

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING  
6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD  
FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433  
810-659-0800 FAX: 810-659-4212  
***SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING***  
DATE: NOVEMBER 28, 2005 TIME: 7:00 P.M.  
WEB ADDRESS <http://www.gfn.org/flushing/index.html>

**MEMBERS OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Aaron Bowron, 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:** Bowron, Doyle, Swanson, Buell, Flowers, Gibbs, Pratt, Fitch, and Morford

**ABSENT:** None

**OTHERS PRESENT:** None

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

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

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2005: DOYLE MOVED**, seconded by Pratt to approve the Minutes of November 14, 2005 as corrected. MOTION CARRIED.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**  
None

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **Round Table Discussion for Plan of Action for 2006 Special (Workshop) Meetings**

**BOWRON** stated that after a discussion regarding Planning Commission Special Meetings, with Township Treasurer Carl Liepmann, there were five (5) remaining Special Meetings remaining after the present meeting, since the last budgeted fiscal year.

**OPENING REMARKS:**

- Section 9 of the Township Planning Act mandates that “at least every five (5) years after adoption of the Master Plan, the Planning Commission shall review the Plan and determine whether to commence the procedure to amend the Plan or adopt a new Plan.
- On January 12, 2004, the Planning Commission, with the assistance of its Planner, issued a report on the five (5) year review of the 1992–2012 Flushing Township Master Plan.
- On January 13, 2004, the Planning Commission held the determination that the five (5) year report was as follows:

“Based on the study by the Planning Commission and the recommendation of the Planner, the Planning Commission at this time does not find a need to update the Plan and confirms the current Plan as Township Master Plan.”

“**SWANSON MOVED**, seconded by Buell to approve the report by the Flushing Township Planning Commission on the Five Year Review of the 1992-2012 Flushing Township Master Plan with the amendment recommended that the Plan be looked at in two (2) years for possible update.” MOTION CARRIED.

- The time has come to review the Master Plan to make sure that everything is still current.
- The Township Planning Act specifies a review at five (5) year intervals.

**After much round table discussion, it was determined the potential future items for the Agenda for Special Workshop Meetings for 2006 would be:**

1. *Review of the Master Plan*
2. *Lighting Ordinance in General*  
Article XXIX, Section 20-1902 (k), Site Plan Review Requirements:  
(k) The location, intensity and orientation of all lighting.  
Article XXIX, Section 20-1907 (g), Environment  
(g) Any buildings, fences, lighting, vegetation of other features that are introduced into the landscape should be designed to complement the site’s surrounding environment and enhance the positive features of the project.
  - a. a lot of people in township have large lights on pole barns
  - b. concern to see if there is a need for a lighting ordinance
3. *Section Three of the Master Plan – Goals and Policies – Natural Features – Problem Statements*  
No. 10) There is potential for inappropriate development in areas with natural features such as flood plains, wetlands, steep slopes and wood lots that are environmentally sensitive and need to be protected.
  - a. ordinance currently does not further the goal in any substantial way.

- b. a wetland ordinance had been investigated by the Center of Applied Environmental Research at the University of Michigan to review costs to examine the material.
- c. flood plains, steep slopes and wood lots are very sensitive and need to be protected; if not going to take any action, the items should not be in the Master Plan.

**BOWRON** stated that in reviewing the check list for the Jennings Realty a few items were not in place:

- Article VI, Section 20-600 (e) (5) refers:
  - 5) A completed Environmental Assessment Worksheet
    - a. an assessment worksheet was never provided to the township from the planners
    - b. the environmental assessment worksheet should be addressed so that every petitioner has to fill a worksheet out, since the ordinance required the information.
- Article XIX, Section 20-1902 (s) and (t) Site Plan Review Requirements:
  - (s) Submission of the “Hazardous Substances Reporting Form for Site Plan Review.”
  - (t) Submission of the “State/County Environmental Permits Checklist.”
    - a. the material has been mentioned in the ordinances.
    - b. the conditions for approval of the site plans would be satisfying all the County, State or Federal environmental permits.

**7:21 P.M. - OPENED TO THE PUBLIC FOR ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION:**

**Continued Items to be added to the Plan of Actions for 2006:**

- 4. *“Sign Locations” and the lighting of the signs*
- 5. *Stake Surveys*
  - a. circumstances when a survey would be required.
  - b. there would be a hard time enforcing set back ordinances when the individual was not sure where the property line was located.
  - c. no problem with fence ordinances
  - d. most problems are with the house
    - 1. problems when someone is purchasing a home where there are no mortgages – a mortgage on a home requires a survey which is paid for by the purchaser.
    - 2. a staked survey is a must.
  - e. what is the responsibility of the township to the citizen concerning his personal property.
    - 1. would it be a legitimate thing for the township to tell a resident he/she has to have a survey of their lot?

