

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING  
6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD  
FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433  
810-659-0800 FAX: 810-659-4212  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 2005 TIME: 7:00 P.M.  
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.gfn.org/flushing/index.html>

**MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Aaron Bowron, Chair  
Jerome Doyle, Vice Chair  
Eric Swanson, Secretary  
Richard Buell  
Ronald Flowers  
David Gibbs  
Barry Pratt, Board of Trustee Representative

Jerald W. Fitch, Building Inspector  
Julia A. Morford, Recording Secretary

**PRESENT:** Bowron, Doyle, Flowers, Gibbs, Pratt, Fitch, and Morford

**ABSENT:** Swanson and Buell

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Jerry Lawrence and Lee St. John

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** at 7:00 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Aaron Bowron by Roll Call.

**BOWRON** requested to amend the wording of number 2 of the Agenda, listed under Unfinished Business, from "Continued Discussion regarding...ordinances" to "Continued Discussion Regarding Common Drive and Private Road Ordinances"

**II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 28, 2005:** Adopted as amended by consent.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 14, 2005:** Approved with corrections by consent.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**1. Lee St. John, 9223 Coldwater Road, Flushing  
Approval of a Private Road (Parcel No. 08-22-200-030)**

At the January 4, 2005 Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) Meeting there was a conditional granting of a variance to **LEE ST. JOHN (L. ST. JOHN)**. Per Article III, Section 20-

305(D)(10), the granting of the variance exempted **L ST. JOHN** from the requirement to pave Coldwater Road Extension (private road).

At the February 14, 2005, the Planning Commission reviewed the ZBA conditions:

1. approval of a fifty (50) foot right of way as opposed to the sixty-six (66) foot right of way
2. motion carried to accept the recordable road maintenance signed by all parties
3. motion carried to record easements from all property owners
4. motion carried to establish the appropriate grade as it currently exists, which future grades will conform with the ordinance
5. consent of all easement holders before making any changes to the roadway
6. motion carried to require any additional future lot split be done in accordance with the Land Division Act
7. it was determined that **L. ST. JOHN** should have a sealed engineered drawing for the private road.

#### **COMMENTS FOR DISCUSSION:**

1. **Sealed Drawing**
  - a. **DOYLE:** since the road has been in existence for so long and a drawing by **MARK ST. JOHN (M. ST. JOHN)** has been given – why would a sealed engineered drawing be necessary
  - b. **GIBBS:** wanted to know the exact location of all water and gas lines and the pipeline.
  - c. **PRATT:** the motion and conditions of the February 14, 2005 Planning Commission minutes, state nothing about the sealed engineered drawing; after further review – ZBA Minutes of January 4, 2005, page 2, paragraph 6, “Henneke stated the matter had previously...an engineered drawing was also needed.”
  - d. **PRATT:** felt the drive had served its purpose to the current point and that an engineered drawing would not change his decision.
  - e. **BOWRON:** the sealed engineered drawing could be waived under a special land use; the Planning Commission is doing pursuant to the ordinance; all that is required is that **L. ST. JOHN** conform so far as possible to the ordinance. The Planning Commission cannot dispense of the sealed engineered drawing.
2. **BOWRON:** ruling of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was only a variance to exempt the paving of the road, which had to be approved first with conditions of items one (1) through six (6) (ZBA, January 4, 2005, page 9 and Planning Commission, February 14, 2005, page 2)
3. **DOYLE:** all the eleven (11) items mentioned in the Planning Commission Minutes of February 14, 2005 were in existence before the ordinance was in effect - the Planning Commission would be returning back to the original ordinance. Property stakes, road, and all the “stuff” has already been placed in the ground. When a new site plan is put together, nothing has been placed in the ground.
4. **FLOWERS:** concerned about putting his signature on the line where sometime in the future, someone could challenge the matter.

