

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, January 12, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
B. Schmidt, L. Ford, D. Arceo, P. Parrott,
J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

R. Ruhala

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

G. Borse, Fire Chief

Peter Goodstein, Township Attorney

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience addressed the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

December 8, 2005 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve the minutes of December 8, 2005 with a correction on Page 2: add that Chairman Ford arrived at 8:25 p.m.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS: (Referred from Township Board)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #165 BESSIE JONES

LEGAL: 07-08-503-001

LOCATION: 1322 Wood Krest Drive

ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Daycare (6-12 children)

Peter Goodstein, Township Attorney, addressed the Board regarding this case. Present also were Bessie Jones, 1322 Wood Krest Drive, and her Attorney, Barry Wolf. Attorney Goodstein reviewed the Resolution from the Township Board with the Planning Commission.

In regards to the fence, the Resolution states the group day care home for Bessie Jones should have the following specifications:

- (1) (1) The fence shall be a privacy fence, six foot in height;
- (2) (2) The fence shall opaque so that the children cannot be seen through the fence;
- (3) (3) The fence shall not be constructed of pressure treated lumber of any other material which could expose the children to harmful chemicals;
- (4) (4) The fencing shall enclose a minimum area of 400 square feet as required by Michigan Administrative Code R 400.1811(4);
- (5) (5) The fence shall enclose the entire outdoor play area; and
- (6) (6) The fence shall comply with the requirements of the Charter Township of Flint Ordinance #5500, Section 3.15.

The resolution also says that pursuant to MCL 125.286g(3)(d), the hours of operation of the proposed group day care home between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. shall be limited to the following times:

- (1) (1) 10 p.m. Friday to 6:00 a.m. Saturday; and
- (2) (2) 10 p.m. Saturday to 6:00 a.m. Sunday.

Operation of the proposed group day care home shall be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. all other days.

Attorney Wolf addressed the Board regarding parking. He stated that Ms. Jones has a circular drive and that there is no parking area. Dropping off the children at the front door is the standard procedure. There are no employees so there is no parking needed for employees.

There was a discussion of fencing and it was thought the standards set by the Township Board of Trustees were reasonable to protect the safety of the children who will be present at the group day care. The Board, (Planning Commission), also discussed the limitations on the hours of operation and thought them reasonable to minimize the impact of the group day care on the surrounding community.

B. Schmidt indicated that she visited the site and that someone else needed to back their car up so that she could maneuver her car around to get out.

Ms. Jones stated she has a simple sketch with her to show how the cars will park.

This drawing will be made a part of the minutes.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #165 contingent upon the fencing meeting all restrictions listed in these minutes, the hours of operation between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. be restricted as specified in these minutes, and that the parking be followed as submitted in the drawing.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES	L. FORD	YES
H. BLECKER	YES	D. ARCEO	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES	P. PARROTT	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

OLD BUSINESS: (Tabled from December 8, 2005)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #183 CORNELIUS

WHITTHORNE

LEGAL: 07-10-501-011

LOCATION: 3483 Flushing Road

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Used Car Lot

Tim Arvoy, Berry Case & Associates, was present to represent this project. This is a proposed used car lot. This is Phase I of II. There will be a total of seven parking spaces.

No one from the audience spoke regarding this case.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #183 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER	YES	P. PARROTT	YES
------------	-----	------------	-----

J. WASHINGTON YES J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
B. SCHMIDT YES D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES
D. ARCEO YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1083 CORNELIUS WHITTHORNE

LEGAL: 07-10-501-011
LOCATION: 3483 Flushing Road
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Used Car Lot

Tim Arvoy, Berry Case & Associates, represented this case. This is a proposed used car lot. Although the drawings indicate Phase I and Phase II, they are only here to get approval for Phase I ONLY.

G. Jamison indicated to the Board that due to the changes in the state law, the petitioner needs to go through this process in order to get his license.

D. Arceo stated that Page 2 of the drawings should be omitted because it is all Phase II.

P. Parrott asked about the signage. Mr. Arvoy stated that the signage is a fascade change only. Fire Chief Borse stated he has no problem with this project.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1083 for Phase I only.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON YES
B. SCHMIDT YES
L. FORD YES
D. ARCEO YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS:

TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #834 MADHAVAN KRISHNAMOORTHY
Zoning Change from R-1D (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: 07-10-576-100
LOCATION: 3047 Clarendon
ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: General Business Use

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to set Case #834 for Public Hearing on March 9, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #835 KRAFT ENGINEERING

Zoning Change from R-1B (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-21-100-018
LOCATION: 4313 Corunna Road
ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: General Business Use

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to set Case #835 for Public Hearing for March 9, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #836 KRAFT ENGINEERING
Zoning Change from R-1B (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-21-100-012
LOCATION: Vacant 7 +/- acres South of Sam's & Walmart
ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: General Business Use

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to set Case #836 for Public Hearing for March 9, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #832 AKEEL DAKKI
Zoning Change from O-1 (Office) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: 07-25-579-083
LOCATION: 3418 Fenton Road
ZONING: O-1 (Office)
PROPOSED: Appliance Sales

Akeel Dakki, 3700 Acadia Drive, Lake Orion, was present to address the Board. He indicated to the Board that this property has been a tanning salon on the lower half of the building and apartments on the upper half. The petitioner would like to run an appliance store on the lower half of the building. The property is across from the South Flint Plaza located in the City of Flint. The zoning is currently O-1 (Office), however, has been used for C-2 (General Business), for several years.

The petitioner gave pictures to the Board showing the property. Also, there were pictures in the file of every property along Fenton Road between Van Slyke and Hemphill for the Board to review.

There was discussion amongst the Board as to whether this section of the Township was addressed during the Master Plan review. G. Jamison indicated that this part is a cluster of different zoning classifications and that this was not addressed during Master Plan Review. Some Planning Commissioner's indicated that Baker College is looking to buy more property to use for student housing. It was suggested that Commercial zoning may not be the correct use for this area and that this Section should be looked at for the Master Plan.

No one in the audience addressed the Board regarding this case.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to deny Case #832 due to the fact it is not consistent with the Master Plan.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT NO
L. FORD NO
D. ARCEO YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER NO
J. WASHINGTON YES

5 – YES, 3 – NO **MOTION CARRIED**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1084 SWANK BUILDERS

LEGAL: 07-29-501-001
LOCATION: 3060 S. Dye Road
ZONING: O-1 (Office)
PROPOSED: Office

Andy Andre', of Wilcox Professional Services, was present to represent this project. This property is located on the West side of Dye Road just South of Lennon. Currently there is a barn located where this proposed building is to be. They would like to remove the barn, and build a 2,543 square foot office building in its place. There will be added landscaping, and will re-stripe the current parking lot and add parking for the new building.

D. Arceo indicated he would like to see the vaneer continued along the East, North and South sides of the building too. It would only enhance the already beautiful building that exists there currently. Also, there is some parking in the front setback that needs to be addressed. Since the building abuts a warehouse, D. Arceo added that an additional berm and landscaping along the West side would help with noise and add to the beauty of the addition. The petitioner agreed with all suggestions.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT, to approve Case #1084 with the following conditions: this is for Phase I only, that all County and local approvals are met and followed, a rolling berm and landscaping be added along the West side of the property, vaneer be continued around the East, North and South sides, petitioner remove parking from the front setback, resubmit building drawings to Building Department.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT YES
L. FORD YES
D. ARCEO YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES
J. WASHINGTON YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

D. Arceo pointed out to the Board that himself and Chief Borse attended the Planning Commission at the City of Flint in regards to the new building being built near the Penske plant

(corner of Linden and Maple). Chief Borse stated that he addressed the City of Flint Planning Commission. The City of Flint Planning Commission told the petitioners that they needed to meet Flint Township's approval from our Fire Chief before any permits were given. Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Thursday, February 9, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Thompson, H. Blecker, B. Schmidt, L. Ford,
D. Arceo, R. Ruhala, P. Parrott, J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Washington

STAFF PRESENT: G. Jamison, Chief Building Director
G. Borse, Fire Chief
Peter Goodstein, Township Attorney

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one from the audience addressed the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

January 12, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve the minutes of January 12, 2006 as printed.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1038 LANG-MATTHEWS RENTAL LLC

LEGAL: 07-28-557-004

LOCATION: 4056 Market Place (Lot #8 of Market Place #2)
ZONING: IND (Industrial)
PROPOSED: Extend existing Site Plan Review for mini storage facility

No one present for this case. It was determined to move this case to the end of the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1085 LINDEN PROPERTY DEV & MGMT LLC

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-17-200-028
LOCATION: Vacant 6 +/- acres W side of Linden btwn Court & Calkins
ZONING: O-1 (Office)
PROPOSED: Andulacia Health Park Development

Mike Pifer, of Kraft Engineering, Freeman Greer, of GAV Architects, Dr. Zakki, Dr. Usef, Pharmacist, and Dr. Al-Madani were all present to address the Board. Mr. Pifer indicated that this five million-dollar project would be located on the West side of Linden Road in front of the soccer fields, between Court and Calkins Roads. It will be a five building Condo Unit. The total approximate square footage of all five buildings will be 33,000. The detention pond will be located at the Southwest corner of the property in accordance with the County requirements. They are proposing a low profile monument sign along Linden Road. Site Lighting meets requirements. Landscaping will also meeting requirements and there will be islands throughout the development. In regards to the Plan Review Comments, there will be curb and gutter, however, Town Center Parkway West will be a Private Drive. They were granted a variance in regards to said drive. They are not required to have a deceleration lane.

D. Arceo asked if the service drive could be continued South past 1268 South Linden Road to the next property. Petitioners have no problem with that.

There was lengthy discussion regarding parking and general aesthetics of the project.

Fire Department asked that another loop be added. Petitioners agreed.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #1085 contingent upon all County and Township approvals being submitted, water line to loop over to Linden Road per Fire Department

request, service drive being extended Southerly past 1268 South Linden Road, at same time this revokes and rescinds SPR #1069 on parcel 07-17-200-028, approved on 06/09/05.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES	D. ARCEO	YES	
H. BLECKER		YES	R. RUHALA	YES
B. SCHMIDT		YES	P. PARROTT	YES
L. FORD	YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES	

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #833 PAPADELIS BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT

Zoning Change from R-1C (Single Family Residential) to O-1 (Office)

LEGAL: 07-32-576-011 / 07-32-576-012 / 07-32-576-013

LOCATION: Vacant property at Northwest corner of Linden & Maple

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Medical Office Facility

Pat Mannor, Mannor Properties, and Leo Sidee, Realtor, were both present to represent this project. Mr. Mannor stated that this IS NOT a medical facility. He actually does not have a tenant as of yet. He turned in a conceptual drawing only. The project he is proposing would use three parcels of land. He would like to use it for some type of office facility. The office would be open from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

D. Arceo indicated that there are plenty of other parcels that are vacant and already zoned for office use.

Mr. Sidee stated that there is no way that someone is going to build a new home right on the corner of Linden Road or Maple Road. The property has been For Sale for a very long time and there has been no one that has approached them wanting to build a new home. Office use is a perfect use.

Audience

Mr. & Mrs. Kertesz – 4500 S. Linden – Privacy & traffic issues

Karen Bond – Supervisor of Mundy Township – Has traffic concerns – read crash data to the Planning Commission

Dennis Hopton – 4512 W. Maple – In favor of project

Billy Pittman – owner of property wanting to be rezoned – stated that he hasn't sold a lot on this corner to build a house on in over 30 years. No one is going to use these three lots to build a new home on!

Petitioner indicated to the Planning Commission that he would do a traffic study to help with the ingress and egress of the project. He would also use any means necessary to help with privacy concerns to shelter the neighbors from any noise, or lighting, etc.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY H. BLECKER to deny Case #833 due to the fact it is not consistent with the Master Plan.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER		YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES	
L. FORD		NO
D. ARCEO		YES
R. RUHALA		YES
P. PARROTT		YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY		NO
D. THOMPSON	YES	

6 – YES, 2 – NO MOTION CARRIED

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1086 FLINT COMMUNITY PLAYERS

LEGAL: 07-22-400-019

LOCATION: 2462 S. Ballenger Hwy.

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Accessory Building

Kevin Dzurak, 1306 Mann Avenue, Flint, was present to represent this project. This non-profit organization has outgrown its facility and needs additional storage area for props, etc. The building will require the petitioner to remove ten (10) parking spaces, however, the current facility exceeds the required parking spaces. The petitioner also indicated that the dumpster would be relocated and enclosed with a wood structure.

The petitioner gave a pamphlet to each Planning Commissioner to view what the building would look like.

D. Arceo asked that the dumpster enclosure be concrete block instead of wood. The petitioner agreed.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve Case #1086 with the condition that the dumpster enclosure be changed from wood to concrete block.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1087 CENTRAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

LEGAL: 07-36-501-001

LOCATION: 1261 W. Bristol Road

ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Parking Lot Expansion

No one here to represent this project.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to table Case #1087 until March 9, 2006.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES
B. SCHMIDT YES
L. FORD YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1088 SABAH & DENNIS JABORO

LEGAL: 07-25-300-040 and 07-25-300-063

LOCATION: 1508 W. Bristol Road

Vacant Northeast corner of Bristol & Van Slyke

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Gas Station & Retail Center

A memo was sent to the Chairman of the Planning Commission from G. Jamison indicating that the plans are insufficient and the fees are unpaid. Several attempts have been made to contact the petitioners with no success.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to remove Case #1088 from the agenda.

ROLL CALL:

R. RUHALA YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES
B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1038 LANG-MATTHEWS RENTAL LLC

LEGAL: 07-28-557-004

LOCATION: 4056 Market Place (Lot #8 of Market Place #2)

ZONING: IND (Industrial)

PROPOSED: Extend existing Site Plan Review for mini storage facility

A letter was in the file asking for an extension of the existing Site Plan Review #1038.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to deny Case #1038 for extension and ask that the petitioner come back for Site Plan Review.

ROLL CALL:

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

G. Jamison stated to the Planning Commission that it is not in the budget for Attorney P. Goodstein to attend each meeting. If we need to have him here for each one, then a letter needs to be submitted to the Township Board to amend the budget.

Chairman Ford pointed out the importance of saving Township money. Attorney Goodstein will only be used for controversial issues only.

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to allow Chairman Ford and Vice Chairman Arceo to require the presence of legal counsel only when they deem necessary for a particular project.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, March 9, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
B. Schmidt, L. Ford, D. Arceo, P. Parrott,

J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

R. Ruhala

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

G. Borse, Fire Chief

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience addressed the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

February 9, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve the minutes of February 9, 2006, as printed.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS: (Tabled from the February 9, 2006 meeting)

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1087 CENTRAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

LEGAL: 07-36-501-001

LOCATION: 1261 W. Bristol Road

ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Parking Lot Expansion

Clifford Hull, of Hull Stephens & Associates, and Bob Proffer of Central Church of the Nazarene were both present to represent this project. This is an expansion of the existing parking lot to the South. There is an underground drain system that is approved by the County. An existing wood fence is along the South. The neighbor is happy with the fence, so no changes will be made to the fence.

D. Arceo had concerns with the lighting. The lighting will be timed and not be obtrusive to the neighbors. H. Blecker had questions regarding landscaping. The petitioner indicated that there would be additional landscaping added.

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1087 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #834 MADHAVAN KRISHNAMOORTHY

Zoning Change from R-1D (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: 07-10-576-100

LOCATION: 3047 Clarendon

ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: General Business Use

The petitioner was present to represent himself. He indicated to the Board that he purchased this property in 2001. He has been told that this property has been business/office since at least 1973. He never purchased this property in order to have it as a home. Other uses at this address include a civil engineering firm, and physical therapy office.

