

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

DATE: JUNE 12, 2006 TIME: 7:00 P.M.
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Jerome Doyle, Vice Chair	Ronald Flowers
Eric Swanson, Secretary	David Gibbs
Richard Buell	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, Newman, Pratt, Fitch and Morford

ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Jennifer Wagner, Nick (Nicholas) Walker, Brenda Roth, Tom (Frederick) Walker, Ramona Walker, Chris Pung, and Susan Kellett

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:03 p.m. by Planning Commission Vice Chair Jerome Doyle with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.

DOYLE would like to add to the Agenda, Number VI, *Public Comments*, and Number VII, *Election of Officers*.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Pratt to adopt the Agenda with the addition of the two (2) new items: Number VI, *Public Comments*, and Number VII, *Election of Officers*. MOTION CARRIED.

III. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF APRIL 24, 2006: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Newman to approve the Minutes of April 24, 2006 as presented. MOTION CARRIED.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

PRATT MOVED, seconded by Flowers to change Number IV, "*Unfinished Business*", on the Agenda to Number V. "*New Business*" would be Number IV. MOTION CARRIED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **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

FREDERICK (THOMAS) WALKER (T. WALKER) and **NICKOLAS WALKER (N. WALKER)** had attended, on May 6, 2006, an Informal Discussion with the Planning Commission Regarding a Special Use Permit to Expand an Existing Private Drive; suggestions and Sections of the Ordinance were given as how to proceed with the issue.

T. WALKER stated he and his brother, **N. WALKER**, had a lot of property in the area and his children (T. Walker) wanted to build a home. **T. WALKER** would have three (3) parcels plus a parcel for himself (T. Walker). **N. WALKER** would only have one (1) parcel (for his daughter Jennifer) and one parcel for himself (N. Walker).

Per the plot drawing, Willowbrook Drive, a private road, would be at least twenty-four (24) feet wide in order for two (2) cars to pass side by side on the road. Currently, the existing drive (Willowbrook) is thirty (30) foot, but has shrunk over the years and needs to be widened. The easement would be changed from thirty (30) foot to fifty (50) foot wide. There is a possibility the property of **N. WALKER** could be divided into four (4) parcels in the future. For the time being, there would only be two (2) parcels: **N. WALKER** and one (1) parcel for his daughter.

T. WALKER stated he had the original Road Maintenance Agreement dated 1973; the only change would be the road name from Sewell Drive to Willowbrook Drive.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

- **NEWMAN:** since there were seven (7) properties signed on in 1979, is that how the road sits today? **JENNIFER WAGNER (WAGNER)**, daughter of **N. WALKER**, stated one property owner on Willowbrook Drive had not been located and another property owner opted out of the Maintenance Agreement; it was a majority rule situation. The owner of the property that opted out is currently owned by Larry Anderson, Parcel No. 08-04-100-015. It was stated that Mr. Anderson does help maintain the road.
- **T. WALKER:** years ago, the Maintenance Agreement did not go with the Deed.
- **DOYLE:** for the necessity of the Planning Commission to put together the Special Use Permit, if the Planning Commission would accept the request at all, the Maintenance Agreement would be part of the condition where the roads were maintained by everyone.
- **FLOWERS:** for clarification, Parcels A, B, and C would be moved to the West back section of the property (**T. WALKER**) and would not be vacant property for a common area. The property would not be land locked. There would be an easement to cross **T. WALKER'S** property to each division.

