

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

DATE: MAY 8, 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
Mark J. Newman

Barry Pratt, Board of Trustee Representative

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

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

ABSENT: Newman

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Pifer, Representative of Kraft Engineering, Flint, Michigan, Mark Urgowns, F. Thomas Walker, Nicholas Walker, Jennifer Wagner, Ramona Walker, Scott Reel

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 Gibbs to adopt the Agenda as presented. **MOTION CARRIED.**

III. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF APRIL 10, 2006: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Swanson to approve the Minutes of April 10, 2006 as printed. **MOTION CARRIED.**

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. PRATT stated there had been an article in the MTA E-News regarding the new Zoning Enactment Laws. **MORFORD** will get the transaction packet for the Planning Commission from MTA.

2. MORFORD stated there had been an article in the May 5, 2006 issue of the MTA Weekly Legislative Report concerning "House Looks to Amend Master Plan Procedures." As updates become available, **MORFORD** will get copies for the Planning Commission.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

**1. Robert Myers, Myers Building Company, P.O. Box 667, Flushing, Michigan
Residential Site Condominium**

A request by Robert Myers, Myers Building Company, P.O. Box 667, Flushing, Michigan was presented to the Planning Commission with a Site Plan Requirement Review Checklist for a Preliminary Approval of the Site Condominium (a/k/a Ambleside No. 3). It would be an addition to an existing subdivision but the proposed would now be a site condominium. For information concerning the procedures and the approval of the particular request, Sections 20-600; Section 20-305; and Section 20-1900 would have to be followed.

MICHAEL PIFER (PIFER) of Kraft Engineering, 409 W. Seventh Street, Flint, Michigan 48503 was in attendance representing the Petitioner, Myers Building Company of Flushing. Also present were Robert and Jenny Myers, Owners of Myers Building Company.

SPECIFIC DETAILS:

- Existing Ambleside Development is located on the South side of Pierson Road, approximately one-half mile (1/2) West of Seymour Road.
- Two (2) previous phases have been platted and are being developed.
- The initial Ambleside extends southerly from Pierson Road and is located on the East side of the proposed phase.
- Phase II of Ambleside is located on the West side.
- Between the two (2) developments, fifty-five (55) lots have already been platted and developed.

PROPOSED REQUEST FOR AMBLESIDE NO. 3: (See Exhibit A)

- Proposed development (“Yellow” area) is immediately South of the existing Ambleside Development.
- Proposed consists of twenty-eight (28) lots on seventeen and one-half (17 ½) acres of land.
- The property to the East (“Green” area) of the proposed property currently is undeveloped and would be utilized for future development.
- There would be single family, residential lots (same as previous phases).
- The lot sizes would be very similar to previous developments.
- The proposed homes to be constructed on Ambleside No. 3 will be similar to previous developments.

PREVIOUS HISTORY OF AMBLESIDE DEVELOPMENT:

- The first few phases of Ambleside were platted per the Plat Act.
- Proposed plans for Ambleside No. 3 would be a site condominium under the Condominium Act.

LOT SIZE AND SQUARE FOOTAGE:

- The current zoning is RSA.
- There will be ninety (90) foot frontage.
- The area will consist of 9,900 square foot.
- The previous developments had lots that were 15,000 to 16,000 minimum square foot.
- Ambleside No. 3 will have the same square footage.
- The typical minimum size lot will be about 15,000 square foot with 95 foot of frontage and approximately 175 feet deep.
- The proposed development will be serviced by public utilities and public roads.
 - a. the road will connect onto the existing road which currently dead-ends on the West side of the site and extends southerly and southeasterly
 - b. there will be two (2) cul-de-sacs
 - c. the roads will be built and turned over to the Genesee County Road Commission after the construction of Ambleside has been completed.

