St., Thornapple Pines Development, LLC

Mark Kurensky, HKM Architects, stated we presented this plan in May, and the plan is substantially the same, in terms of the overall layout, vehicular access and number of units. He then went on to explain refinements that have been made to the plan. Kurensky stated the placement of homes along the river frontage does not maximize the number of homes in this area, in order to maintain an area with an open view of the river corridor. He explained the placement of townhomes along the Ada Drive frontage, with a proposed setback from the road that is greater than the maximum allowed by the PVM district rules. He pointed out they are proposing a secondary sidewalk between the lot line and the building frontages, to maintain the character of an urban street frontage in a forecourt between the front of the townhomes and the secondary sidewalk, thereby conforming with the intent of the code.

Kurensky described the landscape treatments proposed in the development, including the use of retaining walls to preserve existing significant trees on the site, and low wood fencing along road edges adjoining common area.

Kurensky noted that the alignment of the path extending from the private road to a river overlook has been revised to preserve existing trees. He pointed out that the river frontage would be common open space area in the condominium, with a low fence at the top of the bluff between home sites and the open space along the river.

Kurensky described proposed landscape treatment at the private road entry. He noted they are proposing to use the same decorative street lamp as is used in the Village, with lamps installed along the Ada Drive frontage, and at key locations within the development along the private road.

Jeff Visser, J. Visser Design, described the proposed architectural character of the townhomes and single family homes. Visser stated the townhomes use the same architectural palette as the former school house, and attempt to extend the downtown character from the railroad trestle up the hill to the existing 660 building, and bridge the gap between the two. He stated that the detailing of single family homes is similar to homes built in the early 1900's. He noted the attached garages are recessed behind the front porches.

Chuck Hoyt, Thornapple Pines Development, stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals previously granted a variance to permit the number of dwelling units proposed on a single access. He also stated that a public access easement to allow public access to a portion of the sidewalk system in the development has been drafted. He stated their intent is to provide a public pedestrian loop through the development between Ada Drive and a potential future pedestrian underpass at the railroad trestle over the river that would be installed by the Township, as shown on Exhibit C attached to the draft easement.

Hoyt noted there has also been a restrictive covenant drafted that would prohibit installation of a gate at the private road entry either by the developer or the future condo association.

Kurensky described how storm runoff would be discharged to the existing naturalized area on the property for water quality treatment, prior to being discharged to the ditch that extends to the river.

Ferro asked if a wetland determination has been done for the natural area that is being used for storm water management to determine whether it is a state regulated wetland; and if it is, the boundaries of that wetland should be shown on an existing conditions plan.

Tim Bureau, Tim Bureau Consulting, stated they have delineated the wetland and it was surveyed. He stated they could add that line to the map. He stated it is regulated, since it is within 500 feet of the river. He stated its regulated status is also established due to its connection to the river by the ditch along the railroad, and the existing culvert between the wetland and the ditch. There is a DEQ permit required because there will be some grading on the river bank within the flood plain, and for storm water discharge to the wetland.

Ferro stated the zoning rules do have some riparian protection setback standards; a no disturb zone within 10 feet of a regulated wetland boundary. He stated the applicant needs to look at whether Units 14 through 18 comply with that riparian setback standard, and possibly grading activity as well.

Tim Bureau stated there is no fill proposed in the wetland.

Ferro stated he has not yet completed a thorough review of the plans. He stated he does like the general approach being taken and the level of detail with respect to site landscaping and grade retention features being used. Ferro stated the concept of treating the proposed upper level sidewalk in front of the

townhomes is interesting. He stated he doesn't have any objection to the departure that's proposed from the maximum setback standard for the townhomes along Ada Drive, given the topographic constraints being faced in that area.

Ferro stated the pedestrian connection under the railroad will be a challenge for the Township, in both dealing with the railroad and in terms of design and construction feasibility.

Hoyt noted the other departure from the PVM rules proposed is building setback from the private road right-of-way.

Ferro stated there is no defined private road right-of-way shown on the plans, but the code building placement standards are defined in terms of a minimum and maximum setback line that's defined in relation to a road right-of-way, which is typically a 66 foot right-of-way. Ferro stated at his request, the applicant defined a hypothetical 66 foot right-of-way on the plan, and it does present some setback challenges in a couple of areas, and that's something we need to talk about and determine the extent of the departure that is requested.

