

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING  
6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD  
FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433  
810-659-0800 FAX: 810-659-4212  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
DATE: MARCH 8, 2004 TIME: 7:00 P.M.  
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.gfn.org/flushing/index.html>

**MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

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

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

**PRESENT:** Doyle, Gensheimer, Swanson, Bowron, Flowers, Gibbs, Fitch and Morford

**ABSENT:** Buell

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Janice Dye, Gary Niethammer of Wilcox Associates of Saginaw, Michigan, Larry Adkins of L.A. Construction, Rita Bigelow, Richard Bigelow, James Barnwell of Desine Inc of Brighton, Michigan, Howard Scheuner of HJM of Howell, Michigan, Dave Johnson, Dave Woods, Eric Riske of Riske Homes, and Mr. & Mrs. R.M. Cliben

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** at 7:04 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Jerry Doyle.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: FLOWERS MOVED**, seconded by Gibbs to approve the Agenda as presented. MOTION CARRIED.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 2004: FLOWERS MOVED**, seconded by Swanson to approve the minutes of February 9, 2004 with corrections. MOTION CARRIED.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**  
None

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. L. A. Construction – Site Plan Review of a Preliminary Plat (Subdivision)**

**GARY NIETHAMMER (NIETHAMMER)** of Wilcox Associates of Saginaw, Michigan was present representing L.A. Construction (Larry Adkins) of Flushing, Michigan to request a Site Plan Review of a Preliminary Plat (Subdivision) for Coldwater Valley Subdivision, Section 24.

**STATISTICS:**

- 58 acres
- 104 lots – average ½ lot per acre
- Sections 23 and 24 with the sectional line extending between Section 23 and Section 24 – located between Johnson Road and Deland Road
- purposed lots have 80’ frontage
- lots 1-9 are the smallest lots due to the road getting wider
- smallest lots are 10, 400 square feet located to the South – Township minimum lot is 9,900 square feet
- each lot envelope shows 10 feet as the side yard setback – a house could be 60foot wide – two story (per Niethammer)
- proposed property purchased from Robert Jakeway
- Flushing Middle School will be constructed South of the proposed project
- sanitary sewers and water main will be installed through the proposed Coldwater Valley Subdivision
- easements for the water main have not been signed – depending upon decision of the Planning Commission on Monday, March 8, 2004 and the Board of Trustees on Thursday, March 11, 2004
- Phase I of the Tentative Preliminary Plat approval would be for 24 lots located at the Northwest portion of the property
- access road would extend off Coldwater Road looped around and then back out onto Coldwater Road
- limited amount of property frontage on Coldwater Road

**ENVIRONMENTAL:**

- FEMA map shows a flood plain area along the Boman Drain (heavy line on plat map)
- Lots 1-3 and Lots 8-13 would be affected by the flood plain
- a DEQ permit has to be obtained to build on Lots 1-3 and Lots 8-13; a storm water detention area would be located in the flood plain
- the action of the Planning Commission would be contingent upon obtaining the permit

**ROADS, SEWERS AND WATER:**

- public entrance road would be built per the standards of the Genesee County Road Commission (Road Commission)
- Mike Mansfield (Mansfield) of the Road Commission would like to see a road system as the proposed road rather than a cul-de-sac on each side of the Boman Drain
- 72 inch trunk sewer on Coldwater Road

- Flushing School system would pick up on the 72 inch trunk running a 12 inch sanitary sewer system down the East side of the proposed road property; the lot line would serve the school
- water main would be on Coldwater Valley Subdivision's West side of the proposed road property
- 12 inch water main on the North side of Coldwater Road would come down the lot line to Carpenter Road and would serve the school – Genesee County Water and Waste wants the system installed in this method to serve the Flushing School – there would be 30 pounds more pressure required for fire fighting purposes if installed through the Coldwater Valley Subdivision
- Proposal to handle the Boman Drain
  1. corrugated metal pipe (culvert) under the road at Coldwater Road approximately six (6) feet in diameter
  2. working with Rowe Inc on the procedure to construct in a flood plain – whatever Rowe Inc. recommends for the Flushing Middle School, **ADKINS** would like to do the same procedure
  3. Boman Drain not involved with Phase I
- Entrance drive of proposed Coldwater Valley Subdivision is ½ mile long – possible in Phase II to have a jog in the road at Lots 7 and 24 to slow traffic
- Islands were mentioned to slow the road traffic
- Deceleration lane needed to turn into the proposed subdivision
- Phase III – possible easement through Clarence Turner's property to Johnson Road –
  1. ditch is located on the plat map between Lots 101-102
    - a. outlet needed to get to Boman Drain from the proposed Coldwater Valley property
    - b. any ability to get to Turner's property for an outlet would be through Lot 101 – L.A. Construction would lose a lot.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS:**