Audience

Debora Gorey – 3265 Walton – owns 3066 Chatfield – Feels like C-2 (General Business) is too broad of a use for this home. It brings the Commercial Use further into the subdivision. Wouldn't mind O-1 (Office) because it's more constrictive.

The Planning Commissioners asked the Fire Chief if he has done any inspections. The Chief stated that when a Business License is applied for, he will do an inspection, and depending on the use, it may need firewalls.

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve Case #834 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
P. PARROTT	NO
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES

7 – YES, 1 – NO MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #835 KRAFT ENGINEERING

Zoning Change from R-1B (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL:	(Part of) 07-21-100-018
LOCATION:	4313 Corunna Road
ZONING:	R-1B (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED:	General Business Use

Mike Pifer, of Kraft Engineering and David Oakes of CESO, presented their project to the Board. David Oakes, Civil Engineer for Wal-Mart, showed a “conceptual” Site Plan to the Board. The current Wal-Mart will be upgraded and expanded into a Super Center with an expanded Lawn and Garden Center. The parking lot will be addressed with islands being added, along with other issues that have been brought to the attention of their Company.

Mr. Pifer addressed the Board regarding the rezoning issue. He pointed out that there is a 2.05 piece of land that is still currently zoned R-1B (Single Family Residential), that needs to be rezoned to C-2 (General Business). A pictorial was given to the Board to indicate the 2.05 acres. Also, another 7.79 acres just South of this piece (the next item on the agenda), is shown on the pictorial, indicating the new proposed Taft Road extending East towards Dutcher Street.

No one in the audience addressed the Board regarding this project.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #835 as presented, with pictorial.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #836 KRAFT ENGINEERING

Zoning Change from R-1B (Single Family Residential) to C-2 (General Business)

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-21-100-012

LOCATION: Vacant 7 +/- acres South of Sam’s & Wal-Mart

ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: General Business Use

Mike Pifer, of Kraft Engineering, and David Oakes, of CESO, presented their project to the Board. This project is the 7.79 acres South of Wal-Mart and Sam's Club that runs parallel with Corunna Road. 5.2 acres of this land will actually be used for the Wal-Mart expansion, and the remainder will be used for Taft Road (currently Mansour Blvd.), to extend to Dutcher.

Some Board members asked that the petitioners meet with the Building Director in regards to concerns with the current condition with the inside and outside of the Wal-Mart. Mr. Oakes agreed.

The Realtor from Polen Mortgage confirms that Mr. Mansour has approved this deal with Wal-Mart. Mr. Mansour is ill and unable to come to tonight's meeting.

No one from the audience spoke to Board regarding this project.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #836 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1089 PUMFORD CONSTRUCTION

LEGAL: 07-27-100-026

LOCATION: 3559 Miller Road (Genesee Crossings)

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Addition to existing strip mall

Brian Swedorski, of Pumford Construction was present and addressed the Board. This is a 4,500 square feet addition to the rear of Genesee Crossings. There are two tenant spaces that are going to be combined into one space. A store called "Petco" will be moving into this space.

D. Arceo talked to the petitioner regarding the security lighting and asked that they look into a security camera system. Also, told petitioner to enclose the dumpster as per Ordinance #5500. The Fire Chief concurred. He indicated to the Board that the dumpsters are a big concern when getting back through there with a fire truck and the equipment. The dumpsters are scattered everywhere.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1089 with the conditions that the dumpster is enclosed to meet the standards of Ordinance #5500, and the Fire Department.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO	YES	H. BLECKER	YES
P. PARROTT	YES	J. WASHINGTON	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES	B. SCHMIDT	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES	L. FORD	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL: CASE #104 LARRY C ADKINS

LEGAL: 07-30-200-024 & 07-30-200-025

LOCATION: South side of Lennon between Dye & Elms Rds.
Lennon Hills Subdivision

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Renew Plat Approval

Gary R. Niethammer, of Wilcox Professional Services, and Larry Adkins, were both present to represent this project. This was approved on 11/14/04 for a Preliminary Plat approval for 211 lots. The petitioner has since changed the name to Rolling Hills and is changing it from a Plat to a Site Condo. The first phase would include 54 lots.

Chairman Ford was apprehensive to approve this project as a Site Condo because the project was published as a Plat. The Chairman indicated to the Building Director that we need to get an opinion from Attorney Goodstein (Township Counsel), before a vote is taken.

Discussion continued regarding this issue.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve Case #104 for Site Condo for Rolling Hills, Phase I, for 54 lots, contingent upon legal counsel's opinion, and contingent upon the petitioner turning in a new set of drawings to the Building Department.

ROLL CALL:

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, April 13, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
B. Schmidt, L. Ford, D. Arceo, R. Ruhala,

P. Parrott, J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

Richard Austin, Township Attorney

Gary Borse, Fire Chief

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Richard Freeman – 3274 Brookgate – He wanted the Planning Commission to treat the “Bristol Village” project as if it were going to be a neighbor of theirs.

Denise Shore – 3304 Brookgate – Overpriced condo’s / barrack style

Bob Rowe – 3320 Brookgate – Passed out pamphlet to the Planning Commission and went over several items.

Kim Anderson – 3323 Brookgate – Wants underground detention pond. Has drainage issues. Project is less expensive than originally planned. Would like more fencing.

Charles Attia – Been in business a long time. They have projects in Grand Blanc. Would like Planning Commission to here out plans and then he will meet with the neighbors to work out all issues.

Doris Anderson – 3394 Southgate – Parking issues regarding ballfield across the way.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve the minutes of March 9, 2006 meeting with minor correction at the bottom of Page 3, last paragraph, 2nd line.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1090 DOUBLE DIAMOND DESIGNS

LEGAL: 07-20-400-024 AND 07-20-400-025

LOCATION: 5120 AND 5126 Lennon Road

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Casner Insurance

Dave McDade, Architect, was present to represent this case. This is a proposed 3,700 square feet office building to include Casner Insurance. 1,400 square feet will be lease space. A possible addition will be added later on if business is good. Two homes will be demolished in order to build. The legal description must be combined as one legal. The office will have a residential look to it. There will be eight employees, working 8-5 p.m. The Fire Department has approved this project.

H. Blecker would like to see dormers to break-up the building a little bit. Also, he asked that some parking spaces be eliminated to add more green space. The petitioner would still meet the parking requirements.

P. Parrott asked that the hcap spaces are moved closer to the front door.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #1090 with the following conditions: (1) all County approvals be submitted to the Building Department; (2) legal descriptions be combined through the Assessment Department; (3) handicap spaces are moved closer to the front door; (4) add dormers to Lennon Road side; (5) remove five parking spaces.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES	R. RUHALA	YES
H. BLECKER	YES	P. PARROTT	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES	L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES		

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

APPLICATION FOR SITE CONDO: CASE #106 ATTIA CONSTRUCTION LLC

LEGAL: 07-25-555-019 / 07-25-555-020 / 07-25-555-021 / 07-25-555-022

LOCATION: S side of Hemphill between Southgate & Hammerburg

ZONING: RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Bristol Village Condo's

Richard VanDever, Davison Land Surveying, and Jerry Attia, of Grand Blanc, were both present to represent this case. This is the proposed Bristol Village with 49 attached condo's (5 buildings). They have changed the design from the last plan to one boulevard entrance with a secondary fire access. They have also added berming along the rear of the condos.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to table Case #105 until a meeting has been set with the developers and the neighbors.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #184 VIKRAM SHAH

LEGAL: 07-26-300-008
LOCATION: E side of Torrey Road between Bristol & Dead-end
ZONING: AD (Airport District)
PROPOSED: Short term storage for new factory vehicles

Vikram Shah, of Flushing, was present to represent his project. He would like to use his 7.75 acres of land along Torrey Road as a short-term parking area for General Motors to store factory-built vehicles. This would be for two years or so. He will then want to build another motel. He will come back for Site Plan when it's time.

No one spoke regarding this case from the audience.

Chief Borse indicated that the ground must support 40,000 pounds for fire equipment. MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #184 contingent upon the ground having hard pack to support Fire Department drawings. Building Department to have drawings turned in, and the project is only valid for one year.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON YES
B. SCHMIDT YES
L. FORD YES
D. ARCEO YES
R. RUHALA YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1092 ASSELIN ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

LEGAL: 07-15-200-011

LOCATION: 3222 Beecher Road
ZONING: C-1 (Local Business)
PROPOSED: Addition to C. Patrick Gray DDS

John Asselin represented this project to the Board. This is a 1,500 square feet addition to an existing dental facility. Additional landscaping will be added.

The Fire Department has approved the drawings.

H. Blecker asked that some arborvitaes in two areas.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve Case #1092 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

9 –YES, 0 – NO ***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY***

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #185 DESHRA M VINES

LEGAL: 07-21-526-057
LOCATION: 2248 Diamond Street
ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Group Day Care (7-12 children)

Petitioner was present to represent her project. This is for an Adult Foster Care facility, NOT a Group Day Care.

Township Attorney Richard Austin indicated to the Board that this Case #185 must be republished so the public can be completely informed of the business that will be ran from this location.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to table Case #185 to May 11, 2006.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1093 BAKER COLLEGE

LEGAL: 07-25-400-004

LOCATION: 1050 W. Bristol Road

ZONING: R-1C, R-1D (Single Family Residential)
AND C-1 (Local Business)

PROPOSED: Graduate studies addition, Tech Center addition,
AND Parking lot addition

Murray Young, of Morgan Construction, and Gerald McCarty II, Vice-President for Student Studies of Baker College, were both present to represent this project.

This is a proposed addition to the Graduate Studies building and an addition to the Tech Center. The Fire Department has approved this project.

The Planning Commission commended Baker for the great job they've done throughout the years.

D. Arceo asked if there was a way to have a meeting with Baker so that the Planning Commission could make future plans for the Master Plan of the Fenton Road areas. It would be nice to know what is being planned so we could work together instead of trying to piece-meal each re-zoning case as they come in for that area. Mr. McCarty agreed.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #1093 contingent upon County approvals being submitted.

ROLL CALL:

R. RUHALA	YES	J. WASHINGTON	YES
P. PARROTT	YES	B. SCHMIDT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES	L. FORD	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES	D. ARCEO	YES
H. BLECKER	YES		

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. by Chairman Ford.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, May 11, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Ruhala,

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, B. Schmidt, L. Ford, R.
P. Parrott, J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

D. Arceo, J. Washington

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director
Peter Goodstein, Township Attorney
Gary Borse, Fire Chief

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Ford.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Gerald Roberts – 4487 Lindewood – Opposed to Case #833. Mr. Roberts provided pictures and a copy of the Mundy Township Zoning Map. Mr. Roberts has a concern with increased traffic and accidents.

Don Kertesz – 4500 S. Linden, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106

Robert Newman – 6030 Bloss Ct, Swartz Creek MI 48473 – Opposed to Case #1091, condition of Elms Road, and the intersection at Linden Road. Mr. Newman is a member of the Mundy Township Board of Trustees, and would like to be notified when Flint Township has changes along their border.

Kim Anderson, 3323 Southgate, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, concerned with drains, would like condo's to look more like homes in the subdivision, and fencing around the detention pond.

Denise Shore – 3304 Brookgate, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, concerned if condo's don't sell, they will rent them out.

David Clemens – 3437 Hammerburg, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, concerned with drains, and water causing roads to erode.

Tanisha Brooks, 3331 Southgate, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, concerned with integrity of company, will they be around to fix problems.

A.J. Rosser – 3476 Southgate, Flint MI 48507 - Opposed to Case #106, concerned with drains, roads, and fence around detention pond.

Bob Rowe – 3320 Brookgate, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, where will snow be stored, access for Fire Trucks, drains, fence around detention pond.

Lloyd Elmer – 3435 Southgate, Flint MI 48507 – Opposed to Case #106, concerned with detention pond.

Mike Brown – 3293 Southgate, Flint MI 48507 - Opposed to Case #106, concerned with price of condo's, and sewer.

L. Ford - Public Participation closed at 8:07

B. Schmidt – Correct Mr. Newman's reference from Case #1091 to Case #833.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

April 13, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY R. RUHALA to approve the minutes of April 13, 2006 meeting with minor correction in the middle of page 3, end of line 12, Change to Case #106 from Case #105.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS (Tabled from the April 13, 2006 meeting)

APPLICATION FOR SITE CONDO: CASE #106 ATTIA CONSTRUCTION LLC

LEGAL: 07-25-555-019 / 07-25-555-020 / 07-25-555-021 / 07-25-555-022
LOCATION: S side of Hemphill between Southgate & Hammerburg
ZONING: RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Bristol Village Condo's

R. Vandever– Site has access to all utilities. The final Site Plan has been approved by all County agencies. There will be shielded streetlights, all units have 2 parking spaces, and adjoining properties will be shielded by berms. Runoff will be captured and diverted back to the detention pond. As far as repairing the Hall Drain, the district as a whole has to pay to repair that offsite drain. All 49 units will be assessed the same as everyone else when that drain is repaired by the County. The detention pond holds the water for 48 to 72 hours and will drain slowly to the Hall Drain.

J. Attia – 12751 S. Saginaw, Grand Blanc – We have made concessions. We have met with the neighbors, and been tabled twice. We have changed our plans due to concerns of the neighbors, so that the road is interior instead of around the condos. We have added berms, increased landscaping, the building has 20 gables. We have no intention of renting them out.

George Rizik, Attorney – 8226 S. Saginaw, Grand Blanc – All zoning is statutory. 1) Townships may request submission for approval of Site Plan. 2) Procedures and requirements must be set forth in the Ordinance. Site Plan shall be approved if petitioner is in compliance with the Ordinance, and State and County requirements. This project meets all these requirements. Site Plan approval must be granted. If you turn down this Site Plan you must state the basis for denial from Statutes and Ordinances.

G. Borse – We came to an agreement to have a 2 hour fire wall separation between units so we would need less pressure at the fire hydrant.

J. Attia – We will be doing more business in Flint Township with Rolling Hills on Lennon Road. We intend to sell, not rent these condo's. We believe we have the right to develop this site. We would appreciate your approval tonight.

There was lengthy discussion regarding berms, fences, drains, water runoff, and general aesthetics of the project.

G. Jamison – Stated that the Township requires a fence if the detention pond is deeper than 2 foot.

R. Ruhala – Asked if the detention pond could be put underground? Petitioner stated that they could do a combination, if they put smaller pipes underground with a shallower bowl on top.

There was additional discussion regarding the detention pond, and also restrictions on the master deed regarding leasing out the condo units.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY R. RUHALA to approve Case #106 subject to; 1) Adding three rear elevation gables. 2) A stipulation in the Master Deed of a three month vacancy before renting out units. 3) Building Department approval of underground pipes in detention pond. 4) A two hour fire separation between units. 5) Looping the water line back into the Hammerburg lines.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON		YES	H. BLECKER	YES
B. SCHMIDT	NO		L. FORD	YES
R. RUHALA		YES	P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY			YES	

MOTION CARRIED 6 – YES, 1 - NO

L. Ford – This Board has empathy with regard to the drain issue, but we cannot correct this problem here. The raw sewage in basements is a huge problem. The key is for the residents to join with us to ask the County Drain Commissioner for some relief. I urge you to contact the Drain Commissioner, Mr. Wright’s Office.

