

"Not yet approved"
**CITY OF AUBURN HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

January 6, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Hurt-Mendyka called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present. Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendyka, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke
Absent. Luenberger
Also Present. City Planner Cohen, City Manager Randall, TIFA Chair Bennett, Recreation Director Marzolf
Guests Three

LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 1827 N. Squirrel Road, Auburn Hills MI 48326

PERSON WISHING TO BE HEARD

Mr. Marzolf gave a brief presentation of the three possible locations for the new Community Center. The recommendation that is being forwarded to City Council, is choice number one, which is just south of the tennis courts. The other two site considerations were the current site and a site fronting Squirrel Road. Mr. Marzolf explained the location near the tennis courts is very visible from Seyburn Boulevard, with easy access and plenty of room for expansion if necessary. Mr. Marzolf stated the playground would be relocated, probably next to the tennis courts and there would be minimal tree removal. Because the current Community Center is a historical landmark, the hope is it will remain and be used for various purposes and possibly a City museum. Once the location is approved, work will begin on a site plan. Mr. Marzolf explained the building will be a one-story, 25,000 square foot structure with a facade similar to the other buildings on the City campus. The building will include a multi-purpose banquet room/gymnasium, locker rooms, fitness area, game room, craft room, kitchen, and office space. It was also noted there will be plenty of parking spaces on this site.

Mr. Marzolf stated they hoped to break ground this spring and be ready for opening the following spring.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka stated recommendations from this meeting will be presented to the City Council at their January 24, 2005 meeting in these same chambers.

PETITIONERS

1. RZ 04-05, Jeffrey L. Hauswirth – Public Hearing

(Sidwell No. 14-14-176-006 and 14-14-177-001)

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka presented the request for approval to rezone property generally located north of Pontiac road, between Opdyke Road and I-75 from present classification of I-1, Light Industrial district to T&R, Technology and Research district or any other appropriate zoning district.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Mr. Cohen explained for Mr. Kresnak, the rezoning description includes “or any other appropriate zoning district”, in the event this was rezoned to something other than T&R, Technology and Research, there would not be a need for another public hearing.

Mr. Cohen reviewed his letter dated December 28, 2004 with the following recommendation:

The rezoning request of 2.12 acres is from I-1, Light Industrial district to T&R, Technology and Research district. The applicant proposes the rezoning to allow the construction of an office and warehouse facility for multiple tenant use with 50% of the total building devoted to office use.

The Adopted City of Auburn Hills Master Land Use Plan depicts subject parcels as Non-Residential land use. Therefore, we are recommending Approval of RZ 04-05 from I-1, Light Industrial district to T&R, Technology and Research district based upon the Adopted Plan.

Mr. John Gaber, attorney for Mr. Hauswirth, stated this site is owned by Pontiac Road Equity Partners, LLC, which his client is a partner.

Mr. Jeffrey Hauswirth explained this property sits between two properties that are currently being renovated and this site has been cleared of two old homes. The proposed building will be 24 feet tall, with an illusion of an all office building, though it will also include warehouse space. The façade will have a “tech” look, brick and glass with some split block. A tenant has signed on with hopes of moving in by October 2005. Mr. Hauswirth noted that he has spoken with DTE regarding the installation for underground utilities, including fiber optics. Mr. Hauswirth stated he has spoken with the neighbors and they too are in favor of the underground utilities. The construction of this building will require the removal of only two trees.

Since there were no further questions, Ms. Hurt-Mendykya closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Moved by Mr. Kresnak to recommend to City Council approval of RZ 04-05, Jeffrey L. Hauswirth from I-1, Light Industrial district to T&R, Technology and Research district.

Supported by Ms. Verbeke.

**VOTE: Yes: Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendykya, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke
No: None**

Motion Carried (8-0)

2. TA 05-01, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 372 – Public Hearing

Ms. Hurt-Mendykya presented the request for TA 05-01, Amendment to Article IX. B-2, General Business District to remove Section 904. Auburn Heights Central Business Area.

Ms. Hurt-Mendykya opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m.

Mr. Cohen reviewed his letter dated December 27, 2004 with the following recommendation:

Section 904 is proposed to be removed from the B-2, General Business District. The old Auburn Heights Central Business Area has been replaced by the VC, Village Center District.

After the public hearing, if you find your questions satisfactorily answered it would be appropriate to move to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 372.

Mr. Cohen stated this public hearing is for the discussion of Section 904 only; any other Sections can be discussed under the New Business portion of the agenda.

Mr. Cohen explained Section 904 is being removed from the B-2 Zoning District and replaced with the new Village Center District zoning.

Since there were no further questions, Ms. Hurt-Mendykya closed the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

Moved by Mr. Ouellette to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 372, to remove Section 904 from the Zoning Ordinance.

Supported by Mr. Kresnak.

**VOTE: Yes: Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendykya, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke
No: None**

Motion Carried (8-0)

3. TA 05-02, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 372 – Public Hearing

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka presented the request for TA 05-02, Amendment to Article IV., R-1A, R-2, R-3 and R-4, One-Family Residential Districts; Section 1829. Site Condominiums; and Article XVII., Schedule of Regulations.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka opened the public hearing at 7:30p.m.

Mr. Cohen reviewed his letter dated December 27, 2004 with the following recommendation:

Staff offers the following potential policy changes for the Planning Commission to consider:

A. One-Family Residential Districts

Key issues:

1. Residential density is governed by the lot size, yard setbacks, height requirements, etc. in the Schedule of Regulations.

We believe that using a “density number” for units per acre is unnecessary since the Schedule of Regulations, road construction requirements, detention requirements, etc. govern the number of units permitted on a parcel.

2. The City attorney has advised us that site condominiums should follow the lot size requirements in the Schedule of Regulations, like subdivision plats.

Thus, Special Land Use permit requirements and existing density restrictions are no longer required.

Suggested Changes:

- Page 11 – Removed reference to density restrictions and SLU for detached condominiums

After the public hearing, if you find your questions satisfactorily answered it would be appropriate to move to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 372.

Mr. Cohen explained the removal of items 6. & 7. on page 11 of the One Family Residential Districts, stating that the Schedule of Regulations should be used not the number of units per acre. The units per acre don't correlate with what is typically allowed in a development. A density figure isn't needed because the Schedule of Regulations limits the number of lots allowed on a parcel. This portion of the ordinance is one of two sections that deals with density figures and can be problematic for the City.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka was concerned with a subdivision within a subdivision being constructed by eliminating the units per acre section. A number of parcels could be purchased and combined to enable this scenario. Mr. Cohen explained once a road is