UTILITIES:

- The underground storm drainage will be a public utility maintained by the Genesee County Drain Commissioner.
- The sanitary sewer and water will be a public utility maintained by the Genesee County Drain Commissioner, Division of Water and Waste Services

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT:

- The proposed development which is part of parcel 08-34-100-004 and consists of approximately twenty-six (26) acres of vacant land would be utilized in the future.
- The proposed development will start by late summer.
- There will be a second entrance to the proposed Ambleside No. 3 beginning at the Cole Creek Subdivision located to the East of the site.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- **PRATT:** one hundred fifteen (115) foot has been mentioned as the frontage on the lots; there are three (3) lots that have a seventy (70) to seventy-eight (78) foot frontage. **PIFER** stated the cul-de-sacs, which are less at the right-of-way line but at the building line they meet the minimum requirement of eighty (80) foot per the ordinance. On a cul-de-sac, the frontage will be smaller because of the lay out of the lot.
- **DOYLE:** when there is sewer and water, the minimum frontage is eighty (80) foot.
- **FITCH:** a house will have to fit on the property and still honor the setbacks.
- **PIFER:** the front setback required by the township ordinance is twenty (20) foot; **MYERS** is proposing a minimum of forty (40) foot.
- **DOYLE:** the lots are supposed to be set up so there is a building area within the lot. In a site condominium, there is an envelope for the building site; a building envelope is not available for the proposed request.

- **PIFER:** they are in attendance for a Conceptual or Pre Preliminary Approval so the current request is the first step. **PIFER** stated all the comments and suggestions from the Planning Commission would be incorporated in the plans. They (Myers) will return to the Planning Commission for a Final Preliminary Approval; at the particular time, they propose to have all the County Agency approvals. The set back lines can be added to the plot plan. **DOYLE** recommended having the building envelope.
- **DOYLE:** in a site condominium there has to be By-Laws which have to be presented to the Planning Commission.
- **PIFER:** all the roads will be public roadways that will be owned and maintained by the Road Commission with a sixty-six (66) foot road right of way that will be dedicated to the Road Commission. The roads will be thirty (30) foot wide from back of curb to curb.
- There will be curb and gutter roads with asphalt pavement that will meet the requirements of the Road Commission.
- The Road Commission will have control over all the roadways in proposed Phase No. 3, the same as in the other two (2) phases.
- **DOYLE:** what about the other properties that was jointly owned properties? **PIFER** the proposed request was called a site condominium and would be the same as a plat book. There would be no common element.
- **PRATT:** would it be single family residents – same type design as the rest of the previous developments. The only difference would be a different Act to develop single family homes, which would reduce the construction/approval time frame.
- **PRATT:** assumed Lots 67, 66, 65, and 64 would be taking advantage of the big dip in the property. **PIFER** made reference to Page 2 of the Site Plans, which indicated that some of the lots have “w/o” and “e/l”. The “w/o” indicates walk out; the “e/l” indicates day light windows.
- **PIFER:** Lot 56 through Lot 68 will all have daylight window or walk out basement.
- **PRATT:** how will the sloping be in the drainage area? **PIFER:** with all the lots, there will be drainage from the homes to the street and also rear yard drainage. New drains will provide for rear yard drainage; there will be swale ditches in the rear yard that will drain to the catch basins that will be located by the rear property line.
- **DOYLE:** will there be any ponds that will be used for drainage? **PIFER:** there will only be an existing storm sewer system that was constructed in the other developments that will be used for drainage to the East toward Cole Creek.
- **BUELL:** what is the use of the property to the south? **PIFER:** it is undeveloped farm land. **BUELL:** how far are the railroad tracks from the South property line? **MYERS:** from the undeveloped south property line on the East side of the proposed Phase No. 3, it would be approximately six hundred (600) to seven hundred (700) feet.
- **BUELL:** is the property to the South vacant, unused land? **MRS MYERS:** the property to the South of the proposed Phase No. 3 is heavily wooded. The proposed Phase No. 3 property ends at the woods.
- **BUELL:** would there be any common area? **PIFER:** the road right of way would be the only common area in that it is not part of the lots; everything is deeded to the Road Commission. There will not be any parks or bike paths.

- **PIFER:** the buyer actually deeds the right of way. With a condominium, when the time comes to accept the ownership of the road, a legal description has to be drawn up and it is actually Quit Claimed to the Road Commission by the property owner.
- **DOYLE:** it will not be part of the Master Deed because it was deeded away to someone else and will not be owned by the association.
- **PRATT:** will there be sidewalks? **PIFER:** sidewalks have not been constructed in the previous developments.
- **BUELL:** several times the drainage swale with catch basins was mentioned which indicates a storm sewer and which indicates the drainage goes someplace, where does it go? **PIFER:** slopes from the house out to the street; behind the house it would slope to the catch basins in the rear yard swales.

