# CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING

6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433

810-659-0800 FAX: 810-659-4212

# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DATE: JANUARY 9, 2012 TIME: 7:00 P.M.

WEB ADDRESS http://www.flushingtownship.com

#### MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Mark J. Newman, Chair
John Cuddeback
Jerome Doyle, Vice Chair
Richard Buell, Secretary
Robert Gensheimer

Mark Purkey, Board of Trustee Representative

Julia A. Morford, Recording Secretary

**PRESENT:** Mark J. Newman, Jerome Doyle, Richard Buell, John Cuddeback, Ronald Flowers,

and Robert Gensheimer **ABSENT:** Mark Purkey **OTHERS PRESENT:** None

- I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:10 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair MARK NEWMAN with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.
- II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Doyle to adopt the Agenda as presented. MOTION CARRIED.
- **III. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: DOYLE MOVED,** seconded by Flowers to approve the Minutes of December 12, 2011 as amended. MOTION CARRIED.

#### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Continued Update of Master Plan

Currently, everything is done except for pending materials/information released from other governmental agencies on data that has not been released, such as traffic counts, assessment rolls, etc.

• **FLOWERS** explained explained the road maps and what the designated colors represented such as primary roads, trunk lines, gravel roads, etc. It was recommended to have a colored map put in the Master Plan Book because it would be easier to read.

• **NEWMAN** stated he could scan the entire Master Plan and then the township could put it on the web. Since the ordinances are all on the web, an individual could go to the web and download the entire Master Plan at no cost. There is also the method in PDF to create hyper web links.

# • BUELL: ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE SURVEY:

- 1. Flushing Township has a very stagnant population. (Long-Range Transportation Projection)
  - a. Current population: 10,640 Proposed population for 2035: 11,336
  - b. Flushing City is built up could see tearing building down and putting in hi-rises.
  - c. Not looking at a substantial growth in Flushing Township.
  - d. Spent a lot of time on the section entitled *Guiding Principles (Appendix B)* 
    - 1. Survey (from the Master Plan Survey ten (10) years ago, broken down into zones disregard "Zones" as BUELL has figured the questions by percentages.

#### BREAKDOWN OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES SURVEY:

- 1. Seventy-nine (79%) percent believed that residential development should occur in an orderly sequence with the proper provision of public services; twenty-one (21%) percent had the alternate view.
- 2. *Eighty* (80%) *percent* believed that agriculture should continue to be the primary land use in the township and any other type of use (residential, commercial, industrial) should only be permitted as exceptions; *twenty* (20%) *percent* had the alternate view. This will not change.
- 3. *Eighty-nine (89%) percent* believed that any large development proposing to tap into the underground water supplies must show some proof of adequate water supplies before development can be approved; *eleven (11%) percent* had the alternate view.
- 4. *Sixty-seven* (67%) *percent* believed that convenience-level commercial facilities (gas stations, convenience stores, etc.) should not be permitted in residential areas; *thirty-three* (33%) *percent* had the alternate view.
- 5. *Ninety-three* (93%) percent believed that industrial development should be limited to areas in or near cities and villages with water and sewer available; seven (7%) percent had the alternate view.
- 6. Sixty-nine (69%) percent believed that county/township road maintenance money should be spread around so all roads would get some work; thirty-one (31%) percent had the alternate view. Primary roads are maintained by the County. FLOWERS felt the Planning Commission should put pressure on the Genesee County Road Commission to make Carpenter Road between Deland and Elms a primary circuit road, although it is a local road with a primary traffic problem. DOYLE felt the larger an entity, the more bureaucratese.

