

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

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

MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Mark J. Newman, Chair	Richard Buell
Jerome Doyle, Vice Chair	Ronald Flowers
Eric Swanson, Secretary	David Gibbs
Barry Pratt, Board of Trustee Representative	

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

PRESENT: Newman, Doyle, Flowers, Pratt, Fitch and Morford

ABSENT: Buell, Gibbs, and Swanson

OTHERS PRESENT: 15 interested residents

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:00 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Mark J. Newman 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. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2006: PRATT MOVED, seconded by Doyle to approve the Minutes of June 12, 2006 as corrected. MOTION CARRIED.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- Frederick (Thomas) Walker, 8343 Seymour Road, Flushing MI**
Parcel No. 08-04-400-039 AND
Nickolas Walker, 8341 Seymour Road, Flushing MI
Parcel No. 08-04-400-007
Special Use Permit to Expand an Existing Private Drive

NEWMAN stated the procedure for the formal meeting would be: **1)** to hear from the landowners first as the Planning Commission had received a letter that would change landscape

of the property and 2) the surrounding land owners and interested parties. All comments would be directed to the Planning Commission.

7:07 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

COMMENTS FROM THE LANDOWNERS:

FREDERICK THOMAS WALKER (T. WALKER) stated they had reviewed the situation and had come to the conclusion that the “old” Maintenance Agreement had worked for over forty (40) years. No one was actually pinned down to pay money for the maintenance of the road.

T. WALKER would like to go with the “old” Maintenance Agreement if agreed with the Planning Commission. **NEWMAN** stated, just to make the issue clear, what **T. WALKER** is indicating, if the Planning Commission finds the “old” Maintenance Agreement acceptable to the Planning Commission to approve the request, he (T.Walker) would like to go with the situation. **T. WALKER** would be flexible with anything the Planning Commission decides.

NICKOLAS WALKER (N.WALKER) stated that he agreed totally with his brother, **T. WALKER**, and the proposed Road Maintenance Agreement was an old ordinance which was made up before the Special Use came into affect and was given to the Planning Commission in error. **N. WALKER** would also be flexible with the decision of the Planning Commission.

NEWMAN stated in the documents that were supplied to the Planning Commission for the June , 2006 meeting, an “old” copy of the Road Maintenance Agreement was supplied.

COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

- **DOYLE:** has reviewed the material quite a few times
- **PRATT:** basically everything remains the same except for the “old” Maintenance Agreement”
- **FLOWERS:** no questions at the time.

QUESTIONS FROM THE NEIGHBORS:

- **Susan Kellett, 10107 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing** - “how does the existing Maintenance Agreement differ from what the township is requiring?”

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated the Planning Commission hasn’t made a decision on as to what to require of a Maintenance Agreement. The “new” proposed Maintenance Agreement was an agreement that was made to be consistent with the ordinance as it related to certain driveways and private roads. There was an amendment to the ordinance that permitted pre-existing drive ways and private roads to not have to be brought up to the new standards. **NEWMAN** stated one issue the Planning Commission would be reviewing as to whether or not the Planning Commission would be approving what the **WALKERS** have requested, the additional use of the private road, and as part of the issue whether or not the Planning Commission felt the “old” Maintenance Agreement would be adequate regarding the changes to be made to the road or should there be an adoption of the Maintenance Agreement previously submitted, or somewhere

in between. **KELLETT** felt since the current Maintenance Agreement has been sufficient all these years and the three (3) years which she has lived on the road.

- **Shirley Chaney, 8361 N. Seymour Road, Flushing** - “they don’t use the private road; probably 140’ from the road to the end of her property; scotch pines that line the whole road and would have to be cut; when someone goes down the road, there is a lot of dust; when the branches are cut there will be more dust; some of the branches are already dead on one side so **T.WALKER** stated he would try to salvage because it surrounds another area of their property where there are other trees; when trees (branches) are cut down, the road will not go completely up to where the drive way will meet; there will be a lot of soil erosion because there will not be any branches or trees to protect the soil. **T.**

WALKER has no intention of putting rocks or slabs of bricks in the area.