7:28 P.M. – OPENED TO THE AUDIENCE FOR COMMENTS:

DOYLE reviewed the Site Plan Review Checklist regarding proposed Ambleside Phase No. 3. with below listed additional comments:

- An environmental study is not required, as wetlands are not present on the site or contaminates on record. All the details would be on file, with the township, from previous Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments. Reference was made to Section 20-600, *Condominium Developments*.
- **DOYLE** reviewed Section 20-600, *Condominium Developments*.
 - a. **DOYLE** stated a recent item was added to Section 20-600 for an engineer to check out the ordinance and make sure all the items are covered. There needed to be a preliminary approval and a final approval.
- **DOYLE** briefly reviewed Section 20-1900, *Site Plan Review Procedure – Intent*; Section 20-1901, *Developments Requiring Site Plan*; Section 20-1902, *Site Plan Review Requirements*; Section 20-1903, *Site Plan Review Procedures*; Section 20-1904, *Conditions*; Section 20-1905, *Performance Guarantee*; Section 20-1906, *Approval*; Section 20-1907, *Standards for Approval* - **DOYLE** recommended the above sections be reviewed thoroughly.
- The approximate minimum square footage of the homes will be 1,900 square foot for a ranch; story and a half and two (2) story homes will be higher. There will be a lot of story and a half homes at 2,150 minimum square footage with 1,500 square foot on the first floor. The styles of the proposed condominiums will consist of ranches with a few two (2) story homes included. The two (2) story homes will be 2,400 square footage with 1,250 on the first floor.
- The maximum building height will be twenty-five (25) feet tall
- “Off Street Parking (Locations)” - The proposed parking will be in the driveways and garages; there are no signs as to parking in the streets
- “Off-Street Parking” – will be private drives with approximate two (2) cars wide
- “Number of Signs” – there will be a temporary sign placed at the entrance of the proposed development and the only other signs will be the signs placed by the Road

Commission. (Similar to real estate or building signs). The approximate size will be 2' x 3'.

- “Landscaping (General)” – the sloping of the ground will go away from the home; there will be swale ditches and storm sewer outlets
- “Vehicular Circulation Pattern” – anticipated outlets will go: 1) around to the undeveloped area and back to where the drive is located off Pierson Road; 2) there is a future outlet that goes to the other subdivision.
- The streets are twenty-four (24) foot wide – the proposed streets will be thirty (30) feet from back of curb to back of curb – the curbs are two and one-half (2 ½) foot wide.
- Sidewalks will be eliminated – same as existing phases of development
- “Number of Lights” – Consumers Energy will develop the plans for the intensity and orientation of the lights.
- “Soil Conditions” – primarily clay soil
- “Waste Receptacles” - private
- “Fire Protection” – City of Flushing

DOYLE stressed the main interest of the Planning Commission will be to review the procedures of the site plan in both Sections 20-1900 and 20-600. After the approval of the Preliminary Approval, **MYERS** will return to the Planning Commission for a Final Approval.

7:55 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Pratt for approval of Preliminary Plan of Ambleside No. 3. (Site Condominium). MOTION CARRIED.

MRS. MYERS stated they had a home in the “2006 Parade of Homes” located on Woodridge Dr.

2. Informal Discussion Regarding an Existing Private Drive – Willowbrook Drive

The Walker Family including brothers, Thomas and Frederick, were in attendance to participate in an informal discussion as to what had to transpire for the additional use of a Private Drive. Some of the information, concerning the private drive use, had previously been given to a family member who wanted to construct a home on one of the proposed properties.

DOYLE made reference to Ordinance Section 22-305, *Private Drives, Non-Conforming Uses* where at one time uses had been acceptable but due to ordinance changes over the years, non-conforming uses had resulted.

THOMAS WALKER (T. WALKER) stated he and his brother (**F. WALKER**) owned property located off Willowbrook Drive and would like to split the property so children of both brothers could construct homes on the proposed property. **T. WALKER** stated his proposal

would be for three (3) splits of property each 127' wide by 508' deep which would follow the 4 to 1 ratio. Suggestions were:

- all the homes would face the easement to the East
- the back part of the property would be land locked
- the back part of the property has a small section of woods
 - a. the house would set in front of the woods
 - b. the septic fields would be in the front
 - c. the back yard would be to the woods
- easements would be granted to the lots either with one (1) drive or individual drives to the three (3) divisions.
- per the drawing, parcel D would be part of **T.WALKER'S** property.
- The main concern would be to have an easement so the children could get to Parcels A, B, and C.

