

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING  
6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD  
FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433  
810-659-0800 FAX: 810-659-4212  
**SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
DATE: AUGUST 28, 2006 TIME: 7:00 P.M.  
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

**MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Mark J. Newman, Chair	Richard Buell
Jerome Doyle, Vice Chair	Ronald Flowers
Eric Swanson, Secretary	David Gibbs
Barry Pratt, Board of Trustee Representative	

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

**PRESENT:** Newman, Doyle, Buell, Flowers, Gibbs, Pratt, Fitch, and Morford

**ABSENT:** Swanson

**OTHERS PRESENT:** None

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** at 7:00 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Mark J. Newman with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.

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

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 14, 2006: DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Flowers to approve the Minutes of August 14, 2006 as amended. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**  
None

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. Review and Discussion regarding the 2006 Michigan Zoning Enabling Act**  
**NEWMAN** stated the 2006 Michigan Zoning Enabling Act had been discussed at length with Flushing Township **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON (ATTORNEY MOULTON)** at a recent Planning Commission Meeting. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** presented issues which he (Attorney Moulton) felt the township needed to do to the Ordinances to be in compliance with the new Act. **NEWMAN** stated present and past members of the Planning Commission should be complimented because, even though there is a lot of information in the new Act, there are very few changes Flushing Township has to make. There has been a level of focus and diligence

by staying on top of current issues and with the sophistication of the Flushing Township Planning Commission.

**NEWMAN** stated Doug Piggott of Rowe Inc had presented proposed changes to the ordinances to the Planning Commission in order to comply with the new zoning enabling act.

**NEWMAN REVIEWED THE ATTACHED PROPOSED CHANGES FROM ROWE INC.**

**ATTORNEY MOULTON’S OPINION**

**DOUG PIGGOT’S OPINION**

<p>Section 20-1801 Review Procedures – clean up of the Notice Provisions with amendments to Section 20-1801(b)(1)</p>	<p>Section 20-1801(b)(1): <b>Addition</b>. . including those outside the jurisdiction of Flushing Township. . .; <b>Deletion</b> of . . Notification need not be given to more than one (1) occupant of a structure, except that if a structure contains more than one (1) dwelling unit or spatial area owned or leased by different individuals, partnerships, businesses, or organizations, one (1) occupant of each unit or spatial area shall receive notice. In the case of a single structure containing more than four (4) dwelling units or other distinct spatial areas owned or leased by different individuals, partnerships, businesses, or organizations, notice may be given to the manager or owner of the structure who shall be required to post the notice at the primary entrance to the structure.</p>
<p>Section 20-2001 (a)(b)(c)</p>	<p>Amendments: (a) <b>change</b> from two (2) publications to one (a) (1) publication; (1) <b>change</b> from “first” to “The”; <b>change</b> from “more than thirty (30) nor less” to “fifteen (15) days”; (a)(2) <b>deletion</b> of (a)(2); former number 3 would now be number 2 which states “The notice shall include” with changes and additions based on the new act (a-e); (b) <b>update</b> to current technology: after pipeline “telecommunication” and after public utility company “and the manager of each airport”; (b)(1) <b>change</b> from “first calls” to “first class mail”; <b>change</b> from “twenty (20) days” to “fifteen (15) days”; (c) <b>clarification</b> of <b>all</b> structures instead of single and two family dwellings; addition of structures; addition of “including those outside the jurisdiction of</p>