**L. Ford called for a break at 9:00 p.m.
L. Ford called the meeting back to order at 9:05 p.m.**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #185 DESHRA M VINES

LEGAL: 07-21-526-057
LOCATION: 2248 Diamond Street
ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Adult Foster Care (7-12 adults)

Deshra Vines - 5915 Susan, Flint MI 48505 was present to represent this case. Ms. Vines stated that she is requesting a special land use for Adult Foster Care for more than 6 residents.

There was no one in the audience wishing to speak in regards to Case #185.

There was lengthy discussion regarding the size of the home, the type of foster care residents, the number of employees, the safety of the residents, and parking.

G. Borse – Discussed the need for a different fire code if over 6 residents. Ms. Vines stated she can’t accept the 7th person until they have a 30 minute sprinkler system, and interconnected smoke detectors with battery back-up.

MOTION BY P. PARROT, SECOND BY J. MACGILLIVRAY to approve Case #185.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER	YES	B. SCHMIDT	YES
L. FORD	YES	R. RUHALA	YES
P. PARROTT	YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES		

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
OLD BUSINESS: (Sent from the Township Board)**

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #833 PAPADELIS BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT

Zoning change from R-1C (Single Family Residential) to O-1 (Office)

LEGAL: 07-32-576-011 / 07-32-576-012 / 07-32-576-013

LOCATION: Vacant land at NW corner of Linden & Maple

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Office Building

Leo Seide, of Cooper Commercial was present to represent this case. Mr. Seide stated that Mr. Pittman owned this property for 42 years.

There was extensive discussion regarding attempting to sell this lot as residential, whether or not it would be a medical building, increased traffic and possible accidents.

L. Ford opened the Public Hearing at 9:30 a.m.

G. Roberts, 4487 Lindewood Dr, Flint MI 48507 – Concerned with increased traffic and the fact the driveway would be right next to the residential neighbors.

P. Glenn – 4308 Lindewood, Flint MI 48507 – Concerned with being next to residential.

L. Ford closed the Public Hearing at 9:33 p.m.

There was discussion regarding why the Township Board sent this back to the Planning Commission.

L. Seide - The buyer was out of contract due to the delay, but feels he will come back if this is approved.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY P. PARROTT to deny Case #833 as it is currently zoned residential, and is not in accordance with the Master Plan.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT	YES	L. FORD	NO
R. RUHALA	NO	P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES	D. THOMPSON	YES
H. BLECKER	YES		

MOTION CARRIED 5 - YES, 2 - NO

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1091 BERRY CASE AND ASSOCIATES

LEGAL: 07-15-501-011
LOCATION: 3483 Flushing Road
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Storage building

G. Jamison – Stated that Berry Case was asked to provide more information and had not done so at this time.

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to postpone Case #1091.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1094 WAL-MART STORES LLC

LEGAL: 07-21-100-018 & 07-21-100-012
LOCATION: 4313 Corunna Road
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Addition

Brian Small – 1700 Lions Road, of CESO the civil engineering firm representing Wal-mart was present. Mr. Small stated the addition would be for the grocery and the seasonal sales area. They will be breaking up the parking lot and adding landscaping and expand the parking area to the north. They are buying the land in the back for a detention pond and a new road. The landscaping will be the full length of Taft and around Mansour Blvd.

Larry Altman, Architect – Tried to make it fit in with the area with earth tone colors, and beefed up the entry ways with stone.

G. Borse – Have been in close contact with the Wal-mart people. We agreed there would be a false front between Sam’s Club and Wal-Mart to keep people out of the alley between the buildings. There will be a door to allow Fire Trucks in.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON, to approve Case #1094 subject to; 1) False front between Sam’s & Wal-Mart, 2) employees park in front area, 3) colors of signs to be earth tone colors (eliminate the blue).

ROLL CALL:

P. PARROTT		YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES		H. BLECKER	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES		L. FORD	YES
R. RUHALA	YES			

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m. by Chairman Ford.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, June 8, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,

B. Schmidt, L. Ford, D. Arceo, P. Parrott,

J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

R. Ruhala

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Bldg. Director

G. Borse, Fire Chief

Richard Austin, Township Attorney

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton – Stated that she has lived at this address for 20 years that she has made many calls and had many meetings regarding Advance Auto Parts and feels as if she is getting the run-around. She said that on one occasion she was waiting to speak with Kim Courts and Doug Carlton and they both walked out and they knew she was waiting to see them. She has several issues that haven't been answered yet. Some of them being drainage, curb cut along Moulton Drive, and the fact that she can hear the KFC orders all day and night. Also, she said she went to the Fire Department and gave them a letter in which no one has responded.

Chief Borse stated he has never received a letter from Ms. Vert. He also pointed out that he requires a 2nd drive for the safety of his fire fighters, and the residents. Ms. Vert wanted to know why KFC and other businesses do not have a 2nd entrance. He said he wasn't the Chief then and back then, and cannot answer why certain things weren't done. He can only do what's right, now.

Ms. Vert asked how we would know if Advance Auto Parts follows the landscaping plan, including berming, etc. G. Jamison, Chief Building Director, stated that the responsibility of the Building Department is to make sure that the Site Plan is followed, and the inspections are completed as required. There is a Project Manager on site at the job to make sure that all is going according to what is on the plans.

Pam Luna – 4040 Moulton – since construction began, the property has been raised so that now they have standing water in their ditch. Who can she call?

She was told to contact the Genesee County Drain Commission.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

May 11, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve the minutes as printed.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1095 WILLOWBROOK MANOR

LEGAL: 07-09-528-003
LOCATION: 4436 Beecher Road
ZONING: RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Addition to existing facility

Lisa Demenkowski, Architect, represented this petitioner. This is a nursing home near the corner of Beecher and Mill Roads. They are requesting to remove the existing corridor, rebuild it, and add amenities for the existing residents. They will address some existing drainage problems, and update the exterior of the building. They are looking to enhance the quality of life for the residents. The exterior will have a more residential feel.

The Board asked how many beds are there in the facility. There are 101 beds and 93 are currently occupied.

J. Washington indicated that he has visited the site and wondered about the dumpster at the rear. Ms. Demenkowski stated that dumpster area would be completely removed. Mr. Washington added that he would like to see the fence at the rear, match the brick fence that goes around the rest of the building. Ms. Demenkowski agreed.

Chief Borse stated that where the outdoor area was, there is a sprinkler system that his trucks need to be within 50 feet of. Ms. Demenkowski stated that they have a mechanical engineer on staff that they could work something out with.

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1095 contingent upon all County approvals being submitted, all Township Ordinances are followed and all Fire Department issues are resolved including vehicular traffic, and access to the sprinkler system.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1096 BERRY CASE & ASSOC

LEGAL: 07-10-501-011

LOCATION: 3483 Flushing Road

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Phase II (Construction Office, Banquet Hall)

A letter was received from the petitioner indicating the direction of this project has changed, and because of that, would like to be withdrawn from the agenda.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to withdraw Case #1096 from the agenda.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #186 ANGELA SKERJANCE

LEGAL: 07-15-501-010

LOCATION: 1099 Gilbert Street

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Daycare (7-12 children)

The petitioner was present to represent this project. She moved from Bertha Avenue recently and wasn't aware that she needed a Special Land Use for a residential day care. She doesn't have a drawing however all parking is done in the driveway of her home.

Attorney Austin indicated that the petitioner must have some type of drawing to show the Planning Commission where the parking is located.

Audience

Mrs. Lane – 1105 Gilbert – totally in favor – said you would never know that daycare was there. The children are well behaved.

D. Arceo wanted to know what the hours of operation were and exactly where the parking will be located.

The Board pointed out to the petitioner that photo's will do just fine.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to table Case #186 to the next regular meeting, July 13, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

APPLICATION FOR SITE CONDOMINIUM: CASE #107 HOWARD ENTERPRISES

LEGAL: 07-30-200-027

LOCATION: South side of Lennon between Dye & Elms Rds.

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Fields of Valley Downs No. 2

Rob Wiederman of Davison Land Surveying represented this project. This is Phase II of Fields of Valley Downs. It will include 33 single-family dwellings all ranging between \$160,000 to \$180,000. The road will be private but built to County specifications.

J. Washington indicated that there were about six homes still not occupied in the first phase. The prices were \$159,000.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #107 contingent upon all Township, County and Fire approvals are submitted.

ROLL CALL:

B. SCHMIDT	YES	J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
L. FORD	YES	D. THOMPSON	YES
D. ARCEO	YES	H. BLECKER	YES
P. PARROTT	YES		

8 – YES, 0 –NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #187 MAYNARD E SCHULTZ

LEGAL: 07-35-400-024

LOCATION: 4510 Van Slyke Rd.

ZONING: C-1 (Local Business)

PROPOSED: Billiard Room

The petitioner was present to represent this case. He would like to put a billiard room in an existing tenant space at the corner of Maple & Van Slyke. There is currently a Family Food Center there now. There would be NO alcohol sold at this site. His hours would be noon to midnight.

Attorney Austin indicated that C-1 doesn't specify a Billiard Room as a permitted use, so a Special Land Use would be an appropriate action.

Audience

Mrs. Savoie – 4083 Moulton – asked what age group would be targeted for the billiard room, and if alcohol could be brought in to the building.

The petitioner stated that no alcohol would be allowed on the property or is allowed to be brought into the building. He added that the World Champion for Snooker is only 14 or 15 years old. He is targeting teenagers and older.

D. Arceo stated that he would not be voting for this project due to the fact that there is no drawing for this project.

MOTION BY P. PARROTT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #187 contingent upon all Township Ordinances are followed and Fire Department approvals are received.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO NO
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES
J. WASHINGTON YES
B. SCHMIDT YES
L. FORD YES

7 – YES, 1 – NO **MOTION CARRIED**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #188 BRIAN A BELL FOUNDATION

LEGAL: 07-08-300-008
LOCATION: 5508 Calkins Rd.
ZONING: R-1A (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Semi-Private School & Pre-School

Roy Hodge, 8057 Miller Road, Swartz Creek, and George Wilson, represented this project. They are proposing to move into the East side of the building to put pre-school through third grade only. The remainder of the building will remain a church. This organization is currently located at 5106 Calkins Road, and they have outgrown their current facility.

The Board questioned as to what Semi-Private meant. The petitioner indicated that it was tuition-based (like Powers High School).

The Fire Chief stated that in order for the church to be able to be turned into an educational center, they would have to meet other Fire Codes. Mr. Wilson indicated that they are willing to spend over \$500,000 for fire suppression system, etc. The whole building needs a facelift.

Attorney Austin pointed out to the Planning Commission that pre-schools are not enumerated as either a permitted use, or as a use allowable by Special Use approval. Accordingly, the Planning Commission could require the applicant to receive an interpretation of the Ordinance from the ZBA as to whether or not the Commission has the authority to grant special use approval to a pre-school in a residentially zoned area of the Township.

Audience

Mr. & Mrs. Ken Reno – 5501 Calkins – opposed

Barbara Gamache - 1042 Western Hills Drive – opposed

Larry Wichlacz – 5450 Calkins – opposed

Letter in file from Eugene Talsma of 1010 Western Hills Drive who is opposed.

A letter was given to the Planning Commission from the petitioners from James Bowie of 5103 Calkins Road. He stated in his letter that he has lived at his address the entire duration of the Lighthouse Learning Center's stay at 5106 Calkins Road & he has not been inconvenienced at anytime by traffic from the daycare/school.

Also from the petitioner, a letter was given to the Planning Commission from Chief Sippert, Charter Township of Flint Police Chief. His letter indicates that there has been no abnormal number of calls at their current address (5096 Calkins was listed on his letter).

The audience members that spoke all mentioned that the property is currently zoned R-1A (Single Family Residential) and is not meant for a school. Calkins Road is only a two-lane road and cannot handle that much traffic.

L. Ford indicated to the Board that he was abstaining due to the fact he was a member of the GISD and compensated for such.

MOTION BY H. BLECKER, SECOND BY B. SCHMIDT to approve Case #188 contingent upon all Fire Department approvals, and that fencing is to be in place as required per Ordinance #5500 around play areas where it abuts residential zoning.

ROLL CALL:

P. PARROTT NO

J. MACGILLIVRAY NO

D. THOMPSON YES

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

B. SCHMIDT YES

L. FORD ABSTAIN

D. ARCEO NO

4 – YES, 3 – NO, 1 – ABSTAIN **MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:41 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
B. Schmidt, L. Ford, D. Arceo, P. Parrott,
J. MacGillivray
MEMBERS ABSENT: R. Ruhala
STAFF PRESENT: G. Jamison, Chief Bldg. Director

Vice-Chairman D. Arceo called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barbara Vert – 4064 Moulton – Had concerns regarding the property for sale on the south side of her house. A church is interested in it, and wants to use it for a missionary.

D. Arceo stated any change in use has to come before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Vert would also like to make the board aware that the Advanced Auto store will be a hub for surrounding stores, and it will be more like a warehouse. This will cause more large truck traffic. Ms. Vert asked if a berm could replace a fence?

D. Arceo – This board is not aware that the Advanced Auto has plans to be a warehouse. Also, a berm can replace a fence if that is what this board determines.

B. Vert – Concerns regarding the Zerka Party Store fence and parking.

D. Arceo – We will have to verify the stipulations.

H. Blecker – Would publicly like to state that this Board and the Township Board need to start requiring performance bonds so that we have the power to enforce the stipulations made by this board.

Rueben Arceo – 4301 St. Martins Drive. Is the Planning Commission aware of a big garage or warehouse going up on Judd Road? There are big construction vehicles at Judd and Whispering Oak. They have removed six huge trees. Did the Planning Commission approve this?

D. Arceo – The board will look into it.

H. Blecker – Residents are more likely to get feedback if their request is also in writing.

D. Thompson – If we know people are angry about something ahead of time we can check into it.

G. Jamison – Would like the Board to add two items to tonight’s agenda for the Genesee County Drain Commission 1) The Sewer Recovery Station on Beecher Road, and 2) Relocating the Pump Station on Miller Road.

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY H. BLECKER to add two items to the agenda for the Genesee County Drain Commission.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

J. MacGillivray arrived at 7:40 p.m.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

June 8, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY P. PARROTT to approve the minutes as printed. **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES	
H. BLECKER	YES	
J. WASHINGTON	YES	
B. SCHMIDT	YES	
D. ARCEO	YES	
P. PARROTT		YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY		YES

7 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS:

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY H. BLECKER To remove Case #186 from the table.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #186 ANGELA SKERJANCE

LEGAL:	07-15-501-010
LOCATION:	1099 Gilbert Street
ZONING:	R-1C (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED:	Daycare (7-12 children)

The petitioner Angela Skerjance was present to represent this project. She provided pictures of the Day Care to the Board. Angela stated that she has approval from the State of Michigan to operate a Day Care for 7 – 12 children. She only has two other vehicles coming to her home, there is no problem with parking.

D. Arceo – What are your hours of operation?

A. Skerjance – My last child leaves at 2:00 a.m., my first one comes at 6:00 a.m. The hours

change, I am there when the parents need me. I have two daughters age 18 and 22 to help me with the children.

D. Thompson – Concerned about approving this without a fence, then in the future demanding someone else to have a fence.

D. Arceo – Understand your lot is 526 long by 82 ½ wide. We don't suggest you fence the entire area, only enough for playground area. The playground area is based on the number of children. The concern is for the safety of the children.

B. B. Schmidt – What are the ages of the children?

A. Skerjance – I have a three month old, 1 – 1 year old, 2 – 2 year olds, 1 – 3 year old, and 2 – 7 year olds, and also my 6 year old is included by law, that makes 9.