QUESTIONS:

- **DOYLE:** how much of the property, that was the original property, went with the private drive? Per the ordinance, if there already is a non-conforming private drive, that property is not added to make more non-conforming property. The property in question was adjacent to Willowbrook Drive, an existing driveway easement, which was thirty (30) foot wide when the easement was put together. **JERRY FITCH (FITCH)**, Building Inspector, stated there were property deeds but he (Fitch) could produce section maps from which legal descriptions have been written. The property has not changed since **WALKERS** took ownership of the property.
- **DOYLE:** because the current meeting is an informal discussion, the Planning Commission will assume there isn't any added property to the existing private roads.
- **FLOWERS:** the information is straight forward, according to the tax sheet; it shows the proposed property as one (1) parcel. An easement runs through Parcel D. **FLOWERS** stated Section 08-04-400-007 and Section 08-04-400-039 were two (2) different parcels with houses on each parcel.
- **DOYLE:** any parcel adjacent to the existing drive, that was there originally, would be what was being discussed. A request that would be applied for in the future would use the existing roadway. There are four (4) parcels that do not extend to the existing roadway. Would the Planning Commission demand the parcels extend to the roadway, or would it be something that was necessary, or could it be one of the conditions - in order to have some type of approval to an existing road that was an existing road before it became non-conforming. If that was the case, it should be broken up so that it would extend to the existing road or that the road was adjusted.
- **DOYLE:** the situation should be viewed as an existing driveway that has been in existence as long as Willowbrook Drive, so the two (2) parcels would have the same age; there is also a thirty (30) foot easement.
- **DOYLE:** adjacent parcels to Willowbrook Drive, Section 08-04-200-054, 08-04-200-053, 08-04-200-052, and 08-04-200-037 would be exempt as they are adjacent from another private drive North of Willowbrook Drive.

- **DOYLE:** what would be an allowable thing for Willowbrook Drive in the future?
- **FITCH:** per the drawing, 08-04-200-054 and 08-04-200-053 all have access to Seymour Road through parcel 08-04-200-052. Parcels 08-04-200-037 and 08-04-200-040 have access off Seymour Road. The only parcel that might be divided in the future and have access off Willowbrook Drive would be the back portion of 08-04-200-040 which could possibly add property to the private drive.
- **PRATT:** what about parcel 08-04-200-038? **FITCH:** parcels 08-04-200-038 and 08-04-100-015 are original parcels off Willowbrook Drive and could be split in the future.
- **DOYLE:** the matter has to be reviewed and put together so that it would be an acceptable thing for future use.
- **FITCH:** the original parcels off Willowbrook Drive were 08-04-200-055, 08-04-100-015, 08-04-200-038, both of the Walker property – 08-04-400-039 and 08-04-400-027, and one (1) other property off the corner.
- **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission could make some type of an agreement, so the parcels that would be acceptable for any kind of special use permit in the future, would not expand the non-conforming use.
- **FITCH:** all the residents would have to be involved in a Maintenance Agreement. **DOYLE:** signatures for the Maintenance Agreement have already been obtained and the drive would have to be maintained and kept in good order.
- **PRATT:** in the future, all that any resident on Willowbrook Drive would have to do would be to come before the Planning Commission and apply for a Special Use Permit, providing the property was large enough; the property would then become part of the Maintenance Agreement along with any other conditions that might be placed on the drive.
- **DOYLE:** a common driveway and a Special Use Permit would be involved which would allow the private drive to be smaller in size than required per the ordinance.
- **DOYLE:** there are properties not connected to the private drive.
- **DOYLE:** Walkers could assemble the information and come before the Planning Commission; the Commission would review the situation.
- **WALKER:** what are the overall concerns as to the use of the property? **DOYLE:** the biggest concern would be having a thirty (30) foot wide roadway. If there was a situation where an ambulance or fire truck had to get back to the home, there would only be a one-way drive instead of a two-way drive. **WALKER:** they had plans to widen the road.
- **DOYLE:** in order for the private drive to function, there would have to be two (2) lanes for safety. The Planning Commission's biggest concern is the health, safety, and welfare of the people of Flushing Township.
- **DOYLE:** utility lines could be placed on private property rather than on the thirty (30) foot easement.
- **WALKER:** electricity and telephone lines run overhead to the back of the property.
- **DOYLE:** currently, gas and water is not available but could be placed on private property in the future.