	Flushing Township”; (c)(1) <b>change</b> of eight (8) days to “fifteen (15) days”; (c)(3) <b>addition</b> of “Notification of surrounding property owners and occupants does not apply to rezoning requests involving 11 or more adjacent parcels” – if there is ten (10) or fewer, different procedure has to take place; (f) <b>addition</b> of “If the Township Board chooses to hold a public hearing on the proposed amendment, they must comply with the notice requirements outlined in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) above. If the Township Board wishes to make any changes to the ordinance before adopting it, they may, at their option, resubmit the amendment to the Planning Commission for further review”
Section 20-2002 Notice of Adoption	New Section “Notice of Adoption”
Currently there is a Section 20-2002 entitled “Fees”	(This would be at the Board of Trustees level when the Board adopts the zoning).
Section 20-2001 (f) is a “refer back” and an option of the Township Board of Trustees to make a decision or refer the matter back to the Planning Commission.	
SECTION 20-2003 DOES NOT EXIST.	
Section 20-2208 Variance Review Procedures	(a)(1) <b>Addition</b> of “The ZBA may only consider non-use variances, and may not grant use variances. Reference was also made concerning number 604; (a)(4) reference back to 20-1801 Notices – with addition of “Not less than fifteen (15) days before the meeting the township clerk shall provide notice as required in Section 20-1801 of this ordinance”; the rest of the paragraph will be deleted.
Section 20-2209 Appeals Procedures	(b)(4) <b>addition</b> of “. . .dealing with specific parcels of land including. . .”

**COMMENTS REGARDING 20-1801:**

- **NEWMAN** stated a very important part of the language to the Act was the addition of the 300 feet “including those outside the jurisdiction of Flushing Township.”
- **JERRY FITCH (FITCH)** stated Flushing Township would notify the neighboring township and it would be up to the neighboring township to notify individual property owners in the neighboring township.
- **FITCH** wanted to know what would happen if, for example, Hazelton Township had something going on M-13 (Sheridan Road) and they (Hazelton Township) sent the Notice

to Flushing Township, not to the property owners. If Flushing Township turned around and sent notices to the property owners, in Flushing Township, the notices would be received by the property owners before the meeting, but would not comply with the Act requirements.

- **BUELL** felt Flushing Township would be responsible for notifying the property owners in the particular jurisdiction. **NEWMAN** interpreted the language to read there had to be notice to all the property owners, and that it did not go to the jurisdictional body.
- **FLOWERS** stated the wording stated “occupants of all structures”; it would mean that all homes within three hundred (300) feet whether they are in Flushing Township or another jurisdiction, should receive the notice.
- **BUELL** wanted to know if the Flushing Township Clerk called the Hazelton Township Clerk would the Hazelton Township Clerk fax the names of Hazelton Township property owners to the Flushing Township Clerk? **BUELL** stated he would be very upset if he (Buell) lived in one township and across the street, in another township, construction was taking place and Buell had not received a Notice.
- **NEWMAN** stated the way he understood **ATTORNEY MOULTON’S** interpretation of the language was the Notice did not have to be sent to a specific occupant and addressed “Occupant” at unit a, b, etc for an apartment building.
- **NEWMAN** stated for a single family dwelling, the Notice was sent to the property owner.
- **MORFORD** wanted to clarify for future communication that if someone lived in another township, but was within the three hundred (300) foot distance, should there be a notice sent to the township clerk or to each individual property owner.
- **DOYLE** felt the language meant Flushing Township should notify the other township clerk and they, the other township, would notify the property owners in that particular jurisdiction.
- **NEWMAN** quoted *2006 Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, page 8, number 3, Special Land Use and Planned Use Development Procedures* which stated:

“As with the existing TZA, the new ZEA technically does not impose the new requirements for notice of a public hearing. Both laws actually require only notice of the request (application) for special land use approval, and of the right of the applicant or a property owner/occupant within 300 feet of the subject property to request a public hearing on the application.”
- **PRATT** quoted *Section 20-1801(b)(1)*. . . published in a newspaper which circulates in the township and sent by mail, or personal delivery to the owners of property. . .”  
**PRATT** felt that Flushing Township should be mailing the notice to the individual property owner. Even if the township is not legally bound, Flushing Township would have done everything in its power to notify the property owners.
- **GIBBS** felt the “other township” should be notified and then the township clerk would be responsible for getting the notices to the property owners.
- **NEWMAN gave specific details as to the notice:**
  1. all zoning application hearing notices must be published once in the newspaper, at general circulation, at least fifteen (15) days before the date.