D. D. Arceo - Would like it noted that Chairman Ford has arrived at 7:50 p.m. We will open the Public Hearing.

B. Vert – As a mom I would do anything to help. I would encourage this board to help this lady out.

D. Arceo – As there are no other questions we will close this public hearing.

MOTION BY B. SCHMIDT, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #186 contingent upon fencing in a play area within two years.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER	YES	
J. WASHINGTON	YES	
B. SCHMIDT	YES	
L. FORD	YES	
D. ARCEO	YES	
P. PARROTT		YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY		YES
D. THOMPSON	YES	

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Arceo – I will turn this meeting over to the Chairman.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1097 Genesee County Drain Commission and Water and Waste Services

LEGAL:	07-27-100-012
LOCATION:	4610 Beecher Road
ZONING:	C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED:	Septage Receiving Station

Neil Martz and Matt Raysin from the Genesee County Drain Commission were present to represent this case.

N. Martz – Need to upgrade the facility to make it more modern. We will be expanding the parking lot and adding a small masonry building.

M. Raysin – The existing and proposed stations are unmanned. The DEQ & IPP require testing discharge to the sewer system. The proposed station will allow separation of sand, gravel, and stone that clog up the pump and equipment. The instruments will monitor the sewage brought in.

L. Ford – Are there any Homeland Security issues?

M. Raysin – The instruments test before it goes into our sewer system.

N. Martz – The sample system will give us the ability to find which truck left the sample through the numbering system.

L. Ford – If it detects something how do you know?

M. Raysin – If the system detects anything then it shuts down and won't let anything else in. Discussion regarding safety issues, and time frame of discharge.

M. Raysin – It is almost a pass through system, if no problems are detected.

P. Parrott – Has the Fire Department reviewed these plans? Isn't there some methane gas involved here that the Fire Department needs to look at?

M. Raysin – No, but we can submit plans to the Fire Department.

N. Martz – We are here to inform this body of our updates. We would like you to approve the upgrades to the existing system.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1097 as presented contingent that the Fire Department reviews the plans.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON	YES
B. SCHMIDT	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
H. BLECKER	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1098 Genesee County Drain Commission and Water and Waste Services

LEGAL:	07-27-100-012
LOCATION:	3321 Miller Road
ZONING:	C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED:	Sanitary Sewer Pump Station

N. Martz – A couple of years ago we lost that pump station, it was 6 foot under water. We would like to move this sub-station out of the flood plain. The DEQ would also like us out of the flood plain.

M. Raysin – The capacity will not change. We will have odor control and screen for debris. We are moving 160 foot north. It is behind the U-Haul on Miller Road.

N. Martz – For security reasons we will coordinate with Homeland Security.

L. Ford – H. Blecker, D. Arceo, J. Washington will get together and research this. They will serve as a committee and get back with us by the next regular meeting. There are other costs associated with the project, if you are doing a comprehensive review. You may be talking \$65,000 or \$70,000.

B. Schmidt – Would like to say good-bye, this is my last meeting. My term is up. I will be sending in my resignation to the Township Board.

L. Ford – Beverly you have been a pillar with us for many years. You have given more than we could expect. You've also been a good friend. You can take great pleasure in knowing that there is a bridge named after your husband.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, August 10, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Thompson, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
D. Rowley, L. Ford, D. Arceo, R. Ruhula,

P. Parrott, J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

G. Borse, Flint Township Fire Chief

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Donald Rowley was welcomed to the Planning Commission.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton Drive – Regarding Advance Auto Parts construction - barrels are out along Bristol Road curb so you cannot pull out. Their equipment is backing up & down Moulton Drive.

Pam Luna – 4040 Moulton Drive – They haven't used their pool yet this year due to the dust & dirt. Their home shakes constantly due to the construction. She sweeps tons of dust & dirt from her home every day. She would like her home & Mrs. Vert's home power washed when the construction is complete. The Construction Manager, Art, is very nice, but very few people are doing much to help them. They just found out that this facility is going to be a warehouse for other Advance Auto Parts stores. She has a copy of a letter from Gary Borse regarding the 2nd entrance asking that a gate be placed across it and that it be used for emergency exit only. What's going on with that now?

Chief Borse stated that they might need to talk to Twp. Attorney Peter Goodstein for an opinion and the Planning Commission agreed.

Also, the residents indicated that they are bringing in more dirt to the site. The Planning Commission said that the dirt is for the berm along the rear of the site.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

July 13, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY J. WASHINGTON, SECOND BY R. RUHALA to approve the minutes of July 13, 2006, as printed.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
P. PARROTT	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

NEW BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1099 S E SPOHN DEV GROUP

LEGAL: 07-16-602-002

LOCATION: Southwest corner of Town Center Drive and Charter Drive

ZONING: O-1 (Office)

PROPOSED: Doctor Office and Miscellaneous Offices

Steve Spohn, 5084 Exchange Drive, was representing this project. This is a proposed Site Condo project on the Southwest corner of Town Center Drive and Charter Drive. Phase I is a 6,098 square foot building which will contain Dr. Elian (3,882 square feet), and a vacant lease space (2,216 square feet). Phase II will be another office building approximately 6,000 square feet. Dr. Elian would like to be occupying his space by November 2006.

D. Arceo asked if the access off Town Center Parkway could be eliminated. Also, he asked that the dumpster at Michigan Eye Center be replaced.

Chief Borse indicated that Charter Drive is a nightmare to try to turn around a fire truck. He needs that 2nd drive.

D. Arceo reviewed the parking with Mr. Spohn and architect, John Costa.

After reviewing the parking, it was determined that some parking spaces can be eliminated and green space added (10% less parking).

P. Parrott verified that the handicap parking was in order.

D. Rowley asked Chief Borse if the waterline was sufficient to service the building. Chief Borse stated that with this new building a new system would be in place.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1099 contingent upon a new drawing being submitted to the building department indicating the 10% less parking and additional green space added, also showing the exact handicap spots, the Southwest corner dumpster be relocated, all County approvals be submitted, and all Township ordinances be followed.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

D. ROWLEY YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

P. PARROTT YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. THOMPSON YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1100 GENESEE URGENT CARE PC

LEGAL: 07-21-100-007

LOCATION: Vacant land on the East side of Linden Road just North of the Oak Creek Office Park

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Urgent Care Facility

Mike Pifer, Kraft Engineering, and John Costa, Architect, were both present to represent this project. This is a 7,000 square foot urgent care facility to be constructed on a 1-acre piece of land. This is vacant land on the East side of Linden Road just North of the Oak Creek Office Park. The urgent care facility will be using the same drive as Sam Halstead. The facility is currently located on the South side of Calkins Road near the corner of Linden Road. They are only leasing the facility now. Dr. Ayman Haidar will own the new facility.

R. Ruhala had a big concern with the color of the building. J. Costa stated the red color on the front is to indicate it is an “urgent care” facility.

This urgent care facility will be open 7 days per week, 9:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. They will have a pick up and drop off location on the West side of the building. There will be 59 parking spaces. A monument sign will be constructed as per our Township Sign Ordinance. A masonry dumpster will match the building, which will be masonry and veneer. The landscaping will meet Ordinance #5500. Just South of the site is a Consumer Energy easement. They have an easement agreement for the parking. Also, there is a Conservation Easement in process with MDEQ.

H. Blecker asked if the dumpster could be moved from its current location and more grass or an island can be added in its place.

D. Rowley discussed fire truck access with Chief Borse.

Mr. Spohn stated he has Water/Waste approval, Consumer Energy Easement, and Genesee County Road Commission approval.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1100 contingent upon removing 10% of the parking.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES

R. RUHALA NO
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES

8 – YES, 1 – NO **MOTION CARRIED**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #189 CHARLIE STEPHENSON

LEGAL: 07-27-100-006
LOCATION: 3450 Miller Road (the old Best Buy building)
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Retail sales and service of motorcycles, snowmobiles,
Personal watercraft and all terrain vehicles

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1101 CHARLIE STEPHENSON

LEGAL: 07-27-100-006
LOCATION: 3450 Miller Road (the old Best Buy building)
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Retail sales and service of motorcycles, snowmobiles,
Personal watercraft, and all terrain vehicles

Petitioner requested Case #189 and Case #1101 to be deleted from the agenda. No fees were paid. No notices were mailed out regarding this Special Land Use. The Building Department was notified before the public notices were mailed.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #887 INDUSTRIAL BATTERY EQUIPMENT

LEGAL: 07-03-527-191
LOCATION: 2612 Lavelle Road
ZONING: IND (Industrial)
PROPOSED: Accessory Building addition to existing Site Plan

The petitioner notified the Building Department and asked for this Case #887 to be tabled to the September 14, 2006.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to table Case #887 until the September 14, 2006 meeting.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY YES
L. FORD YES
D. ARCEO YES
R. RUHALA YES
P. PARROTT YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. THOMPSON YES
H. BLECKER YES
J. WASHINGTON YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman Ford then asked for the re-organization of the Board.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY TO NOMINATE L. FORD AS CHAIRMAN.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION BY J. WASHINGTON, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON TO NOMINATE D. ARCEO AS VICE CHAIRMAN.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON TO NOMINATE *D. THOMPSON* AS SECRETARY.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman Ford, Vice Chairman Arceo, and Secretary D. Thompson will hold these positions for 1-year.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Thursday, September 14, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting

Thursday, September 28, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
L. Ford, D. Arceo, J. Gazall, J. MacGillivray,

R. Ruhala

MEMBERS ABSENT:

D. Thompson

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Sandra Wright, Treasurer – 5422 Corunna Road – Spoke in support of the Site Plan Review for Central Church of the Nazarene.

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton Drive – Wanted to know if the detention pond was going to be fenced and how close the pond would be to the softball fields.

L. Ford indicated that all ponds must be fenced if the depth is over 2 feet. He asked that Mrs. Vert wait until the presentation and the petitioner would show us where the pond is located.

NEW BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1102 CENTRAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

LEGAL: 07-36-501-072 / 07-36-200-042 / 07-36-200-002

07-36-200-043 / 07-36-200-044

LOCATION:

1261 W. Bristol Road

ZONING:

R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED:

Expansion / Addition to existing facilities

D. Arceo would like to make it known that all of the parcels that are included in this project are as follows: 07-36-200-042, 07-36-200-002, 07-36-200-043, and 07-36-200-044 along with the original parcel that was posted on the Agenda.

Since the petitioner, Central Church of the Nazarene owns all the parcels, and the petitioner has already turned in the paperwork to the Assessment Department to combine all of these parcels together, the minutes will reflect all parcels.

Kevin Johnson, of Rhoads and Johnson, was present to represent this project to the Board. George Ananich, of THA Architects, was also present. Mr. Johnson confirmed to the Board that all parcels would be combined for project.

In 1997, this church burnt to the ground except for the gym. Since then, they have re-built, and the church has expanded and grown. They have four projects that they would like to propose to the Board tonight.

- (1) (1) Youth Center – exterior to look like the existing church**
- (2) (2) Parking Lot addition of 97 spaces**
- (3) (3) Balcony addition in the Sanctuary – 1,200 seats currently, 1,700 when done**
- (4) (4) 2nd story addition for classrooms**

The Youth Center will be approximately 24,570 square feet and be located just East of the existing church (across Bristolwood Drive). They will also be adding some senior parking that is desperately needed. Parking will also be added to the South end of the existing church parking lot (30 additional senior parking spaces).

Dr. Dennis Benn, currently located at 1203 W. Bristol (also a member of the church), is relocating his practice. The church purchased the property. This will allow the church to create a Boulevard along the East side of the new Youth Center to access the new parking lot. The parking lot addition will create 97 new spaces for the church.

A balcony will be added inside the church to add an additional 500 seats and classrooms to be added on a 2nd story.

D. Rowley asked if it would be 100% suppressed. Mr. Johnson indicated that it would be.

H. Blecker asked if the dumpster could be moved away from the door and screened. He asked the petitioner could add handicap parking to the front of the Youth Center. Also, the pond needs to be fenced. The petitioner agreed.

D. Arceo asked if the North side of the Youth Center could be split-faced block instead of the green panel. He also would like to see Road Commission approval.

D. Arceo suggested that the petitioner turn in another drawing to the Building Department showing the project without the Boulevard, just in case the Road Commission didn't approve the drive.

Mr. Johnson indicated that their congregation has already approved their drawings and he could make a decision tonight on changing the façade of the building without approvals

from the congregation. Also, Mr. Johnson said they have other drawings showing better landscaping that they would like to turn in. The church has money to spend on landscaping and felt that the Ordinance didn't cover what they would like to do.

J. Gazall asked if the Youth Center was for the public. Mr. Johnson stated that currently the Youth Center is only for the member of the church, however, hopefully one day, it will be for everyone. J. Gazall also asked when construction would start. Mr. Johnson indicated that construction would start in Spring 2007 and the whole project would be done by Christmas 2007.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1102 contingent upon the dumpster being moved over to other side of Boulevard (near new parking lot), handicap spaces added to Youth Center, and revised landscaping plan and revised drawings to be submitted to the Building Department.

D. ARCEO to add friendly amendment to the MOTION that the North side only of the Youth Center is all split faced block.

Amendment dies for lack of support.

ROLL CALL ON ORIGINAL MOTION:

D. ROWLEY	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
L. FORD	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
J. GAZALL	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
R. RUHALA	YES

YES – 8, NO – 0 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON that the petitioner combines all legal descriptions: 07-36-501-072, 07-36-200-042, 07-36-200-002, 07-36-200-043, AND 07-36-200-044.

ROLL CALL:

<i>H. BLECKER</i>	<i>YES</i>	
J. WASHINGTON		YES
L. FORD	YES	
D. ARCEO		YES
J. GAZALL		YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY		YES
R. RUHALA		YES
D. ROWLEY		YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

L. Ford addressed the Planning Commission in regards to the BI-Laws that were mailed out to all the members. He would like a committee of three to review them.

J. Washington, R. Ruhala, and D. Arceo were nominated as the committee members.

Also, the new Sign Ordinance should be coming back to the Planning Commission soon to be reviewed. He would like the members of the Sign Committee to present it to the Planning Commission along with the Zoning Board of Appeals members when it's ready.

G. Jamison indicated that Steve Spohn contacted the Township and asked that Dr. Elian's Site Plan be canceled. L. Ford asked that the Township Attorney be contact to be sure that the Planning Commission is able to cancel a Site Plan Review as requested.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, H. Blecker, D. Thompson,
L. Ford, D. Arceo, J. Gazall, R. Ruhala,

J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

J. Washington

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton – She indicated that G. Jamison was supposed to check with the Township Attorney and call them back in regards to the gate. They have yet to receive a call back.

G. Jamison stated it was discussed at the last Township Board meeting and that the Treasurer Sandra Wright said that there would be no gate.

R. Ruhala said that he thought that the Fire Department needed that 2nd drive.

Mrs. Vert said they have a letter from the Fire Chief asking them to put a gate up. D. Rowley stated that there is nothing in the Fire Code that indicates that a gate *must* be put up. The letter was to try to force the issue of the gate for the residents. G. Jamison said that there was nothing said during the Planning Commission Meeting or in the Motion that indicated they needed a gate. The Supervisor, the Treasurer and the Fire Chief had a meeting, and that is where the issue of the gate came from.

Mrs. Vert said it would've been nice if someone would've called her regarding all of this information, like they said they would.