7:25 P.M. OPENED FOR AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. **Brenda Roth, 10172 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-200-038) - “how are the improvements going to be paid for; she (Ms. Roth) is not totally in favor of the improvement because traffic goes down the road at a high rate of speed; the division splits would create additional traffic flow; don’t mind waiting for the other car to go by because it would keep the traffic flow and the speed down.”
2. **Mrs. Morris Chaney, 8361 Seymour Road, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-200-037) - “there are evergreen trees along the road going West and to have the space needed to make the road into a two (2) lane road would eliminate a lot of the branches on the trees; they (Chaney) don’t mind going to an extent but have grandchildren that play in the backyard; the limbs of the trees also protect against the dust; the trees would have to be cut.”
3. **T. WALKER** – “the limbs are hanging over the road approximately five (5) to six (6) foot; there is a thirty (30) foot easement through the property from the telephone pole on the south side of the private drive which would take off a lot of the branches on the trees that line Chaney’s property.”
4. “understands the concern of the trees, but the road has to be widened for safety issues; still would have to be trimmed; trees have overgrown their original plantings.”
5. **Mrs. Morris Chaney, Seymour Road, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-200-037) – “would like to put up a fence to protect her grandchildren. The Chaney has two (2) front yards – one facing Seymour Road and the other facing Willowbrook Drive. The height regulation, per the ordinance, would be no higher than four (4) foot and would have to be placed on the Chaney property; felt the Walkers should do the surveying for the property line. A “clear vision” area has to be maintained on the corner of the property.
6. **Ramona Walker, 8343 N. Seymour Road, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-400-039) – “Mrs. Chaney would like for her family (Walkers) to survey the Chaney property in order for her (Mrs. Chaney) to put up a fence?”

There was a discussion as to responsibilities of the neighbors!

DOYLE stated Willowbrook Drive was a thirty (30) foot right of way which would not be made larger. The road had to be a two-lane roadway in order for the Special Use Permit to be approved. In order for emergency vehicles such as ambulances, fire trucks, etc. to get to the back of the property, there had to be two (2) lane traffic. The Planning Commission was concerned about the Health, Safety, and Welfare of the citizens of the Township. The ordinance recently was amended – the use was there before the ordinance was so therefore created a non-conforming ordinance.

The Planning Commission has to take into consideration there is property off Willowbrook Drive and does not want to create a hardship so the residents could not use their property. A

Special Use Request is being made to allow the **WALKERS** to do with their property what is a reasonable thing to do.

7. **Christopher Pung, 8369 Seymour Road, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-200-040) – “would the trees on the property line (Parcel No. 08-04-200-037) going to be trimmed or cut back; his (Mr. Pung) children visit the neighbors in the back properties and sometimes younger drivers go down the road at a fast pace; with the two (2) lane road traffic tends to go at a faster pace.” **DOYLE** stated if the Planning Commission had to decide that in order to have a two (2) lane road in order to handle two (2) lanes of traffic and the trees needed to be trimmed; the Planning Commission would make the decision.

CONCERNS OF WILLOWBROOK DRIVE FROM THE RESIDENTS:

- The traffic flow
- Speed
- Dust on the road
- The cutting of the trees along the road
- Cost – will it be coming back on the residents

8. **Brenda Roth, 10172 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing, MI** – “to put the road to the original existing state of being, who will be covering the cost.” **DOYLE** stated Mrs. Roth would not be paying for the cost because she had not made a request. **DOYLE** stated originally the part of the whole agreement would be to have the Maintenance Agreement so that everyone would be in agreement as to the maintenance of the private road. A use similar to the particular request is a non-conforming use, because of the nature of the issue. A section of the Private Road Ordinance is the issue where everyone has the responsibility of maintaining their share of the road. The improvements to the road would enhance the value of every parcel. **DOYLE** stated that with more use of the road more issues are involved; the requested issues are handled by such methods as putting up road signs. The road would still be a private road and everyone would have ownership of the road. The Maintenance Agreement would be for the benefit of the individuals that live on a private road - not for the township to control.

PRATT stated the homeowner would provide all permits, bonds and fees associated with widening the road. **PRATT** felt the Maintenance Agreement should specify what the obligations are for each resident.

9. **Susan Kellett, 10107 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing, MI** (Parcel No. 08-04-200-309) – “wanted to know if the decision had been made to allow **WALKERS** to make the road into a one (1) or two (2) lane road.” **DOYLE** stated **WALKERS** had made a request to utilize the property in the back of their property, which is served by Willowbrook Drive. Willowbrook Drive is a non-conforming use of property, a private road, and doesn’t conform to what the ordinances state at the time. The Planning Commission is trying to utilize **WALKERS** property with a special use which the amended ordinance now allows. The property has to conform to certain items:

- a. Because different properties are involved, there should be a two-lane road to the back property for the health, safety, and welfare of the people.
- b. If there is a two-lane road, the Planning Commission will determine the size of the two (2) lane road.
- c. Since the road has been in place for a long time, does it need to be updated?
- d. Who will maintain the road? The ordinance states there has to be a Maintenance Agreement between all the residents or if there isn't a Maintenance Agreement between the residents there has to be a clause as to how the road will be maintained.
- e. How will the property be divided?