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated that either form of the Maintenance Agreement, which might get approved, if that impacts the operation of the road it would need to be taken care of. The concern over erosion, etc would be the aligned with the interests of the **WALKERS**. **PRATT** stated that included in the packet to the Planning Commission, the quote to widen the private road does provide that the contractor would provide and install eight (8) inches of sand base and provide and install six (6) inches of road gravel on the top; there would be a really nice surface for drainage as compared to the powdery dust that are currently in affect. **DOYLE** stated with the dust problem the road would have to be chlorided to keep the dust down; with the gravel surface there would be a great base.

- **DOYLE:** inquired from the Chaney’s, as to how far into their property was the trees located as compared to the property line?

Answer: **T. WALKER** stated it was in the vicinity of four (4) foot. One tree really needs to be trimmed but with the rest of the trees, he might be able to make the situation work. **DOYLE:** the ability to trim the trees so there was an opportunity to put the outside edge of the roadway, there could be a slight ditch so there wouldn’t be a drain on the Chaney’s property. **T. WALKER** stated he had thought about placing stone mix in the area which the water would not wash out. **DOYLE:** something like fresh concrete or something to that particular nature with a sand base.

- **NEWMAN** stated the interest of the **WALKERS** and the **CHANEYS** in terms of the issue are the same because the **WALKERS** do not want to put all the time and money into the road and then have a problem which would add more expense and grief for everyone because part of the yard start eroding away.
- **Brenda Roth, 10171 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing** – “since the last meeting there has been more clarification as to the widening to the existing road to what it initially was which was not completely understood; after reviewing the papers from the purchase of their (Roths) house, there wasn’t a Maintenance Agreement; would like a copy of the initial agreement; don’t have a problem working out the Maintenance Agreement among themselves; don’t have a problem with the initial agreement; the people from which Roths purchased their home are not on the Maintenance Agreement; purchase the house from McComb.
- **NEWMAN:** the people on the Maintenance Agreement other than **WALKER** are Sewell.

Answer: **T. WALKER** stated Ann Sewell was his sister, who had the property before. Sewell sold the property to Doug McComb who did not want to participate in anything. **NEWMAN** stated the Maintenance Agreement was recorded and Ann Sewell signed the Agreement so the Roth property would be bound.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

- **FLOWERS:** concerned about the Maintenance Agreement and having a full 30' right of way, the trees back from the road, and having enough clearance for a fire truck to make it back to the back property; hope the Maintenance Agreement goes through as indicated.
- **PRATT:** thought 22' had been discussed as the right of way.
- **DOYLE:** the road could be adjusted according to the ordinance from 18' up; whatever would work to take care of the trees, the possible ditch, etc. The road way doesn't have to go right down the middle of the 30' – it could swing a little to the North if it had to. Perhaps all the trees would not have to be cut, just trimmed which would take care of some of the erosion. The chloriding of the road might need to be placed in the Agreement.
- **PRATT:** there are six (6) inches of gravel and eight (8) inches of sand base – great base for the road.
- **DOYLE:** some of the conditions that could be placed on the structure of the road way are: road width, chloriding, Maintenance Agreement as to what has to be done to maintain the road, property splits.
- **DOYLE:** items that were mentioned at previous meetings that might be problems: the traffic, speed on the road, chloride - dust on the road; the ditches; the trees, conditions for the Maintenance Agreement; roadway size; gravel base; surveying the property. **T. WALKER** stated the telephone poles were placed on the property lines on both sides of the road; clear vision when coming out onto Seymour Road. **FLOWERS** stated there was a hill coming from the North just before Willowbrook Drive. **DOYLE** stated the angle of coming into Seymour Road was not according to the ordinance which creates a problem being on the angle. **DOYLE** wanted to know who would be responsible for the maintenance of the road – would it be all the people on the road or just certain property owners. Would there be a ditch? The other part would be how the property would be divided. There would not be any joint-owned property in the back. There will be an extension of a driveway off a common driveway which will serve three (3) parcels. **NEWMAN** stated the extension will be fifty (50) feet off the proposed road. The driveways to each of the three (3) parcels will be thirty-three (33) feet. There will be three (3) separate drives off the private drive.
- **Shirley Chaney, 8361 N. Seymour Road, Flushing** – “what would be the size of the road?”

