

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

DATE: APRIL 10, 2006 TIME: 7:00 P.M.
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION

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: Doyle, Swanson, Buell, Flowers, Pratt, Fitch and Morford

ABSENT: Gibbs

OTHERS PRESENT: Mark Urgowns

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:02 p.m. by Planning Commission Vice Chair Jerome Doyle with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Pratt to adopt the Agenda as presented. MOTION CARRIED.

III. (A) APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 13, 2006: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Swanson to approve the Minutes of March 13, 2006 as presented with corrections. MOTION CARRIED.

(B) APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 27, 2006: PRATT MOVED, seconded by Flowers to approve the Minutes of March 27, 2006 as presented with corrections. MOTION CARRIED.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
None

V. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Eight (8) Agenda Items of Interest for Future Discussion

DOYLE stated the current Agenda has listed eight (8) items of interest that had been brought to the Planning Commissions' attention at the November 28, 2005 Meeting.

2. Proposed Teen Ranch

JERRY FITCH (FITCH), Charter Township of Flushing Building Inspector, stated he had received a request from a Flushing Township resident as to requirements for starting a Teen Ranch. The request had consisted of the purchase of two (2) parcels of land, which would total approximately one hundred (100) acres and would be similar to a teen ranch.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

- **DOYLE:** normally a teen ranch was similar to an organization for kids that were under aged and in trouble with the law; the kids would be placed on a "teen ranch" instead of serving time in jail; the purpose: to get the individual's life straightened out.

NOTE: The specific details were not available; only assumptions.

- **DOYLE:** nothing was indicated in the ordinances that pertained to a teen ranch.
- **FITCH:** an agricultural labor camp was the closest thing similar to a teen ranch, which would be permitted in an RSA zoning district with a Special Use. Similar sources:
 1. Adult Foster Care Facility, which is licensed through the State for twenty (20) or more individuals.
 2. a ranch for children who do not have parents; they are not in trouble with the law, but don't have a place to live.
- **SWANSON:** recommended **FITCH** get exact details as to the use for the ranch and if there would be County or State requirements.
- **FITCH:** if the matter was not listed under State Requirements, which direction would the Planning Commission like to go. **BUELL:** anything of this nature would have to be licensed by the Department of Social Services.
- **DOYLE:** if the ranch was a church/religion related organization, there would not be any requirements from the State.
- **BUELL:** the Health Department would be involved if individuals were going to be spending nights and/or eating meals on the facility – there would be a series of layers of requirements.
- **FITCH:** the congregate care facility would be a licensed State facility for more than twenty (20) people and could be a day care center, adult foster care center, or an assisted living facility.
- **FLOWERS:** years ago there was a Girl Scout Camp off Seymour Road which would be similar to the teen ranch. **BUELL:** the ranch was owned by the Fairwinds Girl Scout Council.

- Different types of teen ranches for which a site plan would be required:
 1. special use of some type
 2. a working ranch
 3. some type of private boarding school
 4. “just a camp” – similar to where you can take your mobile home or recreational vehicle
- the possibility of the proposed ranch location could be a wooded area at Coldwater and Elms Road
- **FITCH:** the petitioner would come before the Planning Commission for a site plan review for a special use or some other type.
- Petitioner could present the matter to the Planning Commission in an informal discussion during an open meeting; a decision would not have to be made.
- Petitioner currently does not own land for the proposed project.
- **FLOWERS:** it would almost be like having the “cart before the horse” situation.
- The Petitioner has talked to people in the neighborhood about the possibility of the ranch because two (2) different parcels of land have been mentioned for locations of the ranch.
- **FITCH:** would review the matter with the Petitioner, as he (Fitch) understood it was a private company wanting to build and manage the ranch.
- **DOYLE:** ranch could possibly be similar to summer camps: 4-H Clubs, boot camp, etc.
- **SWANSON:** clubs are mentioned in the Definitions of the Zoning Ordinances which require a discretionary special use and almost all clubs are zoned RSA through RU-2 and RU-3:

“Club means an organization of persons for special purposes or for the promulgation of common recreational interests such as hunting, use of recreational vehicles, conservation, etc. (Amended by adoption 09/11/03)”
- **DOYLE:** a “ranch” could be covered under the ordinances, not specifically stated, but something that would be similar.
- **BUELL:** is a migrant camp temporary? “Yes”
- **DOYLE:** if there was a camp or teen ranch, and there were horses at the ranch, that would possibly be what the Petitioner planned to use to handle the students.

FITCH will get in contact with the proposed Petitioner and schedule a time for the Petitioner to attend a regular scheduled meeting, or, if the proposed Petitioner would like to pay for a Special Meeting on April 27, 2006, that could be arranged.

2. Review of Eight (8) Items of Interest listed on the November 28, 2005 Planning Commission Agenda for Discussion at Future Meetings

- a. Review of the Master Plan
- b. Lighting Ordinance in General
- c. Section Three of the Master Plan – Goals and Policies – Natural Features – Problem Statements
- d. “Sign Locations” and the lighting of the Signs

- e. Stake Surveys
- f. Cost of Density
- g. Vision for Future Development
- h. Site Regulations

FITCH stated: (a) **Review of the Master Plan** had been discussed and the review would not come up for another two (2) years. Research will be conducted on this matter.