- Subdivision restrictions in the Coldwater Valley development
  1. sidewalks on both sides of the road
  2. amenities such as quaint white picket fence, no fencing or buildings behind the lots or in the flood plain (open space)
  3. common area used for recreation purposes
  4. underground utilities
  5. proposed bridge from the subdivision to the proposed Flushing Middle School (reference was made to what Superintendent Barbara Goebel had mentioned at a Planning Commission meeting that all the youth going to Flushing Schools road the bus)
- Plat as opposed to a site condominium
  1. State law requires certain procedures:
    - a. if approval on the Tentative Preliminary Plat, would have to obtain permit from DEQ regardless if flood plain or not
    - b. approval from the Genesee County Drain Office

- c. come back to the Planning Commission and prepare for utility plans again for the Township's approval
- d. six (6) month process to finish Phase I
- Open Space area would be owned by the individual lot owners and would be maintained by the Subdivision Association
- In Phase II and Phase IV, Lots 38, 39, 93, 94, and 95 are corner lots

**CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES AND LANDSCAPE:**

- start out with 1,600 to 2,000 square foot homes
- variety of contractors

**DOYLE** reviewed the letter of correspondence from David Rowe of Inland Seas Engineering dated March 2, 2004 which stated 11 comments:

1. This subdivision will be one of the largest (104 lots) developments in the Township for several years and will also be one of the most concentrated or dense developments.
2. The plan complies with RSA zoning requirements, which requires a minimum frontage of 80 feet when both public sewer and water are available. It is contemplated that both sewer and water will be available when those utilities are extended through the subject property to serve the new middle school on Carpenter Road. Any approval should be contingent on those utilities being in place.
3. A large portion of the property falls within the flood plain as established along the Boman Drain by FEMA. Approximately one-half of the proposed lots in Phase I of the development are affected by the flood plain and would not be buildable utilizing conventional building methods. It is recognized that an effort is underway to submit a LOMA, (Letter of Map Amendment) to FEMA so that the theoretical flood plain level can be lowered and make the lots more buildable. Again any approval should be contingent on the revision of the flood plain level by FEMA.
4. With 104 lots proposed to be served with one outlet, it is suggested that openings for future access from the east or west sides of the property be considered.
5. With a subdivision of the type it is obvious that there will be a large number of school age children living there. It would behoove both the developer and the school administration to provide a pedestrian access to the school property. For instance a small area on the south side of the proposed development could be developed as open space (park, playground). The same space could provide access to the school so students could walk to the school rather than be bussed. A footbridge would be required to provide pedestrian access to the school property. If one were to travel from the subdivision by public roads the distance would be approximately 1 ½ miles.
6. Several areas within the flood plain are designated "Open Space" on the plan. The disposition of the open space should be made clear. Is it to remain under private ownership by each individual lot owner or will there be some association type ownership?

7. The site distance for the subdivision entrance on Coldwater Road appears to be adequate but the final decision is up to the Genesee County Road Commission.
8. The plan to utilize storm water detention areas within the flood plain should be approved by the MDEQ.
9. The two proposed crossings of the Boman Drain will require large culverts which must be approved by the Genesee County Drain Commission and/or the MDEQ.
10. Lots 38, 39, 93, 94 and 95 do not appear to have 80 foot frontage measured at the front set back line.
11. It is recognized that there are only a limited number of options available for the development of this property. Therefore every effort should be made to assure the long term viability of the development by providing as many amenities (Parks, recreation space) as possible during the planning stage. As pointed out in Section 20-101 of the zoning ordinance, the provisions of the ordinance shall be considered as minimum standards and shall not preclude the establishment of higher or more restrictive standards.