2. the notice must describe the nature of the zoning request application or actions and state the time, date, and place of the meeting.
  3. the property that is subject of the request should be indicated.
  4. if the request involved ten (10) or fewer adjacent properties, they must include a list of all existing street addresses within the property.
  5. when and where written comments would be received must be indicated.
  6. for all other zoning notices, if the request involved ten (10) or fewer adjacent properties, or a request for a Zoning Board of Appeals interpretation of the zoning ordinance or appeal administrative decision, the notice must also be sent by mail or personal deliver to owners of property for which the approval is being considered.
  7. all persons to whom real property has been assessed within three hundred (300) feet of the property, occupants to all structures of three hundred (300) feet of the property regardless of whether the property or the occupant is located within the township and if the name of the occupant is not known, the term “occupant” may be used.
- **NEWMAN** felt sending the notice to the township clerk of another township, would not be sufficient. The key triggering factor would be the “ten (10) or fewer adjacent properties”. In most instances there would be less than ten (10) properties that would be “adjacent” to each other.
  - **BUELL** wanted to know if “adjacent” meant across the road? **PRATT** stated the dictionary stated adjacent as “next to”.
  - **NEWMAN** felt the idea of “ten (10) or fewer” meant if there was a dense urban area, there would be more than ten (10) properties within three hundred (300) feet.
  - **BUELL** stated in *Section 20-1001(b)*, where railroads were mentioned, there had been a name change filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.
  - **NEWMAN** felt the railroads should register, like the airports, with the township in order to receive a notification of a Planning Commission action.
  - **DOYLE** wanted to know if the language was just for the registration of airports or was it for everything; the registration of airports had been mentioned at the end of the sentence in the Act.
  - **NEWMAN** felt it would not be fair for the township to have to keep track every time the railroad changed its name; same would apply for Consumers Energy. **NEWMAN** felt the language could apply to all public utilities, railroads, and airports and far as registering with the township.
  - **BUELL** wanted to know if Buckeye Pipeline registered with the township; **MORFORD** stated she heard from Buckeye occasionally but nothing had come in writing requesting to be registered.
  - **PRATT** felt **ATTORNEY MOULTON** should be contacted regarding the questions such as if all had to register or just the airport.
  - **NEWMAN** stated he reviewed *Section 20-2001(f)* which would be a “refer back” and an option of the Township Board of Trustees to make a decision or “refer back” to the Planning Commission.
  - **FLOWERS** stated *Section 20-2003* did not exist. What is being stated in *Section 20-2001* would be considered a “Special Meeting” with the fees being set by the Board of Trustees.

- **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS** felt that proposed *Section 20-2002* should actually be *Section 20-2003*.
- **FITCH** felt with proposed *Section 20-2002* there would be a time frame of fifteen (15) days for the adoption publication.

**COMMENTS REGARDING SECTION 20-2208:**

- **NEWMAN** inquired if, as of February 15, 2006, Flushing Township had an ordinance that used the specific phrase “use variance” or “variances from use of land” to express the authorization of the granting of use variances by the ZBA or if before February 15, 2006, the Township actually granted a use variance.
- **FLOWERS** stated the interpretation of the section, at a recent MTA seminar, was if the ZBA had issued a use variance prior to February 15, 2006, the ZBA could go ahead and continue to issue use variances.
- **FITCH** stated that at one time ZBA granted use variances, but was eliminated by an ordinance in 1995 when use variances were taken out of the ZBA and turned over to the Planning Commission. (Example: earth removal permits etc.)
- **NEWMAN** stated the township appeared to be a township that had granted use variances prior to February 15, 2006; if that was the case, the township may exercise use variance authority after July 1, 2006.
- **PRATT** felt the issue was left up to the township; **NEWMAN** stated it was a “may” situation.
- **BUELL** stated if the issue was negative and permissive, why would the Board of Trustees not choose to make it so that the ZBA could not. **NEWMAN** stated that Rowe was proposing to make the situation so the ZBA could only do “non-use” variances. (Stated in *Section 20-2208 (a) (1)*).

**COMMENTS REGARDING 20-2209:**

- **NEWMAN** stated *Section 20-2209 (b)(4)* would apply to any decision that was made where it clarified that it would be dealing with specific parcels including the Planning Commission, instead of every decision that would be appealed. Notices would only be sent out when it involved “specific parcels” of land.