5. **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission is trying to bring the ordinance into conformity on the non-conforming private roads
6. ways to get rid of a non-conforming use – buy or purchase land

**EXPANSION OF USE:**

1. property already in existence
2. place another house on the road
3. Land Division Act states a private drive off an existing road could be divide two (2) more times (2 lots)

**POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO NON-CONFORMING USES:**

1. non-conformity gets worse each time the ordinance is updated
2. non-conformity limits the use of property
3. per the Plat Act, the County, (size of property) is concerned for septic systems, and as far as the Township Ordinance states, there is  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre (County states one (1) acre) **L. ST. JOHN** has the ability to place a certain number of lots on his property because a road already exists
4. private roads are non-conforming
5. **BOWRON:** the cost incurred by the petitioner should not be a determinant or dispositive factor in the Planning Commission’s decision to require a sealed engineered drawing.
6. **BOWRON:** concerned about a precedent that would be starting with future instances where it would be alleged the “Planning Commission did not require a sealed engineered drawing on one (1) matter but now the Planning Commission requires a sealed drawing for another matter.”
7. **DOYLE:** having a for-sure sealed engineered drawing would be the new drawing because it would be similar to a site plan for a new subdivision.
8. **BOWRON** stated if the proposed ordinance should be passed, the Planning Commission would not have to deal with the problem as it would not be a requirement if, in the Planning Commission’s discretion, it would be related to health, safety, and general welfare of the community. Currently, the Planning Commission is operating under Section 20-305 and not the special land use as proposed under the draft ordinance.

**DEFINITION OF ZONING TERMS:**

1. Variance = to do something that is prohibited by the zoning ordinance.
2. Special Land Use = allows an individual to do something that is permissible; there would not be a violation of the ordinance if operating under the special land use.

**PLANNING COMMISSION OPINIONS:**

- **PRATT** felt the burdening of the matter of an engineered drawing would cause an undue hardship on **L. ST JOHN**, due to the road having been in existence for a period of time without any problems. If the non-conforming use situation is properly explained to future private drive requests, there should be no problems.

- **DOYLE** felt, with the proposed Private Road Ordinance, it would give the Planning Commission the opportunity to add to the ordinance an amendment that would allow the Planning Commission to require a Special Use Permit with conditions where the Planning Commission could accept or reject the issue. One condition would be to not require an engineered drawing.

Currently, the issue deals with the Private Road Ordinance. A motion was made and carried to have a sealed engineered drawing. There were no further questions or objections.

**ORIGINAL ISSUE:**

**DOYLE** felt the whole private drive issue had been to put all the material together so that **L. ST. JOHN** would be included in the new amendment to the ordinance so that everything would work together. The rationale would be to have the non-conforming uses become acceptable. The ordinances have to be kept updated in order to keep all property usable.

**BOWRON** stated, as a general rule, there would always be legal non-conforming uses. The proposed ordinance, Section 20-304 and 20-305 would be to try and get around the issue of “ham stringing” individuals by virtue of the non-conforming use so that property owners can expand on their property and not run with the strict lettering of Section 20-305.

**ADDITIONAL ITEMS SEVEN (7) THROUGH ELEVEN (11) OF THE FEBRUARY 14, 2005 MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

7. Provide sealed site plan by an engineer was set aside for the time.
8. At least an eighteen (18) foot roadway with three (3) foot shoulders on each side for a total of twenty-four (24) feet not demanded the road be paved because of the conditions previously stated by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Gibbs to accept No. 8. MOTION CARRIED.

9. Details regarding access to the property on the North side of the road.
  - **PRATT** wanted to know if the easement issues should be a private matter between the owner of the road and the property, not the Planning Commission.
  - **BOWRON** wanted to know if the Planning Commission was going to allow a common driveway off the current private road.
  - **DOYLE** stated the matter came up due to the existing property that the private road was on, which is the **L. ST. JOHN** property. Does the Planning Commission want other property that is accessible to the private drive on the North side to be included in the private road.
  - **DOYLE** stated the Land Division Act stated that if there was an existing road and if it was acceptable, would the Planning Commission have to place some type of condition on **L. ST. JOHN'S** approval that he would or would not have to accept the property. **PRATT** wanted to know if the Land Division Act would supersede the issue. **DOYLE** stated if the Land Division Act approved more lots, would it be necessary that the Planning Commission or **L. ST. JOHN** accept more easements off of his private drive.

The matter needed to be clarified with wording as “this property does not include the property on the North side of the road, but if there is a request in the future it would have to come back before the Planning Commission for which a site approval would be necessary.”