**DOYLE** reviewed the Site Plan Review Checklist supplied by L.A. Construction. (See Attachment).

Comments regarding the Site Plan Review Checklist:

1. approximately 1,400 square feet for a ranch per plat – minimum per township ordinance is 1,200 square feet – actual living area
2. all the homes will be stick built with a basement or foundation – not manufactured – the By-Laws will reference the matter
3. per Atkins, there will be no parking on the street and will recommend in the by-laws there can only be two cars in the drive way
4. the issue of trailers and campers will be addressed in the By-Laws also
5. a separate permit needs to be obtained if a subdivision sign was placed on Coldwater Road
6. Landscaping General – make sure the property drains from the home to the side rear and front where building is located
7. Recreation Area – designated “Open Space” are individual ownerships except for one (1)
8. the retention area is a small area located Northwest of and in front of proposed  
Lot 24
9. “clear vision area” would be according to the ordinance
10. number of street lights would be determined by Consumers Energy
11. in Phase I and Phase II, the sanitary sewer would be 12 inches and Phase III and Phase IV would have 8 inch sanitary sewer
12. all utilities will be underground
13. sidewalks to be individually maintained – covered in the By-Laws
14. a fence will be located on the property line between the proposed Flushing  
Middle School and the property owned by L.A. Construction
15. the price range of the homes would be approximately \$187,000 to \$200,000 for a 1,400 square foot home including garage

16. **SWANSON** recommended an open mind should be kept as to the open space along the creek; it should be a true open space subdivision for recreation and walkways for everyone.
17. there should be a jog in the main road coming into the proposed driveway to slow the traffic
18. the wetland issue will be determined by the Department of Environmental Quality.
19. the 30 foot of corner area of Lot 59 will have to be maintained by the owners of Lots 59 and 60
20. the distance of the entrance on Coldwater Road appears to be adequate but the final decision is the discretion of the Genesee County Road Commission
21. Planning Commission recommends there be a deceleration lane on the North and South side of Coldwater Road with a middle turn lane
22. Planning Commission recommends there be an access drive located between Lot 101 and Lot 102 accessing to Johnson Road through the property owned by Clarence Turner
23. the existing house on proposed Lot 8 of the plat will have to be removed

**8:10 P.M. – OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

None

**8:12 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**

**NIETHAMMER** stated that tentative preliminary approval/denial had to be made at the meeting due to circumstances with the Flushing Middle School development. **ADKINS** stated that if the tentative preliminary was not approved, the water line may not be installed as he (Adkins) would be participating in the cost of the line. There would be more cost of the water line if the line was installed on Carpenter Road which would give the school thirty (30%) percent less capacity. There would be thirty (30%) percent more pressure by tying into the proposed water line on the proposed Coldwater Valley Subdivision property. If a fire should happen across the street from the school there would not be water at the school (per the County).

**DOYLE** read the steps for approving a Subdivision Plat Plan:

1. The proprietor engages a surveyor who prepares preliminary plat and returns it to the proprietor.
2. The proprietor or agent presents plan to the Flushing Charter Township Planning Commission for a Site Plan Review of the plat. Within 90 days the Planning Commission recommends to the Flushing Charter Township Board either denial or approval of the Tentative Preliminary Plat.
3. The proprietor or agent then presents the Tentative Preliminary Plat to the Flushing Charter Township Board to act on the recommendation of the Planning Commission to either deny or approve the Tentative Preliminary Plat.
4. If the plat is approved, the proprietor then obtains approvals or rejection within 30 days by the:
  - a. Genesee County Road Commission
  - b. Genesee County Drain Commission

- c. Department of Transportation
- d. Department of Natural Resources
- e. Local Health Department or State Health Department
5. Proprietor or agent contacts the Flushing Charter Township Clerk and requests to be on the agenda for the governing body to reject or approve the Final Preliminary Plat Plan. They have 20 days to approve or reject this plan.
6. If approved the proprietor instruct the surveyor to prepare final plat plan. Surveyor gives it to the proprietor to sign the Proprietor's Certificate. The proprietor obtains the County Treasurer's Certificate as to taxes. He then goes to the County Drain Commission to approve or reject within 10 days. From there he goes to the County Road Commission to approve or reject within 15 days.
7. When all information is received, the proprietor asks to be on the Flushing Township Board Agenda for Final Plat Approval. The governing body has 20 days to either approve or reject his request.
8. If approved the proprietor goes to the County Plat Board for approval or rejection within 15 days. This is forwarded to Department of Treasury to approve or reject within 15 days. Department of Treasury forwards to County Register of Deeds and Department of Transportation. The Register of Deeds records upon receipt. Department of Transportation approves or rejects within 10 days.