**2006 MICHIGAN ZONING ENABLING ACT Packet, page 8, number 4, Zoning Board of Appeals Alternates:**

- **NEWMAN** stated the Township does not provide for alternates.
- **FLOWERS** stated the alternates would be involved if there were only five (5) members; Flushing Township has five (5) members.
- **FITCH** stated the Alternates specifically deal with the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- **NEWMAN** stated the statute states “the legislative body may appoint” not more than two (2) alternate members for the same term as regular members to the Zoning Board of Appeals in the absence of a regular member if the regular member would be unable to attend one (1) or more meetings. The alternate member appointed would serve in the case until a final decision was made.

- **FITCH** stated he couldn't remember any time when there wasn't a quorum with the Zoning Board of Appeals, in order to make a decision.
- **NEWMAN** felt the alternates were not an issue and recommended the language not be drafted.
- **FLOWERS** stated the issue would be a Board of Trustees issue.

#### **NONCONFORMING USES OR STRUCTURES:**

- **FITCH** stated that **ATTORNEY MOULTON** wasn't sure if there had to be adjustments in the Zoning Ordinance or not.
- **FITCH** stated the Right to Appeal non conforming uses must be added (2006 Michigan ZEA packet, page 12, Part A. Regulations. Per **ATTORNEY MOULTON**, 2006 MTA ZEA packet, page 12, 6A Regulations, Section 208(2) states:  
“the township **may** provide in a zoning ordinance for the completion, **resumption**, restoration, reconstruction, extension, or substitution of **nonconforming uses or structures** upon terms and conditions provided in the zoning ordinance.” MCL 125.3208
- **FLOWERS** made reference to a concern where a building burned down, could it be rebuilt in a non-conforming area; **DOYLE** stated there was a percentage of loss.
- **NEWMAN** quoted **ATTORNEY MOULTON** who stated:  
“under the current ordinance if a non-conforming use is discontinued it is done, you cannot go back and resume the use. The issue could be attributed to a natural act where it would be too harsh on the property owner to say that he would have to immediately comply with what the zoning ordinance now required; the non-conforming use could be continued. But over a period of time, the uses would dissipate and everything in the area would be conforming. If someone was grieved with a decision on a non-conforming use, the individual could appeal direct to Circuit Court (Section 607 of the ZEA) within a thirty (30) day time limit. It was recommended placing the language listed under Destruction of Structure, *Section 20-313(a)*.”
- **NEWMAN** read *Section 20-313 Maintenance of Non Conforming Uses* which stated:  
“Nothing in this chapter shall prevent the renovation or repair of non structural members, or the maintenance of a non conforming structure made necessary by ordinary wear and tear, provided the cost per year of such repair or maintenance does not exceed twenty-five (25) percent of the value of the structure as determined by its state-equalized valuation.”
- **NEWMAN** read *Section 20-312 Destruction of Structure* which stated:  
“Nothing in this chapter shall prevent the restoration, rebuilding, or repairing of any non conforming structure, or a structure housing a non conforming use, which structure has been damaged by fire, acts of God, or any act of a public enemy, subsequent to December 5, 1989, in amount up to and including sixty-five (65) percent of the replacement value of the structure as determined by

an assessment board consisting of a qualified appraiser appointed by the Township Board, another by the owner of the structure, and a third appointed by the first two (2) appointees, with the cost of such appraiser shared equally by the township and the owner, and provided that the restoration or repairing shall have commenced and is diligently pursued within one (1) year after the date of destruction. Any non-conforming structure, or a structure housing a non-conforming use which has been damaged by fire, acts of God, or any act of a public enemy in an amount greater than sixty-five (65) percent of replacement value may be rebuilt only if it meets existing zoning regulations and any use housed by the structure must also conform to the existing regulations.”

**IT WAS DETERMINED:**

1. to ask Rowe for a clarification of the language and of *Section 20-2209* Appeals Procedures “dealing with specific parcels of land including”
2. to correct typos “jurisdiction”
3. to clarify the interpretation of the Statute of whether only the airports have to register or do all the entities have to register with the townships.