10. Mrs. Morris Chaney, 8361 Seymour Road, Flushing, MI – “they do not use the private road at all, so would they have to pay for the private road.” **DOYLE** stated the private road would not be the responsibility of the Chaney's. The drive would be for the safety of the residents at the back properties.

11. Brenda Roth, 10172 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing, MI – “stated the road was thirty (30) feet; what is the current width of the drive.” **DOYLE** stated it was a thirty (30) foot easement. The road is supposed to be between eighteen (18) and twenty-four (24) foot wide. The roadway isn't necessarily the easement.

12. Susan Kellett, 10107 Willowbrook Drive, Flushing, MI – “wanted to know how to change the name of the private drive from Sewell Drive to Willowbrook Drive; the maps still show Sewell Drive; if there was a fire, no one would know where Willowbrook Drive was located.” **DOYLE** stated when roads are first put together, they have to be accepted by the Genesee County Road Commission (Road Commission) for a name change. It was recommended, that if the approval is granted for the private drive, the residents could contact the Road Commission.

13. Mrs. Morris Chaney, 8361 Seymour Road, Flushing, MI – “could she put up a fence on the boundary of her property now or should she wait until the work has been completed on the road.” **FLOWERS** stated the survey stakes would not make a lot of difference because the survey would only pin point the property line along her roadside property. **FLOWERS** recommended the fence be located six (6) inches from the property line all the way through.

14. Ramona Walker, 8343 N. Seymour Road, Flushing, MI – “they had not contacted any of the neighbors because the Walkers would be taking care of the cost as far as redoing the road back to the original thirty (30) foot.” **WALKERS** knew the cost factor would be a big hassle for all the neighbors.

DOYLE felt the cost issue could be part of the approval of the issue. The Maintenance Agreement would be the major problem since some residents do not want to be involved. The process of property being bought and sold over the years would leave an open problem if

something isn't stated on the Deed or on an Addendum to the Deed that would explain the resident would have a responsibility to maintain a particular portion of the private road.

15. Ramona Walker, 8343 N. Seymour Road, Flushing, MI – “in the winter **WALKERS** do maintain the road but the road is not plowed every time it snows because sometimes the snow isn't that deep.” **DOYLE** poised the question: “If **WALKERS** do decide to do the maintaining of the road, and decide “yes” they will do the maintaining, and some people do not want to be involved in the maintenance agreement, what would happen on the Agreement that would state fifty (50) years down the road that the maintenance would still be done a particular way? Would the maintenance of the road be passed down from owner to owner of the particular property owner? It would have to be shown that a particular parcel number would be responsible for the maintenance of the private road. **T. WALKER** would like to have everyone on the road participate with the maintenance.

NEWMAN wanted to know if people have signed on to the Maintenance Agreement.

RAMONA WALKER (R.WALKER) stated everyone on the road did not sign the Maintenance Agreement as they didn't want to get involved. **R.WALKER** stated that with the new property, the road Maintenance Agreement would go with the Deed. **DOYLE** stated that, in the future, if property should be bought and sold, the Maintenance Agreement would have to be passed down from property owner to property owner.

DOYLE reviewed Concerns on page 7 of the May 8, 2006 Planning Commission Minutes:

- the plot of a 4 to 1 ration would be followed.
- easements would be given to each of the three (3) parcels.
- there would be a fifty (50) foot easement across the property
 - a. the 33' easement could be moved to the South to where it comes into the South side of the property (the easement could be on either the North or South side but either way there has to be a thirty-three (33) foot easement). The property would not be land locked in the back of the property.
 - b. the 33' would extend to the 50' common drive
 - c. the main easement would be the 50' common drive which would be across all the property with the other easements allowed to go back into Parcel A, B, and C property.
 1. the 30' would allow putting the road in which would be 24' wide with 3' shoulders on each side plus the space needed for utilities, ditches, on private property.
 2. the roadway could be determined as necessary to have two way road ways, which is a minimum of 18' per the township ordinance.
- all the homes would face the easement to the East which would be the 50' easement.
- the back part of the property would be land locked if used from the easement back.
- the back part of the property has a small section of woods.
- the house would set in front of the woods – the proper setbacks according to the ordinance would be determined from the Building Inspector.