**FLOWERS** felt the situation was moving too fast because the Township Board of Trustees had not reviewed the site plan documentation.

**DOYLE** reread number 5 which states:

“Proprietor or agent contacts the Flushing Charter Township Clerk and request to be on the agenda for the governing body to reject or approve the Final Preliminary Plat Plan.”

**DOYLE** requested that **ADKINS** return to the Planning Commission and then proceed to the Township Board of Trustees for their Final Preliminary Plat approval. **DOYLE** stated the steps were: the Planning Commission approved the request; the Township Board of Trustees reviewed the request and give their approval; material put together for the Tentative Preliminary Plat Approval and return to the Planning Commission for a Final Preliminary Plat Approval with the recommendation to be passed on to the Township Board of Trustees. This would allow the Planning Commission, as the recommending body, for all the things that were recommended, to proceed for the Final Plat.

**NIETHAMMER** stated there were three (3) steps to the Subdivision Plat Plan:

1. Tentative Preliminary Plat
2. Final Preliminary Plat
3. Final Plat

**NIETHAMMER** stated he and **ADKINS** would return to the Planning Commission.

**DOYLE** stated the request could be turned down.

**GENSHEIMER MOVED**, seconded by Swanson to accept Mr. Adkins' request for Coldwater Valley Subdivision with the notes that have been made, the recommendations that have been made, pending all of his (Mr. Adkins) permits that he has yet to secure from the different agencies, and all the notes that have been made tonight, that we (the Planning Commission) know pretty much what kind of subdivision this will be and we (the Planning Commission) are all in agreement; this includes all of the items from 1 to 11 that have been proposed by David Rowe of Inland Seas and includes the ten (10) amendments (conditions) which we have on our check list (see list below). The final would have to be the By-Laws because of open space and something has to be done with the space. **FLOWERS** recommends the plan come back to the Planning Commission before it goes to the Board of Trustees.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Gensheimer, Swanson, and Doyle

NAYS: Gibbs, Flowers, and Bowron                      MOTION TIED.

ABSENT: Buell

(Ten Amendments)

1. Sidewalks
2. Covered by By-Laws
3. Stick built houses
4. Basements or foundations
5. Open Space for property walkways
6. Jog in the main drive (lots 7 and 24) – Phase II
7. Deceleration/acceleration land (3 lanes)
8. Other access to Turner Property off Johnson Road
9. Separate individual property owner
10. House on Lot 8 to be raised

**GENSHEIMER** stated the Planning Commission had talked about another access through Clarence Turner's property and wanted to know if the Commission should be more specific on the details. **DOYLE** stated there were two (2) choices: 1) the Planning Commission could turn the request down stating **ADKINS** could not proceed unless there was another outlet or 2) approve with the recommendations the access be required when at that particular stage.

**GENSHEIMER** felt that since **FLOWERS** knew the discussions with the Planning Commission, the Road Commission, and the details on the jog in the road everything could be completed with the Township Board of Trustees at their (Board of Trustees) meeting on Thursday, March 11, 2004. **NEITHAMMER** would have a revised plat showing the job at the March 11, 2004 Board of Trustees meeting.

**BOWRON** stated he had some reservations about building in the flood plain prior to obtaining an application from the DEQ. **NEITHAMMER** stated that before he came back to the Planning Commission with the Final Preliminary Plat Plan they would have something from the DEQ.

**DOYLE** wanted to know if there was another motion on this request; **SWANSON** wanted to know the reason for the “no” votes. If a decision is not made tonight, the Planning Commission has to give a good reason as to what is taking place. **GENSHEIMER** wanted to know what the reservations were on the issues. **DOYLE** stated the process doesn’t work where they (**ADKINS**) could proceed with the information until the Planning Commission gives the approval; it is part of the conditions in the motion that state those different issues would be addressed.