Leisman asked if there is also a proposed departure with respect to roofs.

Ferro stated the form-base code standards only allow flat roofs in the village core zone, and not in the village center zone, which is where the townhomes along Ada Drive are located.

Chuck Hoyt stated there is a description of that in the project narrative. He stated they believed flat roofs are appropriate along the Ada Drive frontage, as the 660 Ada Drive building has a flat roof and they wanted to maintain that consistency.

Leisman asked for Commission member comment.

Jacobs stated she likes the fact that public access on the sidewalk was addressed, but why does access to the river overlook need to be contingent upon the Township connecting under the railroad.

Leisman stated the subcommittee talked at length about different options, and the concept we came up with was that the public walkway would extend up to the top of the hill, until such time as a connection under the railroad is achieved. He stated it was a product of some give-and-take between the subcommittee and the developer.

Butterfield stated it was also discussed that the property owner didn't intend to prevent people from walking the sidewalks throughout the community, and that gave the subcommittee some level of comfort.

Jacobs asked what the grade is between the end of the trail and the railroad tracks.

Kurensky stated the existing grade goes down about 8 to 10 feet to the property line.

Lunn asked that Jim look into the riparian zone rules as they apply to this project.

Leisman stated he appreciates the work that has been done by the applicant with the subcommittee. He stated we don't have enough from our own side to take action tonight. He suggested the Commission hear information from the applicant regarding the proposed parking relocation for the 660 building.

Development Plan for Removal of 15 Existing Parking Spaces and Relocation to a new 14-Space Parking Area, 640 and 660 Ada Dr., Thornapple Pines Development, LLC

Chuck Hoyt stated in our development plan for Riverpoint we are losing a temporary parking lot that was constructed for 660 Ada Drive. Since the spaces are going away, we do need to replace those spaces in a more permanent way; and there will be two ownerships, the Riverpoint condominium and Thornapple Pines Rental.

Ferro stated we recently realized that the proposed parking lot extends across the zoning district boundary in the PVM district regulating plan. In order for the new parking expansion to be approved, the site needs to be rezoned to expand the village center zone boundary to encompass where the parking lot is shown. He stated action on this can't be taken tonight. He noted it requires a public hearing, and both Planning Commission recommendation and Township Board approval.

Hoyt asked if a different tact could be considering this a lot type that is not conforming within that transect zone. He stated the ordinance provisions for departures allow a departure to be approved to allow a lot type in a transect zone where it is not normally permitted.

Leisman stated we will explore that option.

Jacobs asked for copies of the minutes from the meetings where we considered the original expansion of the parking lot.

Leisman suggested the possibility of soliciting public input, even though it is not required by the zoning rules. He stated he was surprised that the ordinance doesn't require a hearing on this type of development.

Commission members concurred in this suggestion. Ferro stated it is permissible to hold an advisory hearing.

Motion by Jacobs, supported by Easter, to table the proposed development plan for the Riverpoint of Ada 50 unit development until the January meeting, and that a public hearing be scheduled for the January meeting.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Lunn, supported by Lowry, to table the Development Plan for a 14-Space Parking Area, 640 and 660 Ada Drive, until the January meeting, and schedule a public hearing for the proposed rezoning.

Leisman noted the public hearing could be cancelled if a different procedure for dealing with the parking area is identified.

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBER/STAFF REPORTS

Draft Master Plan Amendment

Ferro presented a draft Master Plan amendment pertaining to the property on Spaulding Avenue proposed for an 80 unit apartment development. He stated the proposed amendment includes a revision to the future land use map, and some changes to the Master Plan text. He stated the amendment adds language and nomenclature on the Master Plan future land use map, indicating the land is suitable for either office service use or multi-family residential use. It also states that appropriate density in the medium density residential category can be up to 12 units per acre.

Leisman stated he would like to table until we have staff reports on each amendment, then we'll schedule a public hearing.

Motion by Easter, supported by Lunn, to table until staff reports are available on each amendment, then a public hearing will be scheduled. Motion passed unanimously.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bernie Veldkamp, 5580 Hall Street, stated he disagrees with the Planning Commission decision to allow the west commercial area to be developed as a condominium. He stated this sets a precedent for other properties to ask for condominium projects because they have two or three lots.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Easter, second by Butterfield, to adjourn the meeting at 10:33 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Smith, Township Clerk

JS/dr