- the septic fields would be in the front of the lots which would be approved by the Genesee County Health Department.
- the easements would be granted to the lots either with one (1) drive or individual drives to the three (3) divisions – it was decided there would be three (3) drives.
- all of the remaining property and the area where an easement is located would be the fourth (4th) Parcel which would be **T. WALKER’S**.

OTHER MATTERS OF DISCUSSION:

- make sure the property is of proper sizes and the easements are in place.
- the roadway is in place
- there is a Maintenance Agreement
 - a. established with restrictions on the existing residents that are interested in becoming part of restricting their particular Deed.
 - b. The existing Maintenance Agreement does not include everyone – a decision will have to be made as to how to handle the situation with the residents that do not want to participate.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

- **PRATT** stated there were three (3) new property owners. Per a **WALKER** representative, there wouldn't be any problems with adding the new residents to the Maintenance Agreement as part of the sale of the properties. There already is a Maintenance Agreement in existence for the property. Should the Maintenance Agreement be amended? **DOYLE** stated there was potential for four (4) other divisions; there cannot be any more splits.
- **PRATT** stated the only remaining concern he had, from the last Planning Commission Meeting, was to have the easements recorded and the Maintenance Agreements be signed and recorded.
- **DOYLE** stated there was a concern about the width of the road in order to have two-way traffic.

* * * * *

DOYLE reviewed *General Provisions Article III Section 20-305 Private Roads* which states:

- (a) A private road is a road that provides direct access to a parcel and which is not dedicated to and accepted by an authorized governmental road agency. A common driveway as used in this ordinance does not constitute a private road.
- (b) Application, review, and approval of a proposed, private road shall follow the same procedures, as conditional use permits with regards to notice and timing.
- (c) Application for approval of a private road shall include a site plan sealed by a professional engineer showing:
 1. Existing and proposed lot lines.
 2. The location of existing and proposed structures.
 3. The width and location of the private road easement.

4. A cross section of the proposed road, showing the types of material the road base and surface will consist.
 5. Utility plans including the location and size/capacity of storm water drainage systems, sewer or septic systems, water lines or private wells, and private utilities such as telephone, electrical or cable service.
 6. Proposed locations of driveways off the private road.
 7. Any existing or proposed structures, trees or other obstructions within the proposed right-of-way.
 8. All division of land shall be in compliance with the Subdivision Control Act.
- (d) The proposed private road shall meet the following standards:
1. The minimum right-of-way width shall be sixty-six (66) feet, provided that an applicant can request a reduction in right-of-way width in order to protect natural features provided that in no case may the right-of-way be less than 50' or as a result of space saving features such as curb and gutter.
 2. The minimum grade for roadways shall be 0.5%. The maximum grade shall be 0.6%. The maximum grade within 100' of an intersection shall be 0.3%.
 3. No fence, wall, sign, screen or any planting shall be erected or maintained in such a way as to obstruct vision between a height of three (3) and ten (10) feet within the triangular area formed by the intersection of a road right-of-way line and a private road right-of-way line and a line connecting two (2) points which are located on those intersecting right-of-way lines, thirty (30) feet from the point of intersection.
 4. The maximum number of residences permitted on a cul-de-sac is 20, but in no instances may a cul-de-sac be over 1,000' in length.
 5. Any driveways off of a private road shall be at least 40' from the intersection of the private road right-of-way and a public road right-of-way.
 6. Intersections of private roads with public roads shall be at an angle as close to 90° as possible, but in no case shall it be less than 80° or more than 100°.
 7. The width of the roadway shall be a minimum of 18' with 3' shoulders provided for bicycle and pedestrian traffic for roads servicing lots over 100' in width. Roads servicing lots 100' wide or less shall provide a 24' wide roadway with 3' wide shoulders.
 8. The minimum radius for circular cul-de-sacs roadway is 40'. An interior island is permitted in the center of the cul-de-sac, provided that the roadway within the cul-de-sac is not less than 25' wide.
 9. Private roads shall meet the recording and maintenance requirements outlined for common drives in Section 20-304(b).
 10. Private roads shall be paved with bituminous asphalt or concrete if any of the following occur:
 - a. The road serves more than 10 residential dwelling units.
 - b. The lots are an average of 100' or less in width.
 - c. The road provides access to multiple family developments.