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated there was a 30' drive which means the road could be placed anywhere within the thirty (30) foot wide strip. How wide the road is today and how wide the Planning Commission may dictate the road to be in the future has to fit someplace within the area. The Planning Commission has been talking about twenty-two (22) foot minimum in order

to have two (2) lanes of traffic. Nothing has been approved as of yet. **NEWMAN** stressed to the neighbors to keep an open mind and stay in touch whether the request is approved or not.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIRPERSON:

1. **NEWMAN** stated per the law that requires notices be sent out to everyone within 300', it does give residents an option of sending in written comments. The following was received:
 - a. Jennifer Howard, 8285 Seymour Road, Flushing, Michigan – “has no problem with the expansion as long as not on her land.”
2. **NEWMAN** stated he had a concern about the emergency vehicles; he (Newman) liked the 50' width in back of the driveways and goes to help eliviate his fear about the emergency vehicles.

PRATT MOVED, seconded by Flowers to approve the Special Use Permit for the **WALKERS** subject to their widening of Willowbrook Drive to 22' at their expense per their estimates and specifications which have been provided to this Planning Commission. Also subject to all the new parcel owners of the splits that were created signing and joining into the existing Maintenance Agreement regarding Willowbrook Drive, a copy of which is to be recorded; subject to a Maintenance Agreement and easements being signed and recorded by all parties served by or parcels being traversed by the existing 50' driveway easement to the newly created parcels.

DISCUSSION:

- **DOYLE:** felt there should be more information regarding conditions as to who will determine if the information is sufficient and to make sure all the items are completed. The conditions should be more specific such as:
 - a. accepting the plans as drawn.
 - b. important part of a Special Use Permit would be to get the Maintenance Agreement pinned down in a manner that would be very specific.
- **PRATT:** the Maintenance Agreement would be subject to Walkers joining into the existing Maintenance Agreement, which the Planning Commission has a copy. The Maintenance Agreement has been continuing since 1979 and there hasn't been any problems for thirty (30) years without problems with the neighbors. **PRATT** stated he felt there was enough confidence to continue with the motion.
- **DOYLE:** the way he interprets the Maintenance Agreement, everyone has to be involved. What if all the people are not involved? Would there be a condition that if all the people aren't included in the Maintenance Agreement, those that are, are they the ones that take care of the road?
- **NEWMAN:** the residents are already bound to the Maintenance Agreement as it sits today; those that haven't signed on are not obligated to do anything. It could be one of the conditions, if it is found to be unacceptable, they don't go forward with the project. **PRATT'S** motion states that the matter would not move forward unless the individuals

that own the new proposed parcels absolutely have to sign on to the new Maintenance Agreement. There are already people bound to the Agreement which leaves a couple of land owners that if they decide not to join in would get a “free ride” and would be something the people on the Maintenance Agreement would have to eat their share.

- **DOYLE:** shouldn't there be further conditions concerning dust and things of that particular nature, the gravel, about the possible need for ditching.

PRATT CALLED THE QUESTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Pratt and Newman

NAYS: Doyle and Flowers MOTION FAILED.