Building Inspector, **JERRY FITCH (FITCH)**, stated the first step for an individual would be to go to Assessor **DENNIS JUDSON (JUDSON)** to divide the property and if the division didn't comply with the Land Division Act, he (Judson) would not divide the land. **FITCH** stated there were options to **L. ST. JOHN'S** property such as:

1. turn **L. ST. JOHN** down flat
2. approve one (1) lot
3. carte blanc that the fifty (50) foot road will be approved and if there is property on the road, the property owners automatically would have access to it
4. set a number of houses to be constructed

**BOWRON** felt if there was going to be a lot split, it would make sense to require **L. ST. JOHN**, or property owner, to retain an easement to the property in the amount of the private road or in the amount required by the common driveway scheme. If there needed to be access to the back property, there could be access that would be consistent with what the ordinance required.

**DOYLE** recommended reviewing the configuration of the property and the additional number of lots that could be extended off the existing driveway, legitimately as far as septic tanks, etc. At present, the particular use of a common drive would accept three (3) more parcels based on the size that is acceptable as well as the proposed build (**MARK ST. JOHN**). **L. ST. JOHN'S** original home would be the fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) unit on the grandfathered property. Per the Land Division Act, if **L. ST. JOHN** wanted to take one (1) lot and the original lot and left another two (2) lots that were acceptable to build on, (acre size), it would take care of the property which **L. ST. JOHN** currently has left now and for the future. It would be legitimate, as far as the Land Division Act, because it would be four (4) parcels off the grandfathered parcel.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR THE NORTH PROPERTY:**

**DOYLE** recommended a site plan be put together starting with the original ordinance and with easements necessary to get to the property, etc. Currently, the North property is not owned by the individual that has requested approval of a private road. If conditions were placed to where the roadway was already in existence, as an acceptable thing, which would be what he would be granted for his particular drive.

The Land Division Act controls the splits.

**DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by (None) to not act on No. 9, but to make a comment to the point that if the property on the North side is requested for a particular use, it has to be requested with a site plan as to how it would be used and any connections to the private drive.

**Discussion:**

1. there currently has not been a request for an easement for the North property so the roadway has no mutual agreement to grant an easement to the North property.
2. include a comment in the conditions, which concerns **L. ST. JOHN'S** particular property, that any addition of any properties on the North, has to be a requested by the person with the site plan to show what they have in mind; there also has to be an easement included. (The individual would have to go through the Land Division Act and the process of what the ordinance states at the present time, which would be a completely new addition to a private road.)
3. **FITCH** wanted to know if the requirements from the ZBA granted easements to all the property owners on the private road? The requirements were referring to the easements for three (3) people on the North side and three (3) people on the South side. **DOYLE** stated the easements that have already been granted could not be changed. The open property has to be dealt with separately.
4. a written comment would explain how the matter would be handled in the future
5. The North property has been exposed to where there could be another private road off a private road.
6. **FITCH** felt all the property on Coldwater Road Extension had to be addressed including both the North and South property. One home would be granted on the fifty (50) foot provided that **L. ST. JOHN** could get the easements but any subsequent requests for property divisions would come back to the Township.
7. **BOWRON** stated if there was a parcel of property split into a certain number of lots, the right of way would meet if there were more than two (2) houses constructed there; there would have to be a fifty (50) foot reserved easement. If there are only (2) homes to be constructed, then the thirty-three (33) foot right of way would be considered. If a subdivision, ten (10) homes or more would be constructed, the matter would have to come before the Board.
8. **PRATT** stated the ordinance already covers the site plan review, etc.
9. **BOWRON** stated that an individual, in the future who should divide his/her property, should make sure an easement was granted which conformed to the ordinance for purposes of accessing split lots for two (2) to review the common drive or more than two (2) for the private road ordinance.

**DIVISION OF SMALL PROPERTY ON COLDWATER ROAD EXTENSION:**

**FITCH** would like the issue of the division of a small single parcel of land on the North side of the Coldwater Road Extension be reviewed as he has recently received several requests.