2. should township intercede between neighbors or just let the neighbors fight it out.
- f. the Land Division Act requires the Assessor to have an accurate legal description of the divided property.
- g. past history has been that the accuracy, of the survey and where the stakes were located, was left up to the property owners.
- h. meets and bounds has been used for platted property. Example: If there is a platted lot and it is Lot 47 of Eastview Estates it already has been surveyed.
- i. would the problem be so great that it would justify imposing the survey cost on all future home builders?
- j. grading ordinances could always be changed but if an individual wanted to build an addition to his home, and the survey had been wrong, the township could be in the middle of the argument since the building inspector issued the permit.
- k. it would be impossible to enforce setbacks if one did not know what he was setting back from.
- l. the smaller the partials, the bigger the problem.
- m. for the last hundred (100) years the method of measurement has been the same – apparently some were not recorded properly.
- n. when the 1835 survey was completed, there are two (2) dividing lines and descriptions for Michigan – Meridian Road, East of Owosso, is the North/South boundary line; the East/West boundary line is South of Flushing.
- o. during a recent re-monumentation of Flushing, the one hundred (100) year survey showed a pointed rock, for measurement, at the corner of McKinley Road and Stanley Road – the pointed rock is located approximately three and one-half (3 ½) feet down and it does correctly check with the North and South boundary line. Also the Flint River, which flows through Flushing Township, was not as wide as it was a hundred (100) years ago.
- p. if an individual was going to pay \$40,000 to \$50,000 for a parcel of land, it would be easier to spend a small amount for a survey and make it worth while, verses \$35,000 or \$40,000 and have the wrong measurement.
- q. would the buyer or seller pay for the survey?
- r. the distinction for a survey would be: 1) if someone wanted to split an eighty (80) acre parcel, a survey should be required; 2) if a subdivision was involved, the property would already have been surveyed; 3) banks would require a mortgage survey.
- s. staked surveys are a growing problem as there are so many houses that are being built in the middle of five (5) and ten (10) acre

- partials; eventually half of the property would be sold as the property owners could not take care of the whole acreage.
- t. contradiction of survey companies dealing with square footage differences.
  - u. a staked survey would head off problems – not everyone that comes into the office would have to have a staked survey at the time the property is divided.
  - v. public input would be needed.
  - w. a lot of farms in the Township have been sold by an agreement: Example: when there are two (2) farms, the two (2) owners declare where their property line would be located, and with the exchange of money, the agreement as to the property line is settled. The agreement could not be changed as it was agreed upon by the two (2) property owners.
  - x. the term “title acquired through adverse possession” has been defined as open, continuous for the statutory period, and hostile.
  - y. the additional cost of a survey of individual lots, from the sales perspective, could retard home sales in Flushing Township.
  - z. it would almost be a necessity to do surveys for splits.
6. *Cost of Density* – loss of density and sprawl
- a. would cut out the affordability of land to all levels of people.
  - b. consensus that smaller, more clustered (dense) development would be the way to go which would preserve open space.
  - c. minimum lot sizes or density are the two (2) reasons most developers come to the Planning Commission.
    - 1. individuals have own septic and water systems with larger lot sizes.
    - 2. Planning Commission should review the minimum lot sizes as to how the State of Michigan reviews the issue; does Flushing Township really want minimum lot sizes.
    - 3. open space
7. *Vision for Future Development* – if a different type of development is encouraged along Seymour Road in the City of Flushing, what kind of implications would it have on Pierson Road (City and Township) and the Southern part of Flushing Township to Potter Road, which is the southern township boundary line. There could be a joint meeting with the City of Flushing and Flushing Township’s planners to review the vision of the future for the City of Flushing.
8. *Site Regulations* - problems with roof pitches for trailers. Modular homes generally meet standard codes. The mobile home criteria should be brought in line with the current ordinance. There are different codes for stick-built homes verses modular homes. Stick built homes increase in

value over the years. Reference was made to Article IV, Site Regulations 20-404 (8), One Family Dwelling Regulations.

CONSENSUS WOULD BE TO BALANCE THE PRIVATE INTEREST WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

**8:29 P.M. CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC FOR ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION**

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

8:30 P.M. – Open to the Public for Non-Agenda Items

8:30 P.M. – Closed to the Public for Non-Agenda Items

**VII. BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. There will be an election of officers at the December 12, 2005.
2. Due to the 2006 MTA Educational Conference being held the week of January 24-27, 2006, the Planning Commission could possibly have a Special Workshop Meeting on Monday, January 30, 2006.

**VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE:**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2005 AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING - AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, THERE WILL NOT BE A SPECIAL (WORKSHOP) MEETING ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 26, 2005.**

**REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**PROPOSED SPECIAL MEETING – MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, **BOWRON** adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting at 8:34 p.m.

---

AARON BOWRON, Chair

---

JULIA A. MORFORD, Recording Secretary

---

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

---

Date of Approval