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT:

- **FLOWERS** felt the dust issue should be part of the Maintenance Agreement
- **PRATT** felt that if eight (8) inches of sand base and six (6) of gravel was provided and installed, it would eliminate the dust problem.
- **FLOWERS** felt if the motion was restated and the dust situation was added, he wouldn't have any problem with the motion.
- **PRATT** wanted to know if an Addendum added to the original Maintenance Agreement providing for dust control.
- **DOYLE** stated the ordinance has been amended so that Special Use Permits could be given to allow long drive ways acceptable so that people could use their property. Under a Special Use Permit, the Planning Commission would be allowed to place conditions according to whatever that particular problem is under the Special Use Permit. It would no longer be a non-conforming use and would be acceptable under the Special Use Permit. **DOYLE** felt there should be conditions that would address the ditching and drainage and who would be responsible for the matter. **DOYLE** stated that 22' had been mentioned for the width of the road, but felt the road could be less and give **WALKERS** a better opportunity to take care of the trees and ditches; 18 inches would work. The height of the truck would be a major problem so would have to have a high clearance under the trees.
- **FLOWERS** stated local roads such as Stanley Road, Coldwater Road, etc. are 20' asphalt roads with 10' lengths. He (Flowers) has no problem with have 18' on a private drive with the amount of traffic predicted.
- **PRATT** felt the 22' issue was mentioned at the initial meeting.
- **NEWMAN** would like to leave the driveway at 22' because the quote would be added by reference to the motion.
- **DOYLE** doesn't have any trouble with 22'; if the road is narrower and there should be drainage problems, there would be more space to put a shallow ditch.
- **T. WALKER** stated there wasn't any water problems; the area is sandy.

NEWMAN MOVED, seconded by Pratt to approve the Special Use Permit for the Walkers subject to their widening Willowbrook Drive to 22' at their expense per their estimates and

specifications which have been provided to the Planning Commission; also subject to all the new parcel owners of the splits created signing and joining into the existing Maintenance Agreement regarding Willowbrook Drive; a copy of which is to be recorded also subject to a Maintenance Agreement and easements being signed and recorded by all parties served by or parcels being traversed by the existing 50' driveway easement to the newly created parcels; also subject to the original Maintenance Agreement being amended to provide for reasonable dust control and water runoff and ditching measures being employed and installed if necessary.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Flowers, Pratt, Newman, and Doyle

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Gary Miller, 10100 Ruby Drive, Flushing, Michigan

Special Use Permit for a Townhouse on Parcel No. 08-16-200-058

(Stanley Road West of 9521 Stanley Road and East of 10025 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan)

NEWMAN stated the Planning Commission had received the On-Site Sewage Disposal Report from the Genesee County Health Department (Septic System), the drawing on graph paper that was required by the Genesee County Health Department (Application for an on-site Sewage System and/or Water Well Construction Permit) and drawing of the area.

COMMENTS FROM THE LANDOWNER:

GARY MILLER (MILLER) stated he wanted to construct a home for his parents to live in during the summer. **MILLER'S** property joins the proposed property.

8:20 P.M. OPENED TO THE AUDIENCE:

1. **Mike Clark, 10000 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “lives across the street from the proposed construction; don't see to have a duplex; what would happen during the time when his parents are not there; will he put more homes on the dirt road.”
2. **Gary Hayward, 10022 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “would there be a development going on in the back property; not able to give an accurate opinion due to not sure of what is going on.”

Miller's Reply: **MILLER** stated that he also owned the red brick house to the West of the proposed townhouse request. The dirt road extending South off Stanley Road goes to **MILLER'S** house; there will be two (2) other houses on the road when the project has been completed. The area where the red pole barn is located will be an easement at 66' wide.

3. **Terry Richey, 10036 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “if the one townhouse is approved, would it set a precedence to allow other townhouses.”

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated the area is zoned RSA so in order to construct a duplex or townhouse, which are two different things, every time someone applies for a duplex or townhouse request in that particular zoning classification, and if not a single family

dwelling, the individual would have to come before the Planning Commission for an individual approval. **NEWMAN** stated the Planning Commission has a subjective authority in reviewing the issue as to how the item would fit in with the area, how would it impact the safety and well being of the citizens of the township, etc. **MILLER** is in attendance because of what the property is zoned and what he would like to do, he has to get approval for the Special Use Permit. If the individual had a lot and wanted to construct a single family dwelling, he would only make application for a building permit and as long as he followed the rules, he would not have to come before the Planning Commission; the building inspector would review the matter and take care of the issue.