11. Sight distances on horizontal and vertical curves shall be a minimum of 200 feet measured at a point 10' from the edge of the traveled road-way at a height of 42" to an object height of 42".
 12. Parcels fronting on private roads shall meet the required front yard setback and lot width for their district.
 13. The private road shall be constructed with a minimum 10" of 22-A aggregate.
- (e) Any road that provides connection to any other (2) public roads, provides access to industrial or commercial property shall be constructed to county road standards, and inspected and approved by the Genesee County Road Commission.
- (f) Any private road in legal use as of the effective date of Section 20-305 shall not be subject to the requirements of Section 20-305. Any increase in the existing use of such private road shall require a special use permit to be considered by the Planning Commission in accordance with Sections 20-1800, 1801, and 1802 of the Charter Township of Flushing Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission shall have the sole discretion to allow modification of the existing use of the private road and may impose any conditions that are reasonably necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in Sections 20-1800, 1801, and 1802. Except as expressly amended by this subsection (f) all provisions of Section 20-305 shall remain in full force and effect. (Adopted on the 14th day of July 2005 by the Charter Township of Flushing Board of Trustees).

* * * * *

AFTER THE REVIEW OF THE ORDINANCE, DOYLE wanted to know if there were other details the Planning Commission Members felt there needed to be or use as conditions to approve the request.

- **SWANSON:** would like more specific information on whom and how the road would be maintained.
- **FLOWERS:** if a Special Use Permit was issued, the **WALKERS** would take care of the cost but down the road if there was a "wash out" or some other emergency then the cost would be split among the residents.
- **SWANSON:** there should be specifics mentioned as to how much chloride, how often the grading would take place, who would take care of the grading, etc.
- **FLOWERS:** felt there needed to be more research on the packet of information that was given to the Planning Commission at the current meeting.
- **PRATT:** felt because the Planning Commission had all the information and with the mentioned proposed conditions, which the **WALKERS** have mostly met, the Planning Commission had to either approve or deny the Special Use Permit – a decision had to be made tonight based on the information which the Planning Commission had received.
- **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission does not have all the information.
- **SWANSON:** there are a lot of ways the issue could be handled such as Preliminary Approval subject to a later approval of the Maintenance Agreement etc.

- **PRATT:** a Maintenance Agreement has been in affect since 1979 – it would not be the position of the Commission to judge the benefits of the Agreement as long as there was a Maintenance Agreement.
- **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission would be allowing the **WALKERS** to use the existing property that was part of the Road Agreement. If the **WALKERS** wanted a Special Use Permit to use the existing property, there would be special conditions put together which would be considered a Special Use – it would not be just a roadway ordinance.
- Items for consideration:
 1. if more people should be added to the roadway, there would have to be a wider road.
 2. if **WALKERS** followed the conditions which would be set forth, the Request could possibly be approved for whatever the **WALKERS** have been trying to use for their property.
 3. there would be a position of having to have the Special Use so that special conditions could be placed on the request.
 4. there would be a great concern about the Maintenance Agreement because someone has to maintain the road.
 - a. up-to-date condition so that traffic could flow constantly on the road.
- **NEWMAN:** not talking about using and maintaining the road as it is today, but, there would be three (3) more parcels using the road. The issue would be what to require and what would be needed if four (4) more residents would be using the road.
- **PRATT:** it would be the duty of **WALKER'S** attorney to take care of Maintenance Agreement – not the Planning Commission. **PRATT** recommended the Maintenance Agreement should be drawn up and signed by anyone that was available to sign, whether the resident joined in or not; it would not be up to the Commission to dictate the conditions of the Agreement. The Planning Commission should only dictate a Maintenance Agreement between the parties be drawn up and recorded. A Special Use Permit could be approval, at the current meeting, subject to easements being recorded and the Maintenance Agreement being joined in by all available parties on the described parcels - signed and recorded.
- **NEWMAN:** nothing could be done about the original Maintenance Agreement, but the Planning Commission has the right to make conditions of the Maintenance Agreement.
- **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission needed more time to inspect the information packet which was currently given to the Commission.
- **FLOWERS:** would have no objections to having the Township Attorney review the issue.
- **DOYLE:** recommended putting together the Planning Commission's proposal which would include the conditions, by which the Commission was concerned, and then if the Commission wanted the township attorney to review, it would be available for deletions or additions.
- **PRATT:** the township should not spend township money for an attorney's opinion for a private maintenance agreement.