**BOWRON** stated that if the Assessor granted the division, the access would be dedicated either by the requirements of the Common Drive or the Private Road. **FITCH** stated if **L. ST. JOHN** adheres to what would be required with the current issue, the proposed property split on the North side of the private road would be large enough to be divided, or could be divided. There could be a lot on the North side of the private drive that would be divided this year. If an individual's property split meets the Land Division Act, he has access if he can be part of the Maintenance Act, should a building permit be issued to the individual.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PRATT** requested to open the meeting to the public at the present time. **BOWRON** would like to keep the meeting closed at the present.

**8:15 P.M. – OPENED TO THE AUDIENCE:**

A decision to open the meeting to public comments was achieved through general consensus.

1. **Lee St. John, 9223 Coldwater Road, Flushing** – “he has asked to have one lot divided and taken off his (L. St. John) property so his son could build.” (Note: **DOYLE** stated the request was for Mark St. John, the son of Lee St. John).

**DOYLE** recommended the Planning Commission continue and try to finalize the issue as per the first request. It would help, for future cases, on trying to resolve any type of amendments to roads.

2. **Jerry Lawrence, 7101 Gillette Road, Flushing** – “there are two (2) laws on the books that state anybody from getting access to their property on the North side, plus if the Planning Commission ok’s the split of the property on the North side, the first lot off McKinley Road, which would open the doors to anyone to split.”

**DIFFERENT TYPES OF EASEMENTS:**

**BOWRON** stated there are different types of easements: 1) express easements which are granted by the subservient estate holder to the benefit of another parcel. It is an easement implied by law whereas if one parcel of property is divided, that by law, it gives the second parcel access of certain requirements that are met. 2) easement by necessity which protects idyl, un-productive land, so the law grants, by necessity, an easement to access the property.

**8:32 P.M. CLOSED TO THE AUDIENCE**

**MAIN CONCERNS:**

- **BOWRON:** How does the Planning Commission go about insuring that if there is a lot split that the Planning Commission has an easement that comports with the ordinance. The individuals that are making the lot split should make certain that they are reserving an easement on the side of size of a common driveway or private road – there should be no problems.
- **DOYLE:** Everyone currently on the private drive, including **L. ST. JOHN’S** property has a right to the fifty (50) foot road way, if there is an easement.
- **GIBBS** stated there was a state ordinance that if a lane was not used over a period of time, it would become a road. (Prescriptive easement).
- **DOYLE** stated that when you own property in the township, you own property to the center of the road; the individual granted an easement to the County for the roadway.
- **PRATT** stated if the road had been in place for fifty (50) years and his (Lawrence’s) dad had made the road, then who would have the rights? **DOYLE** stated that **LAWRENCE** currently had a driveway that extended out to the roadway, with easements.

- **FITCH** stated that once easements have been granted, and once the road maintenance agreement had been signed, there would be different situations that could work.
- **BOWRON** stated that as long as **LAWRENCE** has the right of way, per the ordinance, there would not be a problem. It would be legitimate to have a drive off a private road.

**10. No new purchase of property shall be added to the property.**

**DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Pratt to omit number 10. (What will happen in the future will be handled through the ordinance). **MOTION CARRIED.**

**11. Buckeye Pipeline Easement.**

**BOWRON** stated that at such time when the private drive petition should be approved, it should be made with the condition that it be acceptable to Buckeye Pipeline which Buckeye requests. **FLOWERS MOVED**, seconded by Pratt to omit number 11, Buckeye Pipeline Easement.

Discussion:

**DOYLE** stated the easement which Buckeye Pipeline already has stated they (Buckeye) has to be notified if any construction is done – no construction can be placed on the roadway

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:** AYES: Bowron, Doyle, Flowers, and Pratt NAYS: Gibbs  
**MOTION CARRIED.**

**12. Setbacks of Existing Buildings from easements as to ordinances.**

**PRATT** stated that any property built prior to 1989 was grandfathered when the issue started dealing with setbacks (per the Ordinance). **DOYLE** recommended the Planning Commission not have setbacks as one of the conditions because since the house was already in existence, it would create a legal non-conforming use. **DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Pratt to eliminate number 12, Setbacks of Existing Buildings from Easements as to Ordinances. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Due to number 9 being similar to number 10, **PRATT MOVED**, seconded by Doyle to exempt number 9, “Details Regarding Access to the Property on the North Side of the Road”.