- **DOYLE:** there should be ditches so there would be the ability to get rid of excess water on properties and then flow to the biggest drain available.
- **WALKER:** recently a new thirty (30) inch culvert has been installed on the ravine which takes all the run-off water off the fields and down to the creek. The other water flows toward Seymour Road.
- **DOYLE:** the Maintenance Agreement should be on the Deed so that it would run with the property.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DIVISION OF PROPERTY:

- Have three (3) properties with a joint (common) area in back of the property that would be used and belong to all three (3) properties.
- Have a joint area in front of the three (3) parcels with easements.
- Have an easement across parcel D (see Exhibit A).
- Could the 4 to 1 ratio be eliminated and move the lots up to the drive.
- There could be a one hundred and twenty-seven (127) foot easement or the property could be split with three (3) more lots and give each child more land.
- When property has been sold, there would be the ability to sell a piece of property that couldn't be split in the future. If there is a common area, that could be stated on the Deed.
- There would be three hundred twenty (320) feet of driveway before arriving at the proposed property which would be similar to adding an addition for an easement for a driveway but which would be adding to the roadway.
- Is there a minimum size for the 4 to 1 ratio? **FITCH:** Yes, until you get to where an individual would be subdividing or for a site condominium, it would no longer be a fact because the property would be divided under separate rules. If an individual should divide property on a metes and bounds decisions and metes and bounds descriptions, it would have to abide by the 1 to 4 ratios with the length. The ratio situation would go away with ten (10) acres of land.
- Recommendation: could the fourth lot be a ten (10) foot or twenty (20) foot strip of land on the north side that would extend eight hundred (800) foot and then make it a fourth (4th) lot. Let the lot fronts extend all the way to the road, but leave a small common strip which would be used as the fourth lot. **FITCH:** recommended the Assessor be contacted.
- **FITCH** stated coming South off Willowbrook Drive, the easement would cut through both Thomas and Frederick Walkers property. **T. WALKER** could create four (4) divisions out of the land; Parcel A, Parcel B, Parcel C, and Parcel D would go with the house and would make the division legal.
- Make another driveway for three (3) parcels – if the driveway was down the middle of Parcel B, it would be adding to a driveway that was already there. It would be similar to a cul-de-sac.
- There could only be three (3) properties off the new private drive.

- **T. WALKER** wanted to divide his fifteen (15) acres to create three (3) new parcels plus his own parcel with a house on it to make a total of four (4) parcels.
- **F. WALKER** wanted to divide his fifteen (15) acres to create two (2) parcels (F. Walker and one (1) other parcel) for a total of two (2) parcels.
- Out of the two (2) pieces of property, there would be six (6) parcels with a 4 to 1 ratio, the wider the property the deeper it would be.
- **DOYLE:** make parcel A, B, and C three (3) parcels to the West instead of parcel A, B, C, and D (**T.WALKER**). Would the property listed as **T.WALKER** on the East side of the driveway be large enough if the road only went to the driveway? If there was a situation where an individual took a roadway to the West off the North/South private drive, and it went to the West into parcel B, there would be a parcel at the end (Parcel B), a parcel at the North (Parcel A), and a parcel on the South (Parcel C). It would take up more room than 1.4 acres each, but the lots could be wider and also longer. The square footage for each parcel would be larger.
- The only problem would be to make sure the road would be wide enough and a Maintenance Agreement would be in affect to maintain the roadway. **DOYLE:** a regular paved road would be twenty-four (24) foot wide plus the curbs; if a gravel or paved road should be put in and if the road was twenty-four (24) foot – there would be twelve (12) feet on both sides of the centerline so there would be egress and ingress traffic.
- The Maintenance Agreement would be controlled by placing the Agreement on the Deed which goes with the property.