**GENSHEIMER** wanted to know if the lots in question would make the Commission feel better if they should agree to have them be in “open space” rather than try to build up the land without a basement. **DOYLE** stated the area was in the roadway. **ADKINS** stated another option would be that when he (**Adkins**) came back to the Planning Commission, to return with another tentative plan showing loss of the flood plain. **ADKINS** stated the school was building in a flood plain so what would be wrong with building a house in the flood plain. **DOYLE** stated one corner of the school would be located in the flood plain and the school would have to raise the area three (3) feet to proceed with the project. **ADKINS** stated the grade would be raised and dirt would be removed from another area. **NEITHAMMER** stated that something was progressing with Inland Seas Engineering which Wilcox Associates had not been privy to yet due to a letter dated March 2, 2004 to Jerry Fitch, Flushing Township Building Inspector from Dave Rowe of Inland Seas Engineering concerning Paragraph 3 which states:

3. A large portion of the property falls within the flood plain as established along the Boman Drain by FEMA. Approximately one-half of the proposed lots in phase one of the development are affected by the flood plain and would not be buildable utilizing conventional building methods. It is recognized that an effort is underway to submit a LOMA, (Letter of Map Amendment) to FEMA so that the theoretical flood plain level can be lowered and make the lots more buildable. Again any approval should be contingent on the revision of the flood plain level by FEMA.

After much discussion regarding building homes in the flood plain, it was determined to leave the decision to the DEQ. **GENSHEIMER** wanted to know if **ADKINS** should loose the first seven (7) lots, would he still proceed with the subdivision – per **ADKINS** “yes” and it would be determined by the recommendation of the DEQ. **DOYLE** stated the Planning Commission would be giving **ADKINS** the approval to proceed to put all the conditions, etc. together in order to make everything work. Permits would have to be obtained before **ADKINS** comes back to the Planning Commission.

**BOWRON** stated the Planning Commission was stewards of the community’s wishes. Those wishes are articulated in the Master Plan under “Goals,” Natural Resources section which states:

“Promote the wisest possible utilization of valuable natural resources and the protection of these resources from unnecessary encroachment by development.”

How could the Planning Commission be consistent with the *Goals* and also state it appears developments in a flood plain should go to a DEQ and find out the answer. **GENSHEIMER** felt the DEQ would inform **ADKINS** how to work around the flood plain; for the progress of the township, how could you turn down a request for a proposed site because there are seven (7) lots that are in jeopardy that might be in a flood plain. **DOYLE** stated that according to the Plan and the Ordinance, the area was already zoned RSA which is already acceptable.

**FLOWERS MOVED**, seconded by Swanson to go ahead and give the Tentative Preliminary Plat approval from the Planning Commission to go to the Township Board of Trustees for their approval as with the same wording as the first motion which states: to accept Mr. Adkins' request for Coldwater Valley Subdivision with the notes that have been made, the recommendations that have been made, pending all of his (Mr. Adkins) permits that he has yet to secure from the different agencies and all the notes that have been made tonight, that we know pretty much what kind of subdivision this will be and we are all in agreement; this includes all of the items from 1 to 11 that have been proposed by David Rowe of Inland Seas and includes the ten (10) amendments which we have in on our check list. The final would have to be the By-Laws because of open space and something has to be done with the space. **FLOWERS** recommends the plan come back to the Planning Commission before it goes to the Board of Trustees.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Bowron, Flowers, Swanson, Gensheimer, and Doyle

NAYS: Gibbs            MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Buell

The matter now goes to the Flushing Township Board of Trustees on Thursday, March 11, 2004 for a Tentative Preliminary Approval then will return to the Planning Commission on Tuesday, March 23, 2004.

**2.     Howard Scheuner – Amend an Existing Special Use Permit Phase I (Hyde Park)**

**HOWARD SCHEUNER (SCHEUNER)**, Developer of HJM, Inc. (Hyde Park PUD) of Howell, Michigan and **JAMES BARNWELL (BARNWELL)** of Desine Inc. of Brighton, Michigan were present to request an amendment to an existing Special Use Permit Phase I (Hyde Park).

Per an excerpt from the letter of February 23, 2004 from **BARNWELL** to Supervisor Andrew Trogot, which **DOYLE** read, it states:

“The developer at this time is proposing a modification to the attached unit area of the Planned Unit Development. The amendment consist of reducing the number of units per building and providing more two (2) unit buildings. This amendment will reduce the total number of units by 6. The total number of units proposed for the development with this amendment is 161 units.”

**DOYLE** read a section of the letter dated March 1, 2004 from Rowe Inc to Building Inspector, Jerry Fitch.

1. The applicant has revised the site plan to decrease the number of units in the Planned Unit Development by six (6). The township should be aware that the approved site plan provided building separation of thirty feet; whereas, in the revised plan the buildings are typically twenty feet apart.