#### ITEMS SO CLOSE IN PRECENTAGES THEY NEED TO BE REVIEWED:

- 7. Forty-five (45%) percent believed that residential development should be encouraged to provide housing for all economic and social groups; fifty-five (55%) percent had the alternate view. **NEWMAN** felt if a more diverse housing program, individuals could still move up within the community. CUDDEBACK felt that whether it is a rich home or poor home, it is the right direction to go; in apartments there isn't the pride of ownership; ownership is the key to success in a community. **DOYLE** felt the basic of any community/society is the family; if someone decides they want to do something outside the family and the government is the family, that is when all the terrible things happen in communities and the families don't have control over raising their own children. In a community similar to Flushing Township, where we use to be able to build a house that was 24' x 36' or less, you can't do that anymore. Society has made it so that the amount of square feet has increased so much in order to purchase in order to live in it. It puts the individual in a position that if you can't afford to purchase a new house or get a house the size you would like for the money you want to spend, you have to purchase an inferior house; a house already constructed. It goes along with the issue of when people try to do things in their particular subdivisions, there are ordinances. There is good reason for not allowing commercial use in a residential area. Most people look at it as "to what I would like" and I don't have a decent house and things of that nature. Decisions always go back as to how they feel about their family. Housing has not always been easy because the minimum square feet, septic area, roads, etc was always going up. CUDDEBACK wanted to know if the Planning Commission wanted to go back to the mid 1950's where a lot of people lived in the Flushing Community where the houses were small but there was ownership and family. **DOYLE** stated there was a lot of business in the area and a need for houses; everything evolves around cost. **BUELL** felt the answers for the questions should guide the Planning Commission's thinking about the issues. **NEWMAN** felt the questions ask should be consistent from year to year to see the trends which would give guidance to the Planning Commission. BUELL felt there needed to be a sense of one another on the Planning Commission; in the near future would like to send out a random survey, addresses from the tax roll; two hundred (200) cards with six (6) important questions on the cards; just check the answers and then put back in the mail box. **FLOWERS** felt it could even be a folded double sided post card. **GENSHEIMER** wanted to know how the "Guiding Principles" Survey came into affect. (Rowe Professional Services arranged the questions into zones and sent out as a mailer.) It was suggested to use the Voter Registration File for the addresses for the survey.
- 8. *Seventy-six* (76%) *percent* believed that nonagricultural development in areas of prime agricultural soils should be prohibited; *twenty-four* (24%) *percent* had the alternate view.

- 9. Fifty-eight (58%) percent believed that individuals wishing to build in suspected floodplains must provide engineers report showing they are not in a floodplain before doing permitted to build; forty-two (42%) percent had the alternate view.
- 10. *Ninety-one* (91%) percent believed that commercial development should be located in existing business areas in cities and villages to support their continued growth: nine (9%) percent had the alternate view.
- 11. Seventy-two (72%) percent believed that nonindustrial uses (commercial, residential) should not be permitted in areas set aside for industrial uses; twenty-eight (28%) percent had the alternate view.

#### THIS OUESTION NEEDS TO BE REDRAFTED:

12. Fifty point eight (50.8%) percent believed that municipal water and sewer lines should be extended into rural areas whenever requested by property owners in those areas; forty-nine point two (49.2%) percent believed that municipal water and sewer lines should only be extended gradually into areas close to existing urban areas with a relatively high concentration of businesses and residences. GENSHEIMER stated there was an issue in the Ponderosa Area regarding sewer lines. FLOWERS stated Flushing Township had acquired 60/40 grants from the State to run lateral sewer; it had never been done before. A large number of residents had been notified that sewer could be put into their neighborhood; the issue was turned down; another smaller number of residents assembled and once again the issue was turned down. There were problems with septic tanks on small lots. DOYLE stated the residents would be spending a small amount of money in taxes to be able to increase the value of their property. FLOWERS said the average cost at that time was under \$3,000. Ten years (10) later, the same residents came to the township to get sewer lines which the cost would have been \$9,000 to have the sewer lines installed.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THIS OUESTION WILL BE DELETED:

13. Fifty-five (55%) percent believed that residential development along state highways and major county roads should be limited to subdivision with limited access to these roads; forty five (45%) percent believed that residential development along state highways and major county roads should permit individual lots with access directly on theses roads.

\* \* \* \* \*

14.Eighty (80%) percent believed that residential development should be limited in rural areas to prevent conflicts with agricultural operations that create noise, dust and odors;

twenty (20%) percent had the alternate view. **BUELL** wanted to know if the Planning Commissson could infur from the majority the plurality of one alternative is such that

this question doesn't have to be ask again because you would continue to get the same answer because the majority was so overwhelming? **DOYLE** felt the Planning Commission didn't have to

## V. NEW BUSINESS:

None

# ACTION OF THE MOTION: ROLLCALL VOTE:

AYES: 0

NAYS: Doyle, Buell, Cuddeback, Flowers, Gensheimer, Purkey, and Newman

Motion Failed.

#### **ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

AYES: 7 NAYS: 0 Motion Carried.

## VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

8:54 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS
None

8:55 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

#### VII. BOARD COMMENTS:

VIII. NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING WILL BE HELD ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M.

## **FUTURE REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING DATES:**

MARCH 12, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M. APRIL 9, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M. MAY 14, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M.

<b>IX. ADJOURNMENT:</b> Due at 9:00 p.m.	to lack of business matters, <b>NEWMAN</b> adjourned the meeting
MARK J. NEWMAN, Chair	JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary
RICHARD BUELL, Secretary	Date of Approval
Planning minutes 01 09 2012	