LETTER OF CORRESPONDENCE:

Jimmie and Barbara Gillean, 9518 W. Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan – “totally against” the potential housing complex; the townhouse will not blend in with the single family homes in the area.”

RESPONSE FROM MILLER:

MILLER stated he wanted to keep the property nice and that is why he purchased the property; there will not be a subdivision or housing complex.

NEWMAN stated that duplexes and townhouses are unique terms of art that have different requirements and definitions. **DOYLE** stated that duplexes can have a single septic system because usually it is owned by one party. A townhouse has complete separate facilities for each townhouse. If one person owns both buildings it could be done litigimately; but it could be owned by two separately people so therefore the rational was if a townhouse would be allowed in an RSA zoning district, that it be like a two single family homes even though they are attached.

NEWMAN made reference to *Special Use Permits, Article XVIII, Section 20-1804 (LL) (1), Townhouses* which states:

“Definition: Shall consist of no more than four (4) single-family attached dwelling units, each individually owned, non communicating, and attached by party walls; each unit shall have separate front and rear entrances and have separate sewer, water and other utilities.”

MILLER stated that each half of the townhouse would have its own septic system, separate utilities, city water, and natural gas.

4. **Gary Hayward, 10022 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “would the property be deeded separately so it would be two separate houses.”

Answer: **DOYLE** stated a townhouse can be built in a single family residential areas; a duplex is stepping down in the district and would go to a RU 1 or RU 2. With the townhouse the situation would be there would not be a large amount of people living on a small area. A

townhouse would fit into an RSA zoning district to make it a reasonable item to accept for a special use.

PRATT made reference to *Section 20-701 of the Zoning District Schedule of Uses*, duplexes are not listed in the RSA zoning district but townhouses are listed with discretionary special use permits.

(The question arose as to whether **MILLER'S** request would be a duplex or a townhouse due to one of the permits stating "duplex" and the Planning Commission Agenda stating "townhouse").

MILLER stated he did want the townhouse with separate facilities. There would be one individual family living in each townhouse.

5. **Gary Hayward, 10022 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – "if approved and going to be a townhouse, would the density of the housing in the area be increasing by having two houses on property which normally there would only be one house."

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated there is a provision in the zoning ordinance that does allow the Planning Commission to permit a townhouse to be constructed on a lot that normally would only be a single family dwelling. Does it increase the density? Yes, especially if two residences in one spot. The residences would normally be smaller due to set back issues and other requirements where the building has to comply. **DOYLE** stated setbacks have to be reviewed and to make sure there is room for the septic systems which is part of what **MILLER** has done with the permits for the present and the future. **DOYLE** stated that if the property was large enough and the septic systems are acceptable as to the amount of room needed for the septic systems and the setbacks are fine, that particular part of the request would be a reasonable thing as far as what has to be reviewed.

6. **Mike Clark, 10000 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – "in the future after **MILLER'S** parents are gone, what would keep him from selling the property to someone who turns the townhouse into rental units."

Answer: **NEWMAN** stated that could be done with any piece of property in the township. Clark stated there would be two families close together where normally there would be single families like the rest of the area.

8:46 P.M. CLOSED TO THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS:

- **PRATT** reviewed *Special Use Permits Article XVIII, Section 20-1802(b), Standards for Decisions Involving Special Land Use Requests* states:
"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."
PRATT stated that after reviewing the information, it was his opinion that the activity would not be compatible with the current land uses.
- **DOYLE** stated 1) there was a concern about the architectural of the particular proposed building as compared to other buildings in the locale. It would be hard to determine

since the Planning Commission has not received any drawings of the townhouse, which **DOYLE** has a problem with the situation; **2)** there is a lot of room and another house could be constructed that would be just as big as the proposed townhouse which would be a single family home; there could be the possibility there would be just as many people in the single family home as in the proposed two smaller units; **3)** anyone in the township could rent their property.

- **FITCH** had received a copy of the architectural drawings and gave to the Planning Commission for their review.
- **FLOWERS** wanted to know if **MILLER** would maintain ownership of the whole property.