**2. Review and Discussion of Transportation per the Master Plan**

**NEWMAN** stated the Transportation Section, page 7 of the Master Plan, involved such issues as Traffic Counts.

- **DOYLE** stated the rationale of the Master Plan was to be concerned about different areas of the township.
- **DOYLE** felt there should be a listing of what the goals and directions of the Planning Commission were for the Township. If there was something on the prior “Goals” that had not transpired, it should be taken off the “Goals” list.
- **DOYLE** stated if there needed to be a new road or highway, it was up to the Genesee County Road Commission.
- **FLOWERS** stated when he was first placed on the Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Committee, Flushing Township wasn’t listed on the metro transportation planning list. There weren’t any roads that would be affected by the metro alliance transportation plan. Some long range plans for the Metropolitan Planning Commission:
  1. Linden Road was the West boundary line for the transportation plan; Federal dollars were not available for anything on the other side.
  2. less than ten (10) years ago, the transportation boundary line was moved to include North/South Elms Road.
  3. in the last five (5) years, the Flint River has become the boundary on McKinley Road extending almost to River Road.
  4. anything in the township from McKinley Road East is now included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan which would now be qualified for federal funding on road projects and things of that particular nature.



5. Elms Road will one day be another Linden Road; the new four (4) lanes and turn lane at Corunna Road will be extending North.
- **NEWMAN** wanted to know why the metro planning area didn't go all the way to M-13 (Sheridan Road). **FLOWERS** stated the area was based on projections and population. The City of Flushing is included in the area; the City of Flushing qualified for federal funds for roads. **NEWMAN** stated a lot of tax dollars fly out of the community and never come back.
- **FLOWERS** stated when the 20/30 Transportation Plan was available he would give a map to everyone, which has been projected to be the Metro Area Transportation of Interest.
  1. traffic jams are a major problem in the area:
    - a. Elms Road and Coutant Road
- **FLOWERS** stated that at one time there was a distance of twenty-five (25) miles from the Detroit Metropolitan Area and the Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Area; currently seven (7) miles separates the two planning areas.
- **BUELL** wanted to know if bicycle paths fell under the heading of transportation; **FLOWERS** stated it was part of the non-motorized transportation plan.
- **NEWMAN** stated the current Master Plan is an interesting recitation of traffic flow and one recommendation of the Master Plan would be for more common or shared driveways to be used instead of having so many driveways.
- **DOYLE** stated the shared driveways was mainly for commercial uses; Flushing Township does not have that many commercial uses.
- **FITCH** stated there aren't that many commercial uses in Flushing Township. If Elms Road was proposed to be widened to four (4) or five (5) lanes perhaps the Planning Commission should look at future development. There possibly could be problems with Flagstone (Flint Township – Elms Road) if the road should be widened. The homes are very close to the roads. Other roads that would be affected:
  1. parts of River Road
  2. parts of Flushing Road
  3. parts of Pierson Road
  4. Carpenter Road currently is not a primary road

**NEWMAN** wanted to know if after reviewing and discussing the Master Plan, was there anything that needed to be changed in the Master Plan? **FLOWERS** felt updates at the appropriate time would be all that was necessary.

There needed to be some changes made within the Transportation, Master Plan, Traffic Counts:

1. the traffic flow on Carpenter Road by the new Flushing Middle School
2. **PRATT** reviewed Page 10, last paragraph:

“Two other locations on Elms Road are approaching a LoS grade of C/D. One location is between Flushing and Pierson (ADT of 10461) the other is between Coutant and Pierson (ADT of 10373). A 15% increase in traffic volume would place the LoS of Elms Road at C/D at the two locations”  
(from 1991 to 1996 there was a 1.7% decrease when the report was made)
3. Traffic, Master Plan, page 9, last paragraph:

“Three (3) locations experienced a slight decline in ADT’s over the seven year period. One of these was on Pierson Road between Dillon Road and the City Limits, another was on Elms Road between Coutant and Pierson, and the third was on McKinley Road between Carpenter and Pierson Roads.”