Discussion:

**FLOWERS** felt the situation would go back to the same issue that the Planning Commission had previously with the seventeen (17) foot.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:** AYES: Bowron, Doyle, Gibbs, and Pratt NAYS: Flowers  
**MOTION CARRIED.**

**CONTINUED CONCERNS:**

1. **GIBBS:** concern regarding the Buckeye Pipeline. There would be no recourse; **L. ST JOHN** would only have to bring the engineered drawing information to the Planning Commission but doesn’t state any action could be taken if there should be something unusual in the plans. **BOWRON** stated the information would be implicit so where the Planning Commission would have the discretion to make additional comments. **GIBBS:** requested the sealed engineered drawing with all the details so there would be no surprises.
2. **DOYLE:** felt all the information showed on the Buckeye Pipeline drawing.

**3. BOWRON:** the information had been moved, seconded and carried at the last meeting to require an engineered drawing which the ordinance requires and the Planning Commission is guided by the ordinance. There can be no exceptions.

**SUMMARY:**

There would be eight (8) issues involved with the **L. ST. JOHN** request for a private drive. Those issues being:

1. Planning Commission approval for a 50' right-of-way as opposed to 66' right-of-way.
2. Recordable Road Maintenance signed by all parties.
3. Record easements from all property owners.
4. The appropriate grade is established on the road.
5. The consent of all easement holders before making any changes to the roadway.
6. If any new lots established, they (St. Johns) would have to go through the lot split approval process.
7. Provide sealed site plan by an engineer.
8. At least an eighteen (18) foot roadway with three (3) foot shoulders on each side for a total of twenty-four (24) feet not demanded the road be paved because of the conditions previously stated by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**(UNFINISHED BUSINESS)**

**2. Continued Discussion Regarding Common Drives and Private Road Ordinances**

Everyone had received a draft ordinance from **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON**  
**(ATTORNEY MOULTON)**

Comments:

- **BOWRON:** if the Township had an ordinance like the draft on the records, the Planning Commission would not be going through all the extra work especially with the engineered drawing requirement with **L. ST. JOHN**. For existing legal non-conformities whether they are a common drive or a private road, it seeks to exempt them from the respective ordinances. It will be treated like a special land use in accordance with Sections 20-1800, 20-1801, and 20-1802.
- The standards must bear some legitimate and rational relationship to the health, safety, general welfare of the community.

Section 20-1802: Standards for Decisions Involving Special Land Use Requests

- a. That the special land use shall be consistent with and promote the intent and purpose of this chapter.
- b. That the proposed use will ensure that the land use or activity authorized shall be compatible with adjacent land uses, the natural environment and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the proposed land use.

- c. The special land use sought is consistent with the public health, safety, and welfare of the township.
- d. A request for approval of the land use or activity, which is in compliance with the standards stated in this chapter, the conditions imposed pursuant to this chapter, and other applicable ordinances and state and federal statutes shall be approved by the commission.

**BOWRON** stated by not specifically articulating additional standards, the Planning Commission would be giving itself flexibility to deal with cases as they arise in the future with others who want to expand or modify the use of a legal non-conforming common drive or private road. It would be inconceivable to draft a set of standards if the Planning Commission was going to be specific about the matter that would govern all the potentialities that could arise from the number of non-conformities with regards to the drives and private roads. **FLOWERS** stated there were too many “night mares” dealing with the common drives and private roads.

As the non-conformities related to a common drive or a private road, what the Planning Commission would be stating by “it cannot be expanded or modified” the Planning Commission would be denying effective use of the land.

**JERRY FITCH (FITCH)** Building Inspector, wanted to know if the draft ordinance was already approved, what type of drawing would be appropriate; would **MARK ST. JOHN’S (M. ST. JOHN)** drawing be approved. **BOWRON** felt **M. ST. JOHN’S** property was burdened by a lot of easements. A previous situation, similar to **M. ST. JOHN’S**, occurred last year where the father owned a large piece of property and all he (the father) wanted to do was divide the property so his daughter could build a house. **BOWRON** could not predict what type of drawing would be appropriate. **FITCH** suggested a drawing that showed utilities, the width of the road, and the drainage. **GIBBS** wanted to know why a surveyor’s drawing would not work since it showed width, lot size, roadway, etc. **BOWRON** stated a surveyor’s drawing may be appropriate if the draft ordinance should be approved. **DOYLE** stated the ordinance already stated that if a qualified person could do the engineered drawing. **PRATT** stated according to the ordinance, at a point where an issue comes before the Planning Commission, a drawing could be a condition. **FLOWERS** stated that in General Provisions, Article III, Section 20-304(3), *Common Driveways*, it states there has to be:

3. A staked boundary survey showing the location of the driveway easement.

**FITCH** felt the matter should be left open, since most of the special use permits required a drawing, even the home occupations permits which would be simple and could be drawn at the “kitchen table.” **DOYLE** felt that **FITCH** would have to stand behind the recommendation of an engineered drawing to make sure that everyone had the same type of drawing.

**BOWRON** made reference to Amendments Article XX, Section 20-200, *Initiation of Zoning Ordinance Amendments* which stated:

C. Any proposal for an amendment to the zoning ordinance text or map may be initiated by the Township Board or the Township Planning Commission, upon filing with the township clerk a resolution, duly adopted and proposing an amendment.

**FINALIZATION OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT ORDINANCE:**

**DOYLE** felt the proposed private drive ordinance by **ATTORNEY MOULTON** is needed by the Planning Commission to give the freedom to handle the non-conforming uses. Without conditions placed on the issue, it would be open to the Planning Commission to create conditions for each individual case. If after the issue has happened, there are individuals that are concerned because there were conditions placed that would be acceptable in one case and not in another, there would be complaints. There really would be no excuse because they are non-conforming uses. **PRATT** felt the strength of the discussion as to why the decision was made and the wisdom of the discussion; the members on the Board would support the matter as long as it is within the ordinance of safety, health and welfare. **DOYLE** stated that if an individual made a request, there should be in the minutes the rational what the request was for because if one goes to court, there has to be a legitimate reason for making a decision. **BOWRON** stated the legality of the condition would stand or fall on its reasonableness. He (Bowron) mentioned a Michigan Supreme Court Case of 1951 Detroit v Lowenstein & Sons where the Court upheld as legitimate the following standards for a special use: 1) that it is not injurious to the surrounding neighborhood and not contrary to the spirit and purpose of the ordinance.

**TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**RE: Proposed Private Drive Ordinances**

- Since two Planning Commission Members will be out of town until April 14, 2005; recommended to wait for the input from the full Planning Commission.
- Rational to resolve **L. ST. JOHN'S** situation.
- Another private road case similar to **L. ST. JOHN'S** coming before the Planning Commission in the very near future; the individual was told to have an engineered drawing. The issue could be heard but no decision could be made.
- The proposed ordinance had been sent to Planner Doug Piggott of Rowe Inc.
- There was a concern regarding "existing use" in both subsection c and f of Sections 20-304 and 20-305

**FLOWERS MOVED**, seconded by Gibbs postpone any decision concerning proposed amendments to Sections 20-304 and 20-305 until such time there shall be a full Planning Commission to review.

Discussion:

- Main concern was to have a two-lane road for ambulance and emergency purposes.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION: MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. Continued Discussion Regarding C-1 and C-2 Zoning Districts**

**DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Gibbs to postpone the extra work that has to be done on C-1 and C-2 amendments until there is a full Planning Commission. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**  
None

**VI. BOARD COMMENTS:**

**1. Transportation Safety Forum**

**FLOWERS** stated the Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission will be sponsoring a *Traffic Safety Forum* on Thursday, March 24, 2005 from 8:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. at the Genesys Conference and Banquet Center in Grand Blanc, Michigan; a variety of topics relating to transportation safety will be discussed. Lunch will be provided for all attendees. Please let **FLOWERS** know immediately if you plan to attend.

**VII. MEETING SCHEDULE:**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2005 – 7:00 P.M.**  
**PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETEING – THERE WILL NOT BE A SPECIAL MEETING ON MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2005 DUE TO EASTER VACATION**  
**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2005 – 7:00 P.M.**  
**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, MAY 9, 2005 – 7:00 P.M.**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no objections, **BOWRON** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 9:34 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
AARON BOWRON, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Approval