**BARNWELL** reviewed history of the proposed amendment:

- Originally all attached units were three (3) and four (4) units
- 2003 - came to the Planning Commission to request the Southwestern portion of the project be converted to single family units
  1. approval of the 64-single family units on the Southwest portion of the site
  2. conditions placed on the overall plan
    - a. buildings by River Road removed and since have been rebuilt
    - b. upgrading to the ponds
  3. sanitary sewer, watermains, and storm sewers have been constructed in the 64-single family development
  4. grading and curbing has been done – 64 single family development
  5. roads have not been paved – 64 single family development
  6. based on marketing statistics people like outside units
    - a. like the ranch style units
    - b. Developer would like to go to two-family attached units
      1. new plan would accommodate the two-family attached units
      2. more 2 units in the area to be developed on the Southeastern portion of the site
  7. requested the development to be reconfigured to allow more two (2) units to be constructed
  8. no changes in style of the homes, requirements, or conditions that were originally placed on the development by the Planning Commission
  9. only 6 units will be deleted
  10. changes to be made: 4 units on the Northeast outer perimeter of Cambridge Drive
  11. square footage to remain the same as original request – 1,300 to 1,500 square feet – 2 unit ranch units
  12. some of the ranch homes will have option to have lofts; same architectural exterior designs as originally requested – restrictions the same
  13. 20 feet setback between each single family home
  14. no changes in the By-Laws
  15. side set backs the same
  16. Lot 15 unit located on Kings Way is too close to the corner
  17. Lot 19 unit will be shifted a little for proper setbacks

### **9:15 P.M. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

#### **Questions and Concerns:**

1. “how are seniors going to be able to climb the stairs to the loft of the ranches?”

2. “concerned about the 1,100 square feet of floor space.”
3. David Johnson – “has an interest in 11 units in the development – Lots 22-28; bought the property based on original condominium by-laws; currently tri-plexus constructed; he has 7 tri- and quad- units- 2 left; if amendment for approval to decrease 6 units, Johnson would like to have the ability to change to duplex units also; duplex more marketable. **SCHEUNER** stated that he ask for changes only to property which he owns; not other individuals property but has no problems with changes for Johnson’s property.
4. “concerning Open Space - the previous units were 30 feet between the units and now reduced down to 20 feet – would the overall space of units be changed?” The area has to be safe to get a fire truck between the units; the density is better. **DOYLE** stated that when you cut the amount of properties that you have for sale, six (6) in this case, the area would be less dense. **DOYLE** stated the only thing that would help on Cambridge Drive would be to make a few of the tri-plexus into duplexes; on Kings Way, one of the duplexes would have to be removed to give distance between the buildings. In order to give more room between the buildings, four (4) units would have to be eliminated.

**SWANSON MOVED**, seconded by Flowers to approve the request for change to the two (2) units as in the drawing; per the conditions of No. 15 to be adjusted along the property line; trying to keep as much distance between the buildings as possibly in order to have over 20 feet; and to keep the same architectural structures.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Gensheimer, Bowron, Gibbs, Flowers, Swanson, and Doyle

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Buell

#### **VI. BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. Don’t forget Work Session scheduled for Tuesday, March 23, 2004 at 7:00 p.m.
2. MTA Seminar – *Powers and Duties of Zoning Administrators* – Monday, April 26, 2004 from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Gateway Centre, Flint, Michigan. Early Bird Registration Deadline is April 9, 2004. Please let the Clerk know as soon as possible.
3. For future recommendations to the Board of Trustees, the wording will be “we recommend this be required” this was for the Coldwater Valley Final Preliminary Plat Approval. (This paragraph was revisited and re-approved again on April 27, 2004 by the Planning Commission).

**VII. MEETING SCHEDULE:**

**\*\*\*THERE WILL NOT BE AN APRIL 12, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DUE TO EASTER VACATION. THE MEETING DATE WAS CHANGED TO MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004.\*\*\***

**PROBABLE WORK SESSION – TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2004 – 7:00 P.M.**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004 – 7:00 P.M.**

**PROBABLE WORK SESSION – TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2004 – 7:00 P.M.**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, MAY 10, 2004 – 7:00 P.M.**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business matters on the Agenda, **DOYLE** adjourned the meeting at 9:51 p.m.

---

JEROME DOYLE, Chair

---

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

---

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

---

Date of Approval

Planningminutes 03/08/04