3. **PRATT** stated Flushing Township would suffer changes at the township level to accommodate the rest of the county.
4. **FLOWERS** stated the traffic would also increase with the new Wal-Mart in Vienna Township.

**CONCLUSION ON TRANSPORTATION:**

**NEWMAN** stated Transportation had been reviewed and discussed; at the current time there are no critical issues that needed to be addressed.

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**8:54 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

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

**VII. BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. **BUELL** felt it would be valuable periodically for the Flushing Township Planning Commission to meet with the City of Flushing Planning Commission regarding their thoughts and aspirations for the future. **NEWMAN** will contact City Manager Dennis Bow and discuss the issue.
2. **FLOWERS** stated there are future plans for the Bike Path Committee to meet; in the future an individual would be able to take a bike ride from Flushing to Clio etc. There are bike path maps available. The next time the Road Commission repaves McKinley Road, a ribbon along the side the road would be added for a bike path. A certain percent of funds that come in every year are designated for non-motorized uses. Funds are also available for sidewalks in the township; there was a recommendation to have sidewalks at the new middle school.
3. **FLOWERS** stated the Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission would be holding a Planning Forum for local planning commissioners on Saturday, October 21, 2006 from 8:30 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. at the Mass Transit Office, Dort Hwy at I-69, in Flint, Michigan.
4. **PRATT** stated, in the Summer Zoning Seminars in Frankenmuth, it was stated the ZEA must have a “Finding of Fact” for special land use issues:
  - **NEWMAN** stated that if a case went to Circuit Court, which there is a provision in the ZEA, the Court would sit and have no idea why the Flushing Township Planning Commission made a particular decision. The Court could also pull out the “Finding of Fact” or could start from the beginning to determine the courts own decision. It would be the responsibility of the Chair or Vice Chair to make sure the records have been clear and why the decisions were made.

- **DOYLE** stated the Planning Commission's decision was based on the fact the information on the Check List was ok in one category but not in some other category; the information had to be correct.
  - **NEWMAN** stated the motion should state clear specifics in case someone should come back and challenge the Planning Commission's decision, the record would be clear that the Planning Commission found the decision to be consistent with the Master Plan and would not be overly burdensome.
  - **BUELL** recommended having a "skeleton motion" to follow which would include all the information that would be needed for a "Finding of Fact"
  - **PRATT** stated, at the seminar, there was a step by step procedure through the ordinance for the "Finding of Fact" which he felt the Planning Commission should follow. There was a discussion between the Planning Commission members as to the procedure to make sure everything was clear with the ordinances and with the decisions of the Commission. **PRATT** felt maybe the Planning Commission should get more structured with the Findings of Fact with each request.
  - **DOYLE** stated that at each Planning Commission meeting the applicant has been asked if he has a copy of the ordinance, has read the ordinance, and does he understand the ordinance. The conditions would then make the request acceptable or non acceptable. The conditions then are reviewed to make sure the concerns are taken care of; the Check List is then reviewed. The Planning Commission is supposed to be intelligent enough to take the ordinance, use it, and make decisions based on the ordinance.
  - **NEWMAN** stated that in the future, if everyone would bear with him, he would incorporate, after someone made a detailed motion and after discussion if the request is approved or rejected, would give the matter the best effort to state "the Planning Commission found the following when reviewing the application; a check list and skeleton list could be used. The request was approved under the ordinance with the following conditions: 1) 8,000 lbs of gravel, 2) widen the roadway back, 3) etc.
5. **DOYLE** stated the Check List could be updated.
  6. **PRATT** stated the permission to go on someone's property needed to be updated. **FITCH** stated he made everyone aware there might be a Planning Commission member's car in their driveway checking out the appropriate request.
  7. At the Special Planning Commission Meeting on Monday, September 25, 2006, a list of the items that needed to be worked on would be addressed

#### **VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, THERE COULD BE A SPECIAL MEETING ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, THERE COULD BE A SPECIAL MEETING ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, **CHAIR MARK NEWMAN** adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARK J. NEWMAN, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Approval

Planningminutes 082806