- **DOYLE:** the Planning Commission would be following the ordinances. A private road would be involved and if something should happen on it, and if the township should be cited because one of the private roads should give way, it would not only be a private road but an issue which the Planning Commission had approved. If the residents did something that had not been approved, it would be a different matter. If something happened and the Planning Commission approved the issue, then the township would become a party to a suit and could be in a lot more trouble.
- **PRATT:** felt the Planning Commission had fulfilled their obligation if the Maintenance Agreement should be was drawn up.
- **SWANSON:** the ordinance required a Maintenance Agreement; the Planning Commission was only trying to clarify what was stated in order to not be liable to either side.

ACTUAL CONCERNS:

- Maintenance Agreement
 - a. Dust on the private road
 - b. Trimming of the trees along the private drive
- Size of the road and whether it needed to be built up better
- Who would be involved in the Maintenance Agreement

NEWMAN does not feel comfortable limiting the Maintenance Agreement to certain items; would like to postpone the issue until the next meeting.

NEWMAN MOVED, seconded by Buell to postpone the matter until the next regularly scheduled meeting until July 10, 2006. **MOTION CARRIED.**

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Proposed Amendments to Stake Survey and Agricultural Signs

JERRY FITCH (FITCH) Building Inspector reviewed the proposed ordinances on Stake Surveys and Signs which had been received from Township **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON (ATTORNEY MOULTON)**. It was determined the proposed amendments to the ordinances would be reviewed at the Special Planning Commission Meeting on Monday, June 26, 2006.

2. Cul de sac Review

PRATT recently had a concern regarding a developer that had come to the Planning Commission with an issue dealing with an eighty (80) foot frontage on a cul-de-sac. **DOYLE** stated that in a new subdivision, they go to the front of the house to determine the width of the property as it would be narrower on the roadway. **PRATT** wanted to know if an asterisk should be placed in the ordinance to indicate the matter would be different from normal measurements. **FITCH** wanted to know if a footnote could be added to the ordinance instead of going through all the procedures of changing the ordinance. **DOYLE** stated in the past, there have been issues that have not been self-explanatory so amendments had to be made to the ordinance. **FITCH** will check with **ATTORNEY MOULTON** on the matter.

3. “Common Sense Solutions to Intersection Safety Problems” Seminar

FLOWERS gave a brief report on a recent seminar he attended entitled “Common Sense Solutions to Intersection Safety Problems.” **FLOWERS** distributed material which he had obtained from the seminar; the meeting was put together very well and was very educational. He (Flowers) stated there were formulas to determine how to figure if stop signs should be placed at four (4) corners of a street OR if there should be a light. In some instances there is a four-way stop sign but now there needed to be a signal light.

FLOWERS also had received a report from the Genesee County Planning Commission (Community Development Block Grant Program) which gave highlights of roads and projects going on in Genesee County.

4. “MTA Summer Evening Zoning Series” Seminars

FLOWERS stated the *2006 Summer Evening Zoning Series* was scheduled for July 20 and August 24 in Frankenmuth. **PRATT** stated the Board of Trustees had already approved the attendance at the Summer Sessions; please contact the Clerk to let her know if you plan to attend.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

9:20 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

9:20 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

PRATT recommended there be paper election ballots; the nomination would be for the Planning Commission Chair.

FLOWERS AND GIBBS were nominated to count the ballots. The election results being:

Chairperson – Mark Newman

Vice Chair – Jerry Doyle

FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Pratt to destroy the ballots. **MOTION CARRIED.**

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:

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.

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

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

IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Vice Chair **DOYLE** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 9:33 p.m.

JEROME DOYLE, Vice Chair

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

Date of Approval

Planningminutes 06/12/06