Mrs. Vert said that at the bottom of the Certificate of Occupancy, it states that it is a *Conditional* Certificate of Occupancy due to the following conditions:

- (1) (1) All Site Plan & GCRC issues to be taken care of by 09/20/06; and
- (2) (2) All outstanding building code issues by 09/20/06 and if these items aren't taken care of, the Certificate of Occupancy will be revoked and the business will be padlocked.

Mrs. Vert wanted to know if this means that all of the landscaping, and the fencing around the detention pond, and the road all has to be done by September 20, 2006.

G. Jamison said that if the Certificate of Occupancy states that they have only until that date, then that's all the time they have to get all the items completed.

Mrs. Vert indicated that no work is currently being done at the site. There is no fencing around the pond and the pond is currently full of water and has been for quite some time now.

Also, the gate is still rolled back at KFC. Mrs. Vert said she has mentioned it three or four times now.

Pam Luna – 4040 Moulton – She said the gate over the drains are removable and someone can fall in. Also, the Drain Commission told them the pond should only take 6 hours for the pond to drain and it's still full of water and has been full of water for quite some time!

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

August 10, 2006 Regular Meeting

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve the minutes of August 10, 2006 as printed.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OLD BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #887 INDUSTRIAL BATTERY EQUIPMENT

LEGAL: 07-03-527-191

LOCATION: 2612 Lavelle Road

ZONING: IND (Industrial)

PROPOSED: Accessory Building addition to existing Site Plan

The petitioner asked that Case #887 be tabled until the next regular meeting on October 12, 2006.

CASE #887 (Continued)

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to table Case #887 to October 12, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #190 MICHAEL VAUGHN

LEGAL: 07-10-300-003

LOCATION: 4022 Beecher Road

ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Multiple Family Dwelling

Michael Vaughn 16353 Hi-Land Trail, Linden, Michigan, represented this project to the Board. Mr. Vaughn indicated to the Board that the Township is currently taking him to Court over this building. Zellar & Sons Excavating has demolished the shed and torn out the pool and filled it in by orders of the Township. Mr. Vaughn purchased this property two years ago as a four-unit rental with an office. He was told then, that this property has been multi-family for 20 years or more. He also said that he has made several interior repairs to the building including electrical repairs, to try and address the concerns of the renters.

J. MacGillivray stated that he & his wife visited this property and spoke with some tenants. The one unit they went into stated that they keep blowing fuses. Another tenant stated that they have a patio window that goes out to nowhere. He added that the building looks like it needs to be condemned. Most of the tenants they spoke to were very unhappy and the units were in need of repair.

G. Jamison pointed out to the Board that most of the repairs cannot be done until the property has use changed.

Audience

John Crouch – 4030 Townview – He says the property has been a mess ever since the petitioner has owned it. The grass hasn't been mowed but twice all year. He had to put up a privacy fence just to keep the rodents out of his yard.

David Biggs – 4040 Beecher – He has lived at this address for over 40 years. This building at 4022 Beecher Road has caught fire twice. He lives right next door and doesn't want his house to catch fire due to the violations (electrical or otherwise) of this home! His advice is to make the building comply 100% with the current 2003 Building Code and have fire alarms in each unit. It is the only way to make it safe.

Mr. Biggs indicated that either make the building comply with the current code, or tear the building down and re-build it.

J. MacGillivray stated the due to the fact that the fuses are blowing out, he agrees that the building should be condemned and that the Fire Department and Building Inspector should do another inspection.

G. Jamison said he would have the Building Inspector go out again this week for another inspection.

The Planning Commission discussed whether or not to let the petitioner make repairs now and approve him for the use later, after seeing what kind of progress the petitioner would make.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to deny Case #190 due to the fact that the Board could not in good faith agree with this project, that the petitioner failed to follow the law, and it is not in the spirit of the Ordinance.

D. Rowley added that after being the Fire Chief of this Township for several years, he has fought both fires at this address, and he cannot in good faith vote for this project.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER YES

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

J. GAZALL YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #191 ERIK VON BROCKDORFF

LEGAL: 07-18-400-016

LOCATION: 1509 East Drive

ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Duplex

Erik VonBrockdorff, 3108 Van Vleet, Swartz Creek, represented his project to the Board. He has received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals on September 6, 2006, for setbacks due to the lot size. He purchased this lot from the Genesee County Land Bank. The petitioner is proposing to build a duplex for two families with enough parking for four.

D. Rowley indicated that there is other duplex's along this private drive, and added that this would be a good land use for this property.

H. Blecker asked what would be done with the large trees on the lot. The petitioner stated that they would have to come down. H. Blecker asked if they would be replaced. The petitioner indicated that there wasn't room after the structure is replaced, to add landscaping.

No one from the audience address the Board regarding this case.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #191 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

J. GAZALL YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #837 FLINT TWP BLDG DEPT

LEGAL: 07-36-528-021

LOCATION: 1105 W. Williamson

ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Apartment

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. GAZALL to set Case #837 for Public Hearing on November 9, 2006.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #170 GEN CO LAND BANK AUTHORITY

LEGAL: 07-03-576-135 and 07-03-576-136
LOCATION: Vacant lots on the North side of Mallery Street
ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Zero lot line (reinstate Special Land Use that has expired)

G. Jamison addressed the Board stating that the Genesee County Community Action Resource Department was granted a Special Land Use on July 14, 2005. At that time, they were anticipating a contract from HUD to be received shortly thereafter. They have just received that contract, and now need an extension on this Special Land Use so they can start their project.

No one from the audience addressed the Board.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY H. BLECKER so approve Case #170 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO YES
J. GAZALL YES
R. RUHALA YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
D. ROWLEY YES
H. BLECKER YES
D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL: CASE #103 AMBER’S WHEAT SUBDIVISION

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-32-300-003
LOCATION: Extension of Alfalfa Drive & Rye Ave.
ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Extension of No.’s 4 and 5

Richard VanDever, of Davison Land Surveying, represented this project. This is the preliminary plat of Amber's Wheat Subdivision, Phase IV & V. This portion of the subdivision abuts I-69 and the railroad tracks. It was approved originally in October of 2004, but due to the economy, was never developed. They would like to start construction next Spring if possible.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. GAZALL to approve Case #103 for a one-year extension.

ROLL CALL:

J. GAZALL YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER YES

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

D. ARCEO YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

H. Blecker handed out some information that he, D. Arceo, and J. Washington have gathered regarding the rewriting of the Township Master Plan. They are still gathering information. He would like the Board to review this and give him feedback.

G. Jamison showed the Board two renderings of signs for Wal-Mart. He asked the Board to pick which one they liked better. They had a choice between the blue background with white lettering or just the white lettering. The Board discussed it and decided on the white lettering alone.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Thursday, October 12, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, J. Washington, D. Thompson,

L. Ford, J. Gazall, D. Arceo, R. Ruhala,

J. MacGillivray

MEMBERS ABSENT:

H. Blecker

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

G. Borse, Fire Chief

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton – asked why there was no audience participation for the Church of the Nazarene case at the September 28, 2006 meeting. L. Ford indicated that is was not a Public Hearing, just a Site Plan Review. Mrs. Vert stated she has concerns with all the traffic coming out on the new boulevard. She also indicated to the Fire Chief that Advance Auto had electrical cords running across the parking lot for their Grand Opening.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES

September 14, 2006 Regular Meeting

September 28, 2006 Special Meeting

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve the minutes of September 14, 2006 and September 28, 2006, as printed. **VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

OLD BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #887 INDUSTRIAL BATTERY EQUIPMENT

LEGAL: 07-03-527-191

LOCATION: 2612 Lavelle Road

ZONING: IND (Industrial)

PROPOSED: Accessory Building addition to existing Site Plan

The petitioner asked to be deleted from the agenda.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to delete Case #887 from the agenda. **VOICE VOTE:**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #192 OTIS WILLIAMS and MONIQUE ELBERT

LEGAL: 07-07-577-034

LOCATION: 1062 Western Hills Drive

ZONING: R-1A (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Group Daycare (12 children and under)

Monique Elbert, 1062 Western Hills Drive, Flint, was present to address the Board. Ms. Elbert stated she has a license pending with the State of Michigan for 12 children. The name of her daycare is ABC 123 Child Care Center. Her hours will be Monday – Thursday 5:30 a.m. until 10:00 p.m., and Friday she will be open until 7:00 p.m. The reason for the late hours is to be flexible for parents that work in retail. If needed, she will have 2 other employees. She has room for 5 parking spaces; her vehicles will be parked in the garage. D. Arceo stated he is okay with the parking, however, he asked Chief Borse if he has inspected the property. Chief Borse indicated that he does not inspect the property until a Business License has been applied for. 400' of fencing will be required.

The petitioner stated that they have a natural barrier on the one side of her yard. There was a lengthy discussion in regards to fencing and the hours of operation.

Audience

Kenneth Perkins – 1048 Western Hills – would like a privacy fence

Kelly Medley – 1071 Sandstone Pass – slippery corner, has concerns with accidents

Mort Krasner – 6042 Calkins – concerns with traffic and noise

John O'Brien – 4086 Sierra Pass – limit the hours of operation

Barb Gamache – 1042 Western Hills – zoned residential NOT commercial

Betty Leavitt – 1072 Sandstone Pass – wants to sell home, fence will detract sellers

Letters received in opposition:

Betty Leavitt – 1072 Sandstone Pass

Marsha Eshbaugh – 1095 Briarcliffe Drive

Mr. & Mrs. Donald B. Martin – 6056 Calkins

Dorothy Winegarden – 1032 Western Hills

Letters are in the file.

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #192 with the following stipulations: that the hours of operation are 16 hours per day, the fence shall be a privacy fence, six foot in height; the fence shall be opaque to that children cannot be seen through the fence; the fence shall not be constructed of pressure treated lumber or any other material which could expose the children to harmful chemicals; the fencing shall enclose a minimum of 400 square feet as required by Michigan Administrative Code R 400.1811(4); the fence shall enclose the entire outdoor play area; and the fence shall comply with the requirements of the Charter Township of Flint, Ordinance #5500, Section 3.15.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
L. FORD	YES
J. GAZALL	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #193 MALY COMMERCIAL REALTY

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-21-100-027

LOCATION: Vacant Southeast corner of Corunna & LinCor Pkwy.

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Restaurant with drive thru window

Mike Pifer, Kraft Engineering, and Henry Quig were both present to represent this project. Mr. Pifer first indicated that they have received a variance on September 6, 2006, for setback items. This is a proposed 4,500 square feet building at the SE corner of Corunna and LinCor Parkway. The Northerly unit will be a Starbucks, and the other two units will have possibly a cell phone store and a beauty shop. They have a cross-easement agreement with Lowe's for 18 additional parking spaces. The employees will probably park there. The dumpster will be enclosed with the enclosure matching the exterior of the building. There will be landscaping on the North, South, and West sides and two monument signs as per the Charter Township of Flint Sign Ordinance #6021.

Audience

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton – walking across the service drive to get to the project is dangerous.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve Case #193 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON YES

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

J. GAZALL YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. ROWLEY YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1103 MALY COMMERCIAL REALTY

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-21-100-027

LOCATION: Vacant Southeast corner of Corunna & LinCor Pkwy.

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Shoppes @ Corunna & LinCor

Mike Pifer, Kraft Engineering, and Henry Quig, Architect, were both present to address the Board. A rendering of the exterior of the building was shown as Mr. Quig described the exterior. There will be a West entrance only to the facility. Lowe's offered 18 parking spaces (even though they only needed an extra 5 spaces), so they took the offer of 18, just in case down the road they need them.

Chief Borse stated that they couldn't have an emergency exit that goes out into the drive-thru window traffic. They need either a 2-hour firewall or another way out.

J. Gazall asked that they move all mechanical, electrical equipment from the front of the building. This all faces Corunna Road and is unsightly. The petitioner indicated that due to the cost of copper, it would cost a lot of money to re-route the equipment. The petitioner said they would screen it with landscaping.

D. Arceo asked that the address be on the building.

J. Gazall asked for additional signage for employee parking across the service drive (in Lowe's parking lot) to direct pedestrian traffic. The petitioners agreed.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1103 contingent upon all County approvals being submitted.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

J. GAZALL YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. ROWLEY YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT: CASE #201 EGRFL PARTNERSHIP

LEGAL: 07-08-200-003 and 07-08-200-013

LOCATION: Vacant Southwest corner of Beecher of Linden Roads

ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Planned Unit Development

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to set Case #201 for Public Hearing on December 14, 2006. **VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1105 GENESEE COUNTY DRAIN COMMISSION

LEGAL: 07-04-551-017

LOCATION: 4610 Beecher Road

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Office Expansion

John O'Brien, Deputy Drain Commissioner for Genesee County, was present to represent this project. They are proposing to remove one trailer from the premises, and add three more until the funds are obtained for the expansion.

MOTION BY J. GAZALL, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve Case #1105 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

J. GAZALL YES

D. ARCEO YES

R. RUHALA YES

J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

D. ROWLEY YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

APPLICATION FOR CONDOMINIUMS: CASE #108 TDE HOLDING LLC

LEGAL: 07-19-501-028

LOCATION: 2029 S. Elms Road
ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential), C-2 (General Business)
AND C-3 (Highway Service)
PROPOSED: Turning existing Commercial project into Condo's

Bruce Thomas, petitioner, and Russ Osborne were both present and addressed the Board. This is for tax purposes only. They have a purchase agreement to sell the property to a drug company. This will be a legal description change only.

MOTION BY J. GAZALL, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #108 as presented.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
L. FORD	YES
J. GAZALL	YES

8 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Chairman Ford stated that there would be a Special Meeting scheduled for October 26, 2006 to review the Sign Ordinance and possibly the BI-laws if time allows. He asked that the ZBA, as well as the Planning Commission attend this meeting.

R. Ruhala said the sub-committee met regarding the BI-laws and then met with Galen. Galen will now meet with the Township Attorney and get back with the Planning Commission.

J. Gazall, H. Blecker, and D. Arceo are going to be the Plan Review Committee. They will review all plans coming before this Body 14 days prior to the meeting. There will then be a review written up so as not to spend an hour on the placement of a dumpster. Too much time is being spent on each item. This will help the meetings run smoother.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Special Meeting

Thursday, October 26, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, J. Washington, D. Thompson,
L. Ford, J. Gazall, D. Arceo

MEMBERS ABSENT:

H. Blecker, R. Ruhala, J. MacGillivray

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one from the audience addressed the Board.

NEW BUSINESS:

REVIEW SIGN ORDINANCE

Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals present included B. Smith, N. Pappadakis, B. Parker, and V. Shaheen.

Members of the Sign Committee present included T. Tucker, R. Schumaker, D. Crannie, M. Ellithorpe, and P. Parrott.

T. Tucker and B. Parker (Co-chairpersons of the Sign Committee) addressed the Planning Commission with the changes that were made to the Sign Ordinance.

B. Parker indicated that the copies of the proposed new ordinance that were marked-up were never meant to be sent out. Each member should have received a clean copy of the ordinance to review. The members did receive a clean copy before the meeting. Only a few members received the marked-up copies.

T. Tucker stated that in the old ordinance Sections 1-3 showed all the amendments that had been done. The new ordinance will have the amendments incorporated throughout.

Page 1 of the new ordinance has 2 new definitions:

Billboard: A sign separate from a premises erected for the purpose of advertising a product, event, person, or subject not related to the premises on which the sign is located. Permitted off-premises directional signs shall not be considered billboards for the purpose of this article.

B. Smith indicated that this definition needed to be re-written or tweaked in some way. The Planning Commission agreed.

Board of Appeals: The Board of Appeals established in Article 27 of Flint Township Ordinance No. 5500, as amended.