(b) Lighting Ordinance in General

1. issues arise from time to time where someone will, either by accident or design, place high intensity lamps that shine in the neighbors bedroom window, which then creates animosity.
2. approved with the site plan review
3. have lights that would not protrude on neighbors' property (North Flushing Baptist Church)
4. site plan approval does not take care of individual cases.
5. something in the ordinance to deal with RSA
6. ordinances dealing with non-polluting lights
7. recent case at Deland Road and Carpenter Road – the light was pointed in the direction of the neighbor's house – the situation was resolved by having the church point the light down. Flushing Township Supervisor Trogot reviewed this matter with the neighbor.
8. Determination as to whether to add a paragraph to the ordinance regarding lighting
9. the sign ordinance addresses illuminated or terminally illuminated signs but no wording as to the brightness of signs is available.
10. **PRATT** will mention the issue at the next Board of Trustees meeting as to the Board's opinions.
11. dangerous situations if lights are shining down the road and the individual cannot see to drive due to the glare of the light.

The lighting matter will be postponed until more information can be obtained.

(c) Section Three of the Master Plan – Goals and Policies – Natural Features – Problem Statements.

1. It was suggested there should be something in the Master Plan as to future discussion on the townships Nature Features.
2. There was never an interest in doing anything with Section 3 so the information waits until someone has brought details to the Planning Commission.
3. \$1,000 Grant from Michigan State University:

- a. wetlands – maps were received from Michigan State University
 - b. wetlands are personal property
 - c. woodlots
 - d. received a CD which showed maps
 - e. showed maps of Lapeer because they have a lot of wetlands.
 - f. to get more detailed information on the maps, the cost would be more
 - g. the maps would pertain to five (5) acres or less
 - h. **PRATT** would contact Board of Trustee Members to continue to investigate the status of the grant money
4. recommended reviewing the Goals and Policies again at the next Special Meeting.
 5. **FITCH** is able to get National Wetland Maps off the web
 - a. wetland maps could be used for both a proposed grading/drainage ordinance – lot of information available.
 - b. felt the banks of the Flint River Bank needed to be reviewed and preserved
- e. **Stake Surveys**
1. the stake survey, cost of density, and lighting are currently being reviewed by **ATTORNEY MOULTON** (Flushing Township Attorney)
 2. **FLOWERS** has arranged for a licensed surveyor with the State of Michigan to come to the April 24, 2006 meeting to further discuss the stake survey issue

SWANSON stated the Assessor currently is requiring stake surveys for property splits but actually what is needed is the authority to continue to require stake surveys. **SWANSON** doesn't have a problem requiring stake surveys, but he doesn't feel that everyone should be required to have the surveys. If an individual wanted to construct a house on two (2) acres or more of land, he should not have to get a stake survey. If the individual is close to the borders when he constructs, **FITCH** should have the authority to require a stake survey. **DOYLE** stated if there were problems, the Planning Commission could require a stake survey.

SWANSON felt the Planning Commission should review the ordinances, especially the Open Space and Planned Urban Development (PUD). He (Swanson) made reference to Hyde Park and the set up since there are no lines only density and the space between the buildings. Some of the new builders are not familiar with the lot lines; site condominiums are plotted lots. **DOYLE**

stated that when an individual brought a request to the Planning Commission for approval, those have to be engineered. The problem occurs on single-family lots with the new plotting ordinance that states that any split has to be engineered. **PRATT** felt the Assessor could still use the metes and bounds method as compared to the staked survey, it would still have the same value. From the Assessor's point of view it would be cleaner to have a staked survey so he would be able to write a "cleaner/smaller" legal description. **SWANSON** has seen cases that have come to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) without a survey and were turned down. If the individual had the stake survey in the first place, they would not have had to come to the meeting. **SWANSON** felt that **FITCH** should have the authority to require a stake survey before an individual has come to the ZBA; the ZBA could not grant a variance to a line if they (ZBA) are not sure where the property line is located. **DOYLE** stated the information (wording) could be in the ordinance such as: "if you are requesting a set back variance, you have to provide a stake survey in order to decide if the action is necessary", which would be a plot plan. **DOYLE** felt the plot plan was needed more than a stake survey.

- f. Cost of Density, g. Vision for Future Development, and h. Site Regulations**
 - 1. go hand in hand
 - 2. concerns matters such as: future transportation, schools, infrastructure; should be included with the Goals and Policies

BREAKDOWN OF THE FUTURE ITEMS:

FITCH felt letters (a), (c), (f), (g), and (h) all went hand in hand

DOYLE stated c, f, g, and h would be a preliminary review of those items that might be attached to the Master Plan when the review took place in the future.

FITCH stated the farm signs would go with (d) Sign Locations and the Lighting of Signs. The remaining item remaining would be (b) Lighting Ordinance in General.

DOYLE felt the Site Plan Regulations would be a separate item.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

8:44 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

- 1. Mark Urgowns, 8536 Apple Blossom Drive, Flushing – "glad to be in attendance; will have to attend more of the meetings.

8:46 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

VII. BOARD COMMENTS:

- 1. **DOYLE** stated the Agenda for the April 24, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting would consist of:
 - a. Surveyor Gil Bono – stake survey
 - b. Sign locations.
- 2. **FLOWERS** mentioned there was a lot of remonumentation going on in the State due to problems taking place.

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:

PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, APRIL 24, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, MAY 8, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, MAY 22, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, JULY 10, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Vice Chair **DOYLE** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 8:50 p.m.

JEROME DOYLE, Chair

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

Date of Approval