

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING

6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD

FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433

810-659-0800

FAX: 810-659-4212

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: APRIL 12, 2010

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

John Cuddeback

Eric Swanson, Secretary

Ronald Flowers

Mark Purkey, Board of Trustee Representative

Julia A. Morford, Recording Secretary

PRESENT: Newman, Doyle, Buell, Flowers, Cuddeback, Purkey, and Forther

ABSENT: Swanson

OTHERS PRESENT: One other individual

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:05 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair

MARK NEWMAN with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 8, 2010: FLOWERS MOVED, seconded by Cuddeback to approve the Minutes of Febreuary 8, 2010 as presented. **MOTION CARRIED**

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Continued Review of Proposed Electronic Sign Ordinance in Preparation for Public Hearing

UPDATE: Due to the Flushing Township Sign Ordinance being outdated, samples of sign ordinances from other municipalities had been reviewed. It was determined to update the sign ordinance when a local church wanted to replace an existing sign with an electronic sign. Planning Commission Member **BUELL** typed the draft; it was then sent to Township Attorney Moulton for a more formalized version of the ordinance. There was one correction in the proposed ordinance on page 2, letter C, number 3:

“ 3. For purposes of the subparagraph, residential area mans an area zoned RSA, RV-1, RV-2, RV-3 or RV-4”

CHANGED TO:

“3. For purposes of the subparagraph, residential area **means** an area zoned RSA, RV-1, RV-2, RV-3 or RV-4.”

BUELL MOVED, seconded by Flowers to hold the Public Hearing on Monday, May 10, 2010 on the Electronic Sign Ordinance.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Buell, Flowers, Cuddeback, Purkey, Newman, and Doyle

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Swanson

2. Continued Review of Accessory Structures in Front Yard

There have been several informal inquiries about constructing accessory structures in property owners front yards instead of the side yard.

DISCUSSION/COMMENTS:

1. Due to the increased number of people wanting to construct a pole barn on vacant lots should the Planning Commission change the twenty-five (25) foot side lot requirement in the hopes there will be a home built in the front yard someday.
2. If there was a house and garage, the distance setbacks on the particular structure would have to be adhered to and the house could be built in front of the garage. If a barn was going to be constructed and it didn't adhere to the rest of the architurtial in the neighborhood, then one would have an intrusive looking building. If the language in the ordinance was changed to a setback of fifty (50) foot on the property, then it could be worded that the barn would not have to match the house.
3. The depth of the property would be a great problem. There has to be a distance in the back of the property and especially if the property was narrow.
4. Should the ordinance be worded that the property owner should have a certain amount of property to construct the barn on with a special use permit on vacant property.
5. There could also be a problem if the property was sold to a second property owner, and the second home owner wanted to construct a home on the property in the future.
6. There could also be a problem if a beautiful, huge pole barn was constructed; the property was sold to someone else. If the second owner wanted to build a house and if all the requirements were met, there would be nothing to do with the accessory structure because it would already be there. The person would be building in the front yard.

7. A minimum setback of seventy-five (75) foot is required for barns.
8. If a person wanted to construct a barn with no residents with a special use permit, it could be specified if the property owner wanted to construct a home, there would be a specified setback so the house would not be in front of someone else's home.
9. There could be the example that someone would want a special use permit for a barn.
10. Perhaps the language could be determined exactly what an accessory structure was.
11. If there were animals, especially horses, there would be a seventy-five (75) foot side and back setback. There are limits on the number of animals for a specific sized property.
12. Subdivisions could have five (5) or ten (10) acre parcels; a farm can be not less than twenty (20) acres.
13. In some townships, the structure could not be bigger than the principle home.
14. A "special use permit" would be required if no structures are on the property.

The issue will placed on the May Agenda for further discussion.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Informal Hearing Regarding Residential Adult Foster Care Facility**

Mr. Armando Barry was present to present his case on the Residential Adult Foster Care Facility. The facility would be located in an existing Church located at 8163 Coldwater Road, Flushing, Michigan. Mr. Barry would be a co-owner along with Dr. Dan Duffy, who is a D.O. from the Saginaw, Michigan area.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS TO MR. BARRY:

1. The floor plan of the Church, in the brochure given to the Planning Commission, is the current layout. The floor plan is not expected to be changed. The offices, on the floor plan, would be the bedrooms for the patients.
2. The bathrooms would be shared.
3. There would be six (6) people placed in the facility.
4. There would be 24/7 service and licensed by the State of Michigan.
5. Once an approval to purchase has been met with the Church, Mr. Barry will proceed to obtain the license.
6. There would be contingencies in the contract.
7. The church is in a residential area (RSA).
8. The Church would be like a home; the residents would be getting the necessary exercise.
9. The township only has authority over such issues as signs, parking, etc. The State has the full control.
10. The building would be licensed under Adult Foster Care Facility (AFC) – one (1) to six (6) people.
11. The Church already has all the facilities that would be needed, such a parking, large rooms, room for a gym.
12. The proposed facility is located on ten (10) acres.

13. The facility would be assigned a representative from the Health Department who would check on different issues.
14. There are future plans that structures would be constructed in the back of the Church to facilitate senior citizens.
15. Mr. Barry's primary employment has been in robotics; Mr. Barry and Mr. Duffy have been friends for years.
16. The patients would be patients that have been involved in accidents such as sports, car, etc There would be no medicare/medicaid insurance. There could be any type of scenario.
17. Fences would not be installed.
18. The patients could not wander by themselves, there would always be an aid with the patient.

NEWMAN thanked Mr. Barry for his time in describing the Adult Facility Care home.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

8:03 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

8:04 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

VII. BOARD COMMENTS:

1. **JENNIFER** introduced herself to the Planning Commission.
2. **BUELL** thanked the Secretary for taking the minutes for the Planning Commission facility
3. **PURKEY** was very enthused about the proposed adult care facility.
4. **PURKEY** would like the issue of Medical Marijuana placed on the May Agenda.
5. **FLOWERS** mentioned there would be a training session presented by Rowe Inc., on April 28, 2010 at Mott College.
6. **CUDDEBACK** had information regarding Adult Foster Care Facilities.

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE: NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING WILL BE HELD ON MONDAY, MAY 10, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M.

FUTURE REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING DATES:

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, JUNE 14, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, JULY 12, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING – MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: Due to lack of business matters, **NEWMAN** adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

MARK J. NEWMAN, Chair

JENNIFER FORTHER, Recording Secretary

ERIC SWANSON, Secretary

Date of Approval

Planningminutes 04/12/2010