The definition of the Board of Appeals was copied from another ordinance.

Page 2 of the new ordinance has two new definitions:

Canopy Sign: A non-rigid fabric marquee or awning-type structure that is attached to the building by supporting framework, which includes a business identification message, symbol, and/or logo; see wall sign.

This definition was taken from the City of Fenton ordinance.

Community Event Sign: A portable sign registered with and approved by the Flint Township Building Department, which is erected for a limited time to call attention to special events of interest to the general public which are sponsored by governmental agencies, schools, churches,

or other groups which are non-profit and whose purpose is charitable, philanthropic, religious, or benevolent.

This definition was taken from inside an old ordinance.

Page 3 has a new definition:

Height of Sign: The vertical distance measured from the highest point of the sign, including any decorative embellishments, to the grade of the adjacent street or the surface grade beneath the sign, whichever ground elevation is less (Compare with “Clearance”).

Page 4 of the new ordinance has a wording change:

Major Street: Any state or primary road as defined by the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Genesee.

Our old sign ordinance shows the definition as:

Major Street shall mean any street, primary and local roads as defined by the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Genesee.

Page 4 of the new ordinance has a new definition:

Reader Board Sign: Reader Board means one of the following:

- (i) (i) Manual. A sign on which a copy is changed manually, periodically.
- (ii) (ii) Automatic. An electrically controlled sign, where different copy changes are shown on the same unexposed lamp bank or scrolling portion of the face of the sign, used as a message center reader board.

This definition was taken from the Plainfield City ordinance.

Page 5 of the new ordinance has 3 new definitions:

Real Estate Development Directional Sign: An off-site temporary sign registered and approved by the Flint Township Building Department, that indicates the location of a real estate development.

Sandwich Sign: A sign that consists of two boards upon which a message is posted, which is hinged at the top and open at the bottom so that the boards can lean against each other when placed on the ground or can be worn by a person.

Snipe Sign: A sign affixed to a tree, fence, utility pole, light pole, or similar structure, or a ground sign with a wire support or base.

The sandwich sign and snipe sign definitions both came from Grand Blanc’s ordinance.

Page 6, Section II, Sign Permits

2.01 (1): There were some changes to this paragraph.

In the old ordinance the sentence read:

The insurance is required only if the estimated cost of construction exceeds \$5,000.00.

In the new proposed ordinance it has been changed to:

The insurance is required only if the estimated cost of construction exceeds \$2,000.00.

Also, the last portion has been omitted:

“...and that the equipment to be used is adequate to protect the public safety during erection of alteration thereof, the Chief Building Official shall issue a construction permit.”

T. Tucker stated that this was omitted because the Sign Committee didn’t feel that the Township was able to make this type of determination.

Page 6, Section II Sign Permits

2.01(2) There was a wording change

The old ordinance read as follows:

(2) A construction permit fee as determined by Township Ordinance shall be paid at the time of filing the application for a construction permit.

The new ordinance has worded it as:

(2) A sign permit application and sign permit fee, as determined by the Township Ordinance, shall be filed and paid prior to construction of signage.

Page 6, Section II Sign Permits

2.01(3) Was added

(3) All electrified signs shall be UL Listed.

Page 7, Section II Sign Permits

2.03 Inspection

There were portions added to this section.

The old ordinance read as follows:

Inspection. The Chief Building Official may at any time inspect any sign, and if upon inspection a sign is found to be unsafe or in a condition that does not comply with the applicable provisions of this Ordinance, the Chief Building Official shall give notice of such conditions to the owner or person responsible for such sign, and such person shall, within seven (7) working days thereafter, make or cause to be made, the necessary repairs or alterations, or remove the sign.

The new proposed ordinance will read as follows:

2.03: Inspection. The Chief Building Official may at time inspect any sign, and if upon inspection a sign is found to be unsafe or not as approved by the Flint Township Planning Commission or Flint Township Zoning Board of Appeals, or in a condition that does not comply with the applicable provisions of this Ordinance, the Chief Building Official shall give notice of such conditions and/or non-compliance to the owner of person responsible for such sign, and such person shall, within seven (7) working days thereafter, make or cause to be made, the necessary repairs or alterations or remove the sign.

Page 7, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.01: Signs Permitted – The old ordinance had these all separated.

It now reads as follows:

3.01: Signs Permitted – Single Family Residential Districts, Agricultural Uses, and Institutional Premises within Single Family Residential Districts.

Page 7, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.01 (1) has been changed.

The old ordinance read as follows:

(1) (1) On premises within Single Family Residential Districts, there may be permitted one on-premises sign. If illuminated, it must be indirectly illuminated. The sign may not exceed two (2) square feet.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

(1) (1) Within Single Family Residential Districts, one on premises wall sign is permitted.

The sign may not exceed two (2) square feet and may not be illuminated.

The Sign Committee decided that the sign should be a wall sign instead of a sign that is placed in the yard, and should NOT be illuminated. The homeowner can always go to the Zoning Board of Appeals if he/she chooses.

Page 7, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.01 (2) has a change.

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (2) (2) Subdivision identification signs may be free standing, indirectly illuminated, shall not exceed 24 square feet of surface area per face, and shall not exceed six (6) feet in height.

The new ordinance has changed it to read as follows:

- (2) (2) Subdivision identification signs may be free standing and indirectly illuminated. Such signs shall not exceed twenty-four (24) square feet of surface area per face, and shall not exceed five (5) feet in height.

Page 8, Section III Signs Permitted

3.02: Signs Permitted – Multiple Family Residential Districts, Elderly Housing Residential Districts, and Manufactured Home/Mobile Home Park District.

Elderly Housing Residential Districts were added to the above description. It was not addressed anywhere in our old sign ordinance.

Page 8, Section III Signs Permitted

3.02 (2) There were two changes made.

The old ordinance read as follows:

Signs Permitted – Multiple Family Residential Districts and Mobile Home Residential Districts.

On premises within Multiple Family Residential Districts and Mobile Home Residential Districts, there may be permitted either one (1) indirectly illuminated on-premises wall sign or one (1) on-premises free standing at each entrance to the premises where such entrances are on separate public streets. The aggregate area of such sign shall not exceed two (2) square feet per residential unit to a maximum of thirty-two (32) square feet of surface area. Free standing signs shall not exceed six (6) feet in height.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (1) (1) Within these districts there may be permitted either one (1) indirectly illuminated on-premises wall sign.
- (2) (2) One (1) on premises free standing sign at each entrance to the premises where such entrance are on separate public streets.

These identification signs shall not exceed twenty-four (24) square feet of surface area per face. Free standing signs shall not exceed five (5) feet in height.

The Sign Committee omitted the last sentence regarding the aggregate areas.

Page 8, Section 3.03 Signs Permitted – Local Business Districts, General Business Districts, Highway Service Districts, Offices Districts, Airports Districts, and Industrial Districts.

In the old ordinance, this section had been added to at different times. The additions were: (aa) (bb) etc. This made this section hard to follow without going back and forth from page to page.

The Sign Committee fixed it so it was easier to read, so the (aa) (bb) at the bottom of the pages have been omitted and instead were incorporated into the appropriate sections.

Page 8, Section 3.03

3.03 (1)(a) There was some wording that was added

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (1) (1) On commercial premises there may be permitted the following signs:
 - (a) (a) Wall Signs – one or more on-premise wall sign, directly or indirectly illuminated, with an aggregate surface area not to exceed:

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (1) (1) On commercial premises there may be permitted the following signs:
 - (a) (a) Wall Signs – one on premise wall sign, per business frontage wall, directly or indirectly illuminated, with an aggregate surface not to exceed:

Page 8, Section III Signs Permitted

3.03: (1) (b) There were a couple of changes made.

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (b) (b) Free-Standing Signs – “One (1) on-premises signs per major street frontage, directly or indirectly illuminated as maximum of ten (10) feet. Provided, however, signs erected within boundaries existing at any time of the Central Business Development Areas TIFA 1 and TIFA 2 Districts on Corunna Road or Linden Road shall be limited to (10) feet in height.”

The new ordinance will now read:

- (b) (b) Free-Standing Signs: One (1) on premises sign per major street frontage, directly or indirectly illuminated as maximum height of ten (10) feet.

The Sign Committee omitted the last portion starting at ...”provided, however...”

All new signs must be a maximum height of 10 feet.

B. Smith pointed out that we must use caution due to the obstruction that this causes on some of the old roads. Fenton Road, Ballenger Highway, Dye Road, etc., where the street has widened, by using the 10 feet in height rule, sometimes can cause a vision problem. The sign ends up being so close to the road that it’s hard to see because you can’t see under the sign.

Page 8, Section III Signs Permitted

3.03: Free Standing Signs (bb) has been changed

The old ordinance read:

- (bb) (bb) Maximum of thirty-two (32) square feet of surface area, and may be multi-faced.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (bb) (bb) Maximum of thirty-two (32) square feet of surface display area, and may be double-faced.

Page 9, Section III Signs Permitted

3.03 Free Standing Signs (ii)(aa) has been changed

The old ordinance read:

- (ii) (ii) Premises with more than one hundred (100) feet of major street frontage:
 - (aa) (aa) Maximum of either (80) square feet in surface area, and may be multi-faced.

The new ordinance will read:

- (ii) (ii) Premises with more than one hundred (100) feet of major street frontage:
 - (aa) (aa) Maximum of either (80) square feet in surface area, and may be double-faced.

Page 9, Section III Signs Permitted

3.03 (2) This section was originally bundled in one paragraph. The Sign Committee have split it up for easier reading. Also, one change was made.

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (2) (2) For premises used or occupied entirely for professional or business offices there may be permitted (1) on-premises directly or indirectly illuminated free-standing sign where there are at least fifty (50) feet of frontage on a street. The sign may not exceed ten (10) feet in height. Such sign may be multi-faced and may not exceed forty-eight (48) square feet in surface area per face. In addition, within each office development on (1) sign, not to exceed twenty-four (24) square feet in size nor five (5) in height may be permitted for each separate building for purposes of identification of the tenants. Provided, however,

the signs within each office development may not be visible from a public road right-of-way.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (2) (2) For premises used or occupied entirely for professional or business offices there may be permitted one (1) on-premises directly or indirectly illuminated free-standing signs where there are at least fifty (50) feet of frontage on a street.
- • The sign may not exceed ten (10) feet in height.
 - • Such signs may be double-faced and may not exceed forty-eight (48) square feet in surface area per face.
 - • Within each office development one (1) sign, not to exceed twenty-four (24) square feet in size nor five (5) feet in height may be permitted for each separate building for purposes of identification of the tenants. Provided, however, the signs within each office development may not be visible from a public road right-of-way.

Page 9, Section III, Signs Permitted

3.03 (3) There were some changes made.

The old ordinance was written in two paragraphs. Paragraph (a) and paragraph (c). There was not a paragraph (b).

The old ordinance was written as follows:

- (3) (3) Each business center may be permitted:
- (a) (a) One (1) on-premises free standing sign, directly or indirectly illuminated when such business center has at least one hundred (100) feet of street frontage. The sign may not exceed twenty-five feet (25) in height. The sign may be double faced and shall not exceed one hundred forty-four (144) square feet in surface area per face. The placement of a business center sign shall not result in any reduction in the number of signs or sign area otherwise permitted under the Ordinance for premises included within the business center, but shall result in all other free-standing signs being prohibited within the business center.
- (c) (c) One or more on-premises wall sign, directly or indirectly illuminated, with an aggregate surface per section 4.04 (1).

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (4) (4) Each business center with only two (2) commercial establishments shall be allowed:
- (a) (a) One (1) on-premises free-standing sign, directly or indirectly illuminated when such business center has at least one hundred (100) feet of street frontage. The sign may not exceed ten (10) feet in height. The sign may be double faced and shall not exceed eighty (80) square feet in surface area per face. The placement of a business center sign shall not result in any reduction in the number of signs or sign area otherwise permitted under the Ordinance for premises included within the business center, but shall result in all other free-standing signs being prohibited within the business center.
- (b) (b) The signs must have a clear vision area between three and one-half (3 ½) feet to eight (8) feet above the ground. Supporting columns shall not exceed ten and one-half (10 ½) inches in width or diameter.
- (c) (c) One on-premise wall sign, per frontage wall, directly or indirectly illuminated, with an aggregate surface per section 4.04(a).

Page 10, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.03 (4) There has been changes made

Old ordinance reads as follows:

- (5) (5) Each commercial center may be permitted:
 - (a) (a) One (1) on premises free standing sign for each street frontage directly or indirectly illuminated when such commercial center has at least one hundred (100) feet of street frontage. The sign may not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height, and if located less than ten (10) feet from the edge of the pavement, it must have a clear vision area between three and one-half (3 ½) to ten (10) feet. The sign may be double-faced and shall not exceed one hundred forty-four (144) square feet in surface area per face. The replacement of a commercial center sign shall not result in any reduction in the number of signs or sign area otherwise permitted under the ordinance for premises included within the commercial center and shall not prohibit other free standing signs on the individual parcels in the commercial center in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance.

The new ordinance will be changed as follows:

- (3) (3) Each commercial center may be permitted:
 - (a) (a) One (1) on premises free-standing sign for each street frontage directly or indirectly illuminated when such commercial center has at least one hundred (100) feet of street frontage. The signs may not exceed twenty (20) feet in height, and if located less than ten (10) feet back from the edge of the right-of-way, it must have a clear vision area between three and one-half (3 ½) to eight (8) feet above the ground. Supporting columns shall not exceed ten and one-half (10 ½) inches in width or diameter. The sign may be double-faced and shall not exceed one hundred forty-four (144) square feet in surface area per face. The replacement of a commercial center sign shall not result in any reduction in the number of signs or sign area otherwise permitted under the ordinance for premises included within the commercial center and shall not prohibit other free-standing signs on the individual parcels in the commercial center in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance.

There was some discussion in regards to the sentence in the new ordinance that reads: "Supporting columns shall not exceed ten and one-half inches in width or diameter." B. Smith indicated that by limiting the support columns, it made it impossible to place brick around the bottom. T. Tucker stated that the wording could be worked on. All agreed.

Page 10, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.03 (5) Temporary Grand Opening Signs

There was a slight change in the wording of Section 5(a).

The old ordinance is as follows:

- (a) (a) One grand opening may be permitted on site of the business within eight (8) weeks of receiving a Certificate of Occupancy. The sign shall be no larger than 35 square feet in surface area per side.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (a) (a) One grand opening sign may be permitted only on the site of the business within eight (8) weeks of receiving a Certificate of Occupancy.

The sign shall be no larger than thirty-five (35) square feet in surface area per side.

Page 11, Section III Signs Permitted

Section 3.03 (6) is a brand new section to the new ordinance.

(6) (6) Going Out of Business Signs:

Going out of business signs may be permitted for a period not to exceed fifteen (15) days.

Page 11, Section III Signs Permitted

There were some changes made to different paragraphs throughout this section.

The old ordinance reads as follows:

4.06 Signs Permitted – Off premises Signs. Off-premises, free-standing or wall signs including billboard signs are subject to the following restrictions:

- (1) (1) Off-premises signs may be permitted only on premises which are zoned Highway Service District, Light Industrial District, General Industrial District or Airport District. EXCEPTION: Off-premises signs are permitted in Office District if the signs are adjacent to U S or Interstate Highways.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

3.04: Signs Permitted – Billboard signs are subject to the following restrictions:

- (1) (1) Billboard may be permitted only on premises which are zoned Highway Service District, Industrial District, or Airport District.

The exception was omitted due to the fact that there are no more places in the Township along the expressways that are vacant which would allow for a billboard.