Answer: **MILLER** stated the family would be having an attorney draw up the papers so that if **MILLER'S** Dad or Step-Dad ever decided to sell, they would have to sell to **GARY MILLER**. **MILLER** does not want it to go out to anyone else. There would be the right of first refusal.

- **PRATT** stated that with the request and his personal opinion view, the request doesn't fit in with the area and doesn't maintain the character of the area with single family homes. There would be the option of constructing a single family residence on the same property. **MILLER** stated there were other townhouses in the area so his concept would not be the first in the area.
- **DOYLE** wanted to know (from the drawings that were given to the Planning Commission) if the property sloped in the back of the proposed townhouse due to half of the basement being open in the back. The front elevation comes in a little higher than road height and then the back of the property slopes. **MILLER** stated there would be a five (5) foot wall and then frame from there. **DOYLE** stated there would be sliding doors but there had to be some type of window well or some type of well.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

7. Greg Meinburg, 10046 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan – “as far as the looks of the duplex, although he (Meinburg) would prefer the single family dwelling, but doesn't affect him but the neighborhood is single family dwelling.”

8. Mike Clark, 10000 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan – “lives directly across the street from the proposed townhouse.”

DOYLE MOVED, seconded by Flowers to accept the request which seems to be within reasonable request and what he is doing is not against the setbacks are all large enough to handle the particular part; the appearance of the building is similar to the rest of the structures on the street, not all the same, but similar; and would be acceptable with the township ordinance and the septic system is acceptable as far as Genesee County is concerned; the size of the lot is large enough; and with any other conditions that have been discussed.

DISCUSSION:

- **FLOWERS:** the situation is acceptable; feel it would not be that much of an increase in the neighborhood; has public water and septic system is approved; would not create a burden for anyone.
- **PRATT:** stand on earlier comments.
- **NEWMAN:** look at the matter with sharp eyes because concerned about making sure being consistent; with the surrounding properties take a broader view of the issue because there are several townhouses in the township; would prefer to see the single-family dwelling; sufficiently consistent with the area and the surrounding properties as to how the township is set up and would be appropriate; in favor of the project.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Flowers, Newman, Doyle

NAYS: Pratt **MOTION CARRIED.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

8:50 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

1. **Mike Clark, 10000 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “is there anything to control the dust on the private road off Stanley Road (the private drive owned by Gary Miller)?” **NEWMAN** recommended that **CLARK** get with **MILLER** to see what could be done regarding the dust.
2. **Greg Meinburg, 10046 Stanley Road, Flushing, Michigan** – “the house is not in front of his home but from his perspective, it will increase the value of the other homes in the neighborhood.”

9:09 P.M. - CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

VII. COMMISSION COMMENTS:

1. **NEWMAN** stated the next regular scheduled meeting would be Monday, August 14, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. **FITCH** had a discussion with **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON** regarding the new Michigan Zoning Enabling Act and he suggested meeting with the Planning Commission to review the Act. **FITCH** will contact **ATTORNEY MOULTON** to review his (Attorney Moulton) schedule. **NEWMAN** stated there would be a Special Planning Commission Meeting on Monday, July 24, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. The Act became affective July 1, 2006.

OR

2. if **ATTORNEY MOULTON** could not make the July 24, 2006 Special Planning Commission meeting, the Agenda will include, “Old Business” - Review of the Redrafted Ordinance on Surveys; “New Business” – Farm Signs, and Review Check List.
3. **PRATT** wanted to know the status of the 80’ frontage issue with the cul-de-sacs. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the footnote could be indicated with an asterisk.

4. **FLOWERS** stated that **DAVE GIBBS** was in the hospital and was unable to make the meeting tonight; he has two (2) blockages. **GIBBS** is scheduled for surgery on Tuesday and if it doesn't work, then surgery would be scheduled for Wednesday.

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:

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

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2006 – 7:00 P.M.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Chairperson **NEWMAN** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 9:18 p.m.

MARK J. NEWMAN, Vice Chair

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

Date of Approval