FLOWERS felt if the request was approved, he (Flowers) would like to see it stated so there would not be any more splits due to the non-conforming use situation. **DOYLE** stated the request is a special use so if the request is granted it would be a separate special use all by itself and nothing else in the township would be the same. The township would be trying to eliminate the non-conforming use by making it conforming. Nothing could be added to the property. Conditions would be placed on the special use permit such as: dual lanes, Maintenance Agreement, placement of the encumbrance on the Deed so that everyone would have to conform to the addition that states “the residents have to be part of the maintenance of the roadway” and to have the easements recorded. **BUELL** wanted to know if the road constructions were applicable in situations similar to the one in question. The area would be private, but it could be made a part of the conditions for the special use. The situation was there before and is a non-conforming use now, but it wasn’t originally non-conforming – it would be a matter of what **WALKER’S** would like to do.

FLOWERS would like to bring the private road up to conformity now, instead of later, and would conform to the new private drive ordinance. **DOYLE** stated since **WALKERS’** owned the property, they had the power to widen the private road. On a fifty (50) foot easement, there would be room for the roadway itself, ditches, and additional property for underground utilities. **PRATT** wanted to know if there would have to be larger easements for parcel 08-04-200-055? **FLOWERS** stated that with the large emergency vehicles, a larger easement would be needed.

DOYLE stated that if parcel 08-04-100-015 would allow the ability to get a wider easement, the current easement could go to the West side of the existing thirty (30) foot easement crossing **WALKER'S** property. **PRATT** wanted to know if it would benefit **WALKERS** to have a fifty (50) foot easement if Willowbrook Drive remained thirty (30) foot. **DOYLE** stated there was room to additional footage to Willowbrook Drive in the future even if parcel 08-04-100-015 would not agree to increase the easement to fifty (50) foot. **WALKERS** have increased their parcels to fifty (50) foot which would update part of the property.

JENNIFER WALKER WAGNER (WAGNER), daughter of **F. WALKER**, inquired as to what she had to do, regarding the private road, toward her proposed property Parcel No. 08-04-400-007. It was recommended **WAGNER** have a drive (strip of land) over to the easement and that would become part of the property. If **WAGNER** would like to have fifty (50) foot to connect to the fifty (50) foot that went to **F. WALKER**, that would be the only thing that **WAGNER** would need and it would become a private drive for both her (Wagner) and **F. WALKER**; **WAGNER** could make a fifty (50) foot extension from the current private drive easement.

CONCLUSION:

A description of the proposed Willowbrook Drive splits would be necessary if a stake survey was not performed. **FITCH** felt **WALKERS** would feel more comfortable spending money for surveys if there was something to look forward to. If the issue was approved, the Planning Commission would place conditions on the issue. When the splits took place, the conditions would have to be followed; if the conditions were not followed, there could be a fine. **PRATT** stated the proposed request could be approved subject to **WALKERS** complying with the conditions. **SWANSON** stated that due to the amendments to the Private Road Ordinance, the Planning Commission could work with non-conforming uses. **DOYLE** stated special use situations could now be dealt with easier. **SWANSON** recommended not adding land to the proposed property. **FLOWERS** stated the Planning Commission was trying to take a non-conforming use and make it into a usable situation by placing conditions on the use so in the future, an individual could not add to the property.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

VII. BOARD COMMENTS:

1. Election of Officers for the Planning Commission:

FLOWERS recommended placing the Election of the Chair or Vice Chair on the June 12, 2006 Agenda

2. Items for discussion at future Special Planning Commissions:

a. Review of the Master Plan

- b. Goals and Policies
 - 1. transportation
 - 2. infrastructure
 - 3. schools
 - 4. signs and lighting ordinance would be reviewed by the Attorney
 - 5. stake surveys
 - 6. cost of density
 - 7. cost of future development
 - 8. site plan regulations
- 3. **DOYLE** will be out of town on Monday, May 22, 2006; **SWANSON** will be gone the whole month of July. The next Scheduled Meeting will be held June 12, 2006.
- 4. **FLOWERS** will be attending “Solutions for Intersections” seminar sponsored by the Genesee County Planning Commission on May 17, 2006. If anyone would like to attend, please contact the Clerk.

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:

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.

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

IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Vice Chair **DOYLE** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 9:20 p.m.

JEROME DOYLE, Vice Chair

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

Date of Approval