Page 11, Section III Signs Permitted

The next paragraph has a wording change.

The old ordinance reads:

- (2) (2) Such signs shall be multi-faced and shall not exceed six hundred seventy-two (672) square feet in surface area per face and shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height.

The new ordinance will read:

- (3) (3) Such signs shall be double-faced and shall not exceed six hundred seventy-two (672) square feet in surface area per face and shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height.

Page 11, Section III Signs Permitted

The 4th paragraph in the billboard section has added wording in it.

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (4) (4) Such signs shall be set back not less than fifty (50) feet from the road right-of-way; PROVIDED, however, that where such sign is located within one hundred (100) feet of a building, the sign shall not project past the front face of the building. PROVIDED FURTHER, HOWEVER, such signs shall be set back twenty (20) feet from the right-of-way of an interstate highway.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (4) (4) Such signs shall be setback not less than fifty (50) feet from the road right-of-way, as measured from the leading edge of the sign. Provided, however, that where such sign is located within one hundred (100) feet of a building, the sign shall not project past the front face of the building. Such sign shall have a minimum setback of twenty (20) feet from any side yard as measured to the leading edge of the sign.

The 5th paragraph in the billboard section has one change.

The old ordinance reads:

- (5) (5) Each off-premises signs shall be located so that the signs are spaced apart a distance of not less than seven hundred fifty (750) feet from another billboard on the same side of the street.

The new ordinance will read:

- (5) (5) Each billboard sign shall be located so that the signs are spaced apart a distance of not less than one thousand (1,000) feet from any billboard.

There was some discussion on this issue. It was brought to the attention of the Sign Committee that the state rules for billboards indicate that the 1,000 feet should be from the same side of the street. Everyone agreed that the wording should be added to the new ordinance as well. So the wording ...”from the same side of the street” should be added to the end of paragraph number 5 in the new ordinance.

Page 11, Section III Signs Permitted

3.04: Signs Permitted – Billboard signs

Paragraph 6 omitted the exception.

The old ordinance reads:

- (6) (6) Each off-premises sign shall be located so that it is spaced a distance of not less than a 500 foot radius from an on-premise sign, except when it is adjacent to an interstate highway.

The new ordinance will read:

- (6) (6) Each billboard sign shall be located so that it is spaced a distance of not less than a 500 foot radius from an on-premise sign.

Same page, Paragraph 7, has some wording changes and omitted the exception.

The old ordinance read:

- (7) Such signs must not be within five hundred (500) feet of an existing residential structure having principal frontage on the same side of the street unless separated by a natural barrier, unless under the same ownership.

The new ordinance will read:

- (7) (7) Billboard signs must not be within five hundred (500) feet of an existing residential structure having principal frontage of the same side of the street.

Page 12, Section IV Other Signs – No Permit Required

Old ordinance read as follows:

5.01 Signs Excluded. The following signs, except as in this Ordinance expressly included, shall be excluded from the requirements of this Ordinance.

New ordinance will read as follows:

The following signs are permitted in any district provided that all other standards of this article are met. A sign permit from the Building Official.

Page 12, Section IV Other Signs – No Permit Required

Paragraph 5 there was some wording changes.

The old ordinance read as follows:

- (5) (5) Flags bearing the official design of a unit of government, educational institution or, civil league or organization, fraternal benefit societies, orders or associations, or any organization operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (5) (5) A maximum of three (3) flags of insignia, per parcel, none of which exceed sixty (60) square feet in area, of any nation, state, township, community organization, or educational institution. Such flags must be displayed on a sign pole.

Same page, paragraph 7 has some slight changes as well.

The old ordinance states as follows:

- (7) Seasonal decorations and community event signs which advertise public entertainment or events of public interest, providing the placing of the signs shall be approved and the locations designated by the Chief Building Official. These signs shall remain in place for not more than twenty-one (21) days before and seven (7) days after the event and may not exceed thirty-two (32) square feet in area.

The new ordinance will state:

- (7) Seasonal decorations or on site community event signs which advertise public entertainment or events of public interest, providing the placing of signs shall be approved and the locations designated by the Chief Building Official. These signs shall remain in place for not more than twenty-one (21) days before and seven (7) days after the event and may not exceed thirty-two (32) square feet per face.

Page 13, Section IV Other Signs – No Permit Required

Paragraph 9 has some changes.

The old ordinance states as follows:

- (9) (9) Parking reservation signs not exceeding one (1) square foot in surface area and not exceeding six (6) feet in height.

The new ordinance will state:

- (9) Reserved parking signs not exceeding one and one half (1 ½) square feet in surface area and not exceeding six (6) feet in height.

Page 13, Section IV Other Signs – No Permit Required

Paragraph 10(a) has 1 change.

The old ordinance reads as follows:

- (a) (a) Construction signs in a residential district shall not exceed sixteen (16) square feet in surface area per face and shall be set back at least fifteen (15) from the road right-of-way.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (a) (a) Construction signs in a residential district shall not exceed sixteen (16) square feet in surface area per face and the leading edge of the sign must be set back a minimum of fifteen (15) feet from the road right-of-way, as not to create a traffic vision hazard.

Paragraph 12(b) also has a change.

The old ordinance reads as follows:

- (b) (b) Real estate signs in commercial area shall not exceed sixteen (16) square feet in surface area per face, nor exceed fourteen (14) feet in height, and shall be located entirely out of the road right-of-way.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

- (b) (b) Real estate signs in commercial area shall exceed sixteen (16) square feet in surface area per face, not exceed ten (10) feet in height, and the

leading edge of the sign shall be setback a minimum of fifteen (15) feet from the road right-of-way.

There was discussion regarding this issue. It was decided to change the sixteen square feet to 4 x 8.

Page 14, Section V Prohibited Signs

There was a wording change at the beginning of this section.

The old ordinance read:

6.01 Prohibited Signs. Notwithstanding any other provision of this ordinance, no sign shall be constructed, erected or maintained:

The new ordinance will read:

5.01: Prohibited Signs – A sign not expressly permitted by this Ordinance is prohibited. The following types of signs are expressly prohibited:

Page 14, Section V Prohibited Signs

G. Jamison indicates that the Code Enforcement Officer would like some items added to paragraph number 3.

The old ordinance read as follows:

(3) (3) Which consists of any of the following: banners, pennants, ribbons, streamers, strings of light bulbs, spinners, and elements creating sound.

The new ordinance will read as follows:

(3) Which consists of any of the following: banners, pennants, ribbons, streamers, strings of light bulbs, spinners, balloons, inflatable devices, and elements creating sound.

Page 14, paragraph 5 has items omitted.

The old ordinance read:

(5) (5) Which incorporates in any manner any flashing or moving lights other than time, temperature or stock market quotations.

The new ordinance will read:

(5) Which incorporates in any manner any flashing or moving lights.

Paragraph 6 also has items omitted.

The old ordinance read as follows:

(6) (6) Which is structurally unsafe, or constitutes a hazard to safety or health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation or abandonment, or is not kept in good repair or is capable of causing electrical shocks to persons likely to come in contact with it or vehicles colliding with it.

The new ordinance will read:

(6) (6) Which is structurally unsafe, or constitutes a hazard to safety or health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation or abandonment, or is not kept in good repair or is capable of causing electrical shock.

Paragraph 13 has been omitted completely.

This paragraph read as follows:

(13) (13) Which is not expressly permitted by this Ordinance or which violates any provision thereof.

Page 15, Section V Prohibited Signs

Paragraphs 15, 16 and 17 were all added to the new ordinance and are not found in the old ordinance.

They are as follows:

- (15) (15) Snipe Signs.
- (16) (16) Sandwich signs or hand held signs.
- (17) (17) Window signs which obstructs vision.

Chairman Ford asked that the meeting be rescheduled at this point to another night to finish going through the rest of the new ordinance.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, November 9, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Rowley, H. Blecker, D. Thompson,
L. Ford, J. Gazall, R. Ruhala, D. Arceo

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Washington, J. MacGillivray

STAFF PRESENT: G. Jamison, Chief Building Director
Richard Austin, Township Attorney

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Paul Bueche – City Manager for the City of Swartz Creek – addressed the Board regarding the SPR for I T T Educational Services. Asked the Board to please table the item due to the fact that there are items regarding the Sewer and Water (which are in the City of Swartz Creek), haven't been worked out yet. Also, the traffic that this project would generate would be significant enough that a traffic light would be needed.

Barb Vert – 4064 Moulton Drive – addressed the Board regarding 1048 West Bristol Road. She asked how does a Site Plan get revisited.

Attorney Austin stated that per Roberts Rules of Order, Section 35, since nothing has transpired with this case regarding time limits (in the Motion at the time of approval), then there are no time limits.

Mrs. Vert then asked if there is a time limit to how long a Site Plan have to be completed. Attorney Austin indicated that Mr. O'Leary says there is no time limit. G. Jamison said you have to start the Site Plan within one year of receiving approvals, but no time limit when to finish. Attorney Austin stated that there is a right to that land and there is due process.

H. Blecker asked if they could attach a time limit to a Motion. Attorney Austin indicated yes.

Section 4.8, of Ordinance #5500 addresses the issue of Validity of Approved Site Plan.

- (1) (1) Approval of the final site plan is valid for a period of one (1) year. If actual physical construction of a substantial nature of the improvements included in the approved site plan has not commenced and proceeded meaningfully toward completion during that period, the approval of the final site plan shall be null and void.**
- (2) (2) Upon written application, filed prior to the termination of the one (1) year review period, the Planning Commission may authorize a single extension of the time limit for approval of a final site plan for a further period for not more than one (1) year. Such extension shall only be granted based upon evidence from the applicant that the development has a likelihood of commencing construction within the extension period, the length of which shall be determined by the Planning Commission but which shall not exceed one (1) year.**

Adam Zittle – Zoning Manager for the City of Swartz Creek – addressed the Board regard the I T T Educational Services. He gave everyone an arial map of the Gander Drive area. Mr. Zittle indicated that there is a P U D planned across the street and a traffic study is being done for the Miller Road corridor. A street light is trying to be obtained for the corner of Gander and Miller. The street light cost is approximately \$135,000 for just the one light. Other lights are possible. Again asked that action be differred on this project.

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES:

October 12, 2006 Regular Meeting

October 26, 2006 Special Meeting

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to approve the minutes of October 12, 2006, and October 26, 2006, as printed. VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OLD BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1048 GEORGE ZERKA

LEGAL: 07-36-100-037

LOCATION: 1381 W. Bristol Rd.

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Revisit 6 ft. fencing along South & West sides

Michael O’Leary, Charter Township of Flint Deputy Building Inspector, addressed the Board. He indicated that the original Site Plan asked for vinyl white fencing along the South and West sides. The Building Department wrote a ticket.

L. Ford asked the petitioner why he didn't do what was asked by the Planning Commission when the project was approved on June 10, 2004. The petitioner indicated that his contractor is the one who agreed to the conditions, not him.

A drawing was reviewed by M. O'Leary and the Planning Commission as to what is on the property now. D. Rowley stated that he would be okay with fencing along Moulton Drive and East.

D. Thompson said doesn't care for fencing, and would rather have landscaping.

D. Arceo stated that the fence was ordered to preserve the privacy of the residents. He added that he doesn't care if it was his contractor who agreed to the fence or not. The Planning Commission puts restrictions and conditions on the Motion's for a reason, and the petitioner should've kept his promise.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #1048 regarding the fence issues contingent upon the fence being placed along the property line from Moulton Drive, East 181.5 +/-, and that the fence is solid vinyl and white in color.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER YES

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD NO

J. GAZALL YES

R. RUHALA YES

D. ARCEO YES

6 – YES, 1 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE #837 FLINT TOWNSHIP BUILDING DEPT

Zoning change from R-1D (Single Family Residential) to RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)

LEGAL: 07-36-528-021

LOCATION: 1105 W. Williamson Avenue

ZONING: R-1D (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Apartment

Michael O’Leary, Charter Township of Flint Deputy Building Inspector, addressed the Board. He indicated this property has been used as an apartment for the past 20 years. It was originally converted without permits and without the Building Department’s knowledge. He then went to the Zoning Board of Appeals and was denied the use. The original owner then sold the property to the current owner, George Dugdale. The Building Department has now written Mr. Dugdale a ticket and this matter is now in Court. The Court will not make a decision regarding this Case until the Planning Commission makes a decision.

The Building Department has received a letter from Dan Waldrow at 1114 W. Schmacher asking that this project be denied.

Audience

George Dugdale – current owner since 1981 – told the Board that he has been paying taxes on 2 units and now pays garage taxes on 2 units. Asked that this property be rezoned to make it right.

Jesse Waldron – 1122 W Williamson – asks that this project be denied. He showed pictures of other properties around the area of this home that Mr. Dugdale owns and all of them are slums. Pictures are in the file.

R. Ruhala asked if by zoning this property, would that be considered “spot” zoning. Mr. O’Leary indicated that it would be spot zoning.

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to deny Case #837 due to the fact that it is not consistent with the Master Plan.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
L. FORD	YES
J. GAZALL	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES

7 – YES, 0 - NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1106 WRIGHT & FILIPPIS

LEGAL: 07-10-400-011
LOCATION: 1101 N. Ballenger Hwy.
ZONING: C-1 (Local Business)
PROPOSED: Addition to existing facility

A letter was received from Jim Bays of Wright & Filippis asking to be tabled to the next regular meeting.

H. Blecker indicated that when the Plan Review Committee gathered to review the drawings, there weren't any to review. He suggested that the Building Department drafts a letter to all petitioners indicating that drawings are due 2 weeks prior to the meeting, and that County approvals are also required prior to approval.

There was discussion on the issue. The Building Department always tells the petitioners when the drawings are due in. It is the petitioner's responsibility to make sure that the drawings are here on time.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY H. BLECKER to table Case #1106 until December 14, 2006. VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1107 I T T EDUCATIONAL SERVICES INC

LEGAL: 07-31-100-002
LOCATION: 6359 Gander Drive
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Remodel of existing facility

**John Asselin, Asselin & Associates, and Mike White, Construction Manager, were both present to represent this project. Mr. Asselin indicated they are proposing to modify the interior of the building, and give a facelift to the exterior.
Flint Township Planning Commission**

The school hours would be 8:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. They are doing a traffic study as a courtesy to the City of Swartz Creek. The preliminary study does show less daily trips than a big box development. A school would have approximately 100 to 125 trips per day.

D. Arceo suggested that this case be tabled due to the fact that the drawings weren't in to the Building Department 2 weeks prior to the meeting so the Plan Review Committee could do their review.

Discussion continued.

D. Thompson stated that issue with water isn't something that this Board should be concerned about, it should be worked out between the Government Bodies.

J. Asselin indicated that they have a purchase agreement pending Site Plan approval. He doesn't need water from Swartz Creek. They have a tank and fire suppression. Traffic engineers are pointing out that this is all going to be okay for this project.

Mr. White pointed out that he has met with Chief Borse and the tank they have on site is a 90-gallon per minute tank. He has also spoke with Dave from D & H Fire Suppression and they are all okay with what is proposed.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to table Case #1107 until November 30, 2006.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON	NO
L. FORD	YES
J. GAZALL	YES
R. RUHALA	NO
D. ARCEO	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
H. BLECKER	NO

4 – YES, 3 – NO **MOTION CARRIED**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1108 NEXTEL WIRELESS

LEGAL: (Part of) 07-17-551-011

LOCATION: On Township Property, E side of Shirley between Reuben
& Corunna next to Fire Station #1

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Cellular Tower

Brad Riggs, of Nextel Wireless, was present to address the Board. He is proposing a 120 feet monopole with a 50 x 50 gravel fenced in compound.

Attorney Austin indicated to the Board that Ordinance #5500, Section 5.5, suggests that the setbacks are okay with 40 feet for the front yard.

Mr. Riggs stated that the tower would allow for 2 co-locators.

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #1108 contingent upon FAA approvals being submitted.

ROLL CALL:

J. GAZALL	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
L. FORD	YES

7 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1109 DR GHANEM ALMOUNAJED MD

LEGAL: 07-16-602-004 & 07-16-602-016

LOCATION: W side of Charter Drive between Town Center Pkwy &
Calkins Road

ZONING: O-1 (Office)

PROPOSED: Mid-Michigan Endoscopy Center

Mike Pifer, of Kraft Engineering was present to represent this project. This proposed new facility is located on Charter Drive just North of Town Center Parkway. This is a 12,000 square feet office with two accesses to Charter Drive. There is also a drop off and pick up area for patients. The landscaping will be according to Ordinance #5500, and includes landscaped islands.

The dumpster is located at the Southwest corner of the site and will be screened to match the exterior of the building. A monument sign is proposed to meet Ordinance #6021. The detention pond will be fenced due to the 4 feet in depth.

The project will start in early 2007.

J. Gazall asked if the pond could be spread out over Unit #5, maybe a kidney bean shape, so a fence will not be necessary. He added that there is plenty of room to spread it out, and fences aren't very attractive. H. Blecker agreed with J. Gazall.

M. Pifer indicated that due to the piping, etc., it would not be feasible to spread out the pond. Unit #5 will be used for another office eventually, and so they would like to keep it unoccupied.

Discussion continued regarding the issue of the pond. An underground pond was mentioned, however, according to M. Pifer, the cost would be between \$300,000 and \$350,000 to put in underground. It was discussed to even make the pond a focal point and turn it into a fountain. However, no agreement was reached.

MOTION BY D. THOMPSON, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #1109 contingent upon the following conditions: that Unit #5 has no curb cuts, that a wrought iron fence be used to surround the detention pond, and the all County approvals are submitted.

ROLL CALL:

R. RUHALA YES

D. ARCEO YES

D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER NO

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

J. GAZALL YES

6 – YES, 1 – NO MOTION CARRIED

H. Blecker indicated he would like to discuss with the Board the information he has received regarding the Master Plan. This discussion will be placed on the agenda for November 30, 2006, after the I T T Educational Services Site Plan Review.

L. Ford appointed a Sign Committee: R. Ruhala, D. Rowley & D. Thompson. They will come in to the Building Department and go over the proposed sign ordinance and make referrals back to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Special Meeting

Thursday, November 30, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, J. Washington, D. Thompson,

MEMBERS ABSENT:

D. Arceo, J. Gazall, R. Ruhala, J. MacGillivray
H. Blecker, L. Ford

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

P. Goodstein, Township Attorney

Vice Chairman Arceo called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Curtis Kelly – lives next door to Gander Mountain – stated that he is 100% in favor of this project & that it is a great use, however, would like to see a traffic light.

Paul Bueche – City of Swartz Creek, City Manager – Agrees that it is an excellent use. He submitted a letter (originally directed to John R. Tucker, Attorney representing I T T Tech) for the Planning Commission to review. An agreement has been reached between the two parties.

OLD BUSINESS: (Tabled from the November 9, 2006 meeting)

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1107 I T T EDUCATIONAL SERVICES INC

LEGAL: 07-31-100-002

LOCATION: 6359 Gander Drive

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Remodel of existing facility

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to remove Case #1107 from the table. VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

John Asselin, Architect, Mike White, Construction Manager, John Tucker, Attorney, were present to represent this project.

Attorney John Tucker stated that both parties have reached an agreement per the letter that was given to each Planning Commissioner. The letter indicates the following:

- (1) (1) The City's Traffic Engineer, Pete LaMourie, P.E. of Progressive A&E, Grand Rapids, stipulates to the findings of Tetra-Tech. I T T Tech will make improvements to Miller Road at the entrance of Gander Drive, consisting of the addition of a left turn lane and de-acceleration lane. Drawings and specifications are subject to approval by the City's General Engineer and Traffic Engineer. All costs associated with such improvements are the responsibility of I T T Tech.
- (2) (2) In the future, if and when a traffic signal is warranted, I T T Tech shall participate in a pro-rata cost share, based solely on its trip count impact. A separate agreement shall be entered into with the City that sets forth the details and conditions.
- (3) (3) The City will provide water to the I T T Tech site as a customer on its system, in accordance with the City Ordinance and City Engineering Specifications. Drawings and specifications shall be submitted to the City and approved by the City's Engineer. A separate agreement shall be entered into with the City that sets forth the details and conditions.

An email is attached to the letter submitted from Pete LaMourie, P.E. from Progressive A&E. The email points out the analysis and findings regarding the traffic study along Miller Road near Tallmadge Court.

Based upon their review, this is their findings:

- The expected volumes at the intersection meet standards thresholds for requiring construction of a center left turn lane on Miller Road to safely and efficiently process westbound left turn into the I T T site; and
- -The expected volumes meet thresholds for requiring an eastbound right-turn deceleration on Miller Road at the I T T site.

In addition to those findings, it is clear from a trip generation data in the report that the expected I T T traffic approaching the Miller/driveway intersection will not meet (or come close to meeting) warrants for installing a traffic signal. However, if future development on the North side of Miller Road with access to this intersection warrants a signal, this site should take part in funding such signalization given the benefits received.

D. Rowley asked if the traffic light would cost the Township anything. Mr. Bueche indicated that it would not cost anything to the Township.

Mr. Tucker added that I T T Tech would be paying for all road improvements.

MOTION BY J. GAZALL, SECOND BY D. ROWLEY to approve Case #1107 contingent upon all ordinances being followed and all items regarding the letter dated November 29, 2006, to John R. Tucker, Attorney, are addressed.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES

D. THOMPSON	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
J. GAZALL	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES

7 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Arceo discussed the letter that H. Blecker had given to each Planning Commissioner in regards rewriting the Master Plan. The letter is from ENP & Associates. H. Blecker met with Erin N. Perdu back in August to discuss our need of a consultant to provide some levels of service to assist you in defining the job, costs, etc. Then to actually conduct the planning process and write the plan.

Three items were discussed:

- 1) Defining the job and scope of work**
 - a. a. Identify problems with the existing plan**
 - b. b. Agree on what you want the plan to do and how do you want it to function**
 - c. c. Are there elements you would like to have that it currently doesn't?**
 - d. d. What does it have now that is unnecessary**

- 2) Identifying what areas of expertise you need for the job of developing the plan**
 - a. a. Experience with mature, built-out communities**
 - b. b. Is the size of firm important?**
 - c. c. Someone who can offer innovative techniques/approaches?**
 - d. d. Do you need/want GIS experience**
 - e. e. Develop reasonable cost estimates to target**

- 3) Assist with selecting a consultant to develop the new master plan**
 - a. a. Define the type of job you want to have done**
 - b. b. Sent of an RFQ (and write the letter)**
 - c. c. Compile a list of consultants to send the letter**
 - d. d. Review responses to the RFQ**
 - e. e. Develop the RFQ that specifically defines the scope of work, the deliverables, you goals for the plan, you desired timeline, and the desired qualifications of the consultant**
 - f. f. Conduct interviews**
 - g. g. Provide a recommendation on which consultant to hire**

It also indicates in the letter that the cost for these services would be approximately \$2,000-\$3,000 depending on the number of meetings.

MOTION BY J. GAZALL, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON for a resolution that we recommend hiring ENP & Associates for Master Plan Phase I, and that L. Ford write a letter to the Board of Trustees to amend the budget for \$3, 000.

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON	YES	
D. THOMPSON	YES	
D. ARCEO	YES	
J. GAZALL	YES	
R. RUHALA	YES	
J. MACGILLIVRAY		YES
D. ROWLEY	YES	

7 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED

Vice Chairman Arceo adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLINT PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, December 14, 2006 7:30 p.m.

1490 S. Dye Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Rowley, H. Blecker, J. Washington,
D. Thompson, L. Ford, J. Gazall, D. Arceo,

J. MacGillivray, R. Ruhala

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

G. Jamison, Chief Building Director

G. Borse, Fire Chief

R. Austin, Township Attorney

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Barbara Vert – 4064 Moulton – asked the Planning Commission about the Bristol Road Church of Christ’s sign. She indicated to them that the ZBA granted a variance and that the Church have not complied since day one. She has pointed this out and no one from the Building Department has done anything about it. She also has told the ZBA about it as well, and still nothing has been done about it.

L. Ford told Ms. Vert to go to the Building Department in the morning and have them check into it.

Ben Ramirez – 1427 Chissom Trail – opposes PUD Case #202

Ken Flourney – 5165 Squire Hill Drive – opposes PUD Case #202

APPROVAL / CORRECTION OF MINUTES:

November 9, 2006 Regular Meeting

November 30, 2006 Special Meeting

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to approve the minutes of November 9, 2006, and November 30, 2006 with the change to November 30, 2006 on Page 4 that the resolution say that the Planning Commission “recommend” we hire ENP. **VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

OLD BUSINESS: (Tabled from the November 9, 2006 meeting)

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1106 WRIGHT & FILIPPIS

LEGAL: 07-10-400-011
LOCATION: 1101 N. Ballenger Hwy.
ZONING: C-1 (Local Business)
PROPOSED: Addition to existing facility

The Building Department received a letter from James Bays asking for Case #1106 to be tabled until the next regular meeting on January 11, 2007.

MOTION BY J. WASHINGTON, SECOND BY J. GAZALL to table Case #1106 to January 11, 2007.

ROLL CALL:

D. ROWLEY YES
H. BLECKER YES
J. WASHINGTON YES
D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES
J. GAZALL YES
D. ARCEO YES
R. RUHALA YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT: CASE #202 EGRFL PARTNERSHIP

LEGAL: 07-08-200-003 and 07-08-200-013
LOCATION: Vacant Southwest corner of Beecher & Linden Roads

ZONING: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

PROPOSED: Planned Unit Development

George Rizik, Attorney at Law, represented Dr. Raj for this project. Mr. Rizik indicated that there is going to be a change with this plan. His client would like to turn in a rezoning application for the 28 acres to be rezoned. Ten acres to be C-2 (General Business), and the remainder to be O-1 (Office) with some allowance for a residential buffering.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding this issue. There are no drawings to look at regarding the rezoning or the PUD.

J. Gazall has several issues with this project including the traffic along Beecher Road.

D. Arceo indicated that there is nothing with Case #202 that is in compliance with what is listed in the ordinance.

Township Attorney Austin pointed out that according to Section 20.5, no preliminary information has been submitted, so the Planning Commission has the authority to deny Case #202.

Audience Members Opposing Project

Doug Kline – 1480 Dyemeadow Lane
Steve Armstrong – 1490 Dyemeadow Lane
Carolyne Pegues – 5114 Forestside Drive
Sharon Fouts – 5122 Forestside Drive
Shari Brock – 5072 Forestside Drive
Eleanor Brownell – 1402 Ox Yoke
Mike Issacson – 1435 Chissom Trail
Marilyn Lindman – 2054 Walden Ct.
Ray Anthony – 5018 Beecher Road
Greg Dunlop – 1423 Ox Yoke

The audience members indicated that they are opposed to anything on this corner lot due to traffic congestion. Most of them would like to see it left alone. One member of the audience indicated that there was a lot of vacant land and empty tenant spaces around the Township. We do not need to rezone more property.

MOTION BY D. ARCEO, SECOND BY D. THOMPSON to deny Case #202 for PUD due to the fact that it is not in compliance with Section 20.5.

ROLL CALL:

H. BLECKER YES

J. WASHINGTON YES

R. RUHALA YES
D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES
J. GAZALL YES
D. ARCEO YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #194 SAIRA SYED

LEGAL: 07-30-200-001
LOCATION: 6261 Lennon Road
ZONING: R-1C (Single Family Residential)
PROPOSED: Child Care Center (7-12 children)

**The petitioner asked that she be tabled until the next regular meeting.
MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to table Case #194 until January 11, 2007.**

ROLL CALL:

J. WASHINGTON YES
D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES
J. GAZALL YES
D. ARCEO YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
R. RUHALA YES
D. ROWLEY YES

H. BLECKER YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1110 THE E & L CONSTRUCTION GROUP

LEGAL: 07-29-400-060

LOCATION: 3400 Fleckenstein

ZONING: C-2 (General Business)

PROPOSED: Mobile MRI addition

D. Arceo indicated to the Board that his son works at this address and is abstaining. Township Attorney Austin stated that he did not have to abstain for that reason.

Greg Krueger, Vice President of E & L Construction Group, Steve Ketzbow of E & L Group, and Dr. Sweet of the medical facility were all present to represent this project to the Board. Mr. Krueger presented a sketch of mobile MRI unit approximately 14 x 80. It would be placed on a concrete pad with a canopy over the entrance and a deck walkway to the unit. The mobile MRI would be on site at this location on Mondays and Tuesdays only from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Due to the MRI's cost, it is shared with other facilities like theirs, and that is why the unit is only at this located for two days per week.

It is white in color and says "Mobile MRI" on the side of it. The utilities are located underground and are hooked up when the unit is pulled up to the site.

R. Ruhala asked is this type of facility was allowed in C-2 zoning. Township Attorney Austin indicated that Section 16.2(22) of Ordinance #5500 allows this facility in this zoning class.

H. Blecker is worried that this may set a precedent with trailers being pulled up to buildings. Some other members agreed. L. Ford asked the petitioner if a structure could be built to house the unit while the unit is there. J. Gazall asked if he could add landscaping to buffer the unit.

Discussion continued.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to approve Case #1110 contingent upon additional landscaping (trees, bushes, etc.), being added to hide the unit.

ROLL CALL:

D. THOMPSON YES

L. FORD YES

J. GAZALL YES

D. ARCEO	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE: CASE #195 BASSAM YOUSSEF

LEGAL: 07-29-400-021
LOCATION: 5142 Miller Road
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Drive thru window for Pharmacy

No audience members present for this case.

MOTION BY D. ROWLEY, SECOND BY J. WASHINGTON to table Case #195 until January 11, 2006 due the drawings being turned in two days before this meeting and the Board having to time to review them.

ROLL CALL:

J. GAZALL	YES
D. ARCEO	YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY	YES
R. RUHALA	YES
D. ROWLEY	YES
H. BLECKER	YES
J. WASHINGTON	YES
D. THOMPSON	YES
L. FORD	YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

SITE PLAN REVIEW: CASE #1111 BASSAM YOUSSEF

LEGAL: 07-29-400-021
LOCATION: 5142 Miller Road
ZONING: C-2 (General Business)
PROPOSED: Addition to existing facility

MOTION BY R. RUHALA, SECOND BY D. ARCEO to table Case #1111 to the January 11, 2007 meeting.

ROLL CALL:

D. ARCEO YES
J. MACGILLIVRAY YES
R. RUHALA YES
D. ROWLEY YES
H. BLECKER YES
J. WASHINGTON YES
D. THOMPSON YES
L. FORD YES
J. GAZALL YES

9 – YES, 0 – NO **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

D. Arceo stated that the next Plan Review meeting will be 12/28/06 at 2:00 p.m. and also that on February 15, 2007 there is a Planning Meeting at the Holiday Inn from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. that the Genesee Metro. Planning Commission is having. Mari Corrigan is to gather the information and send it to the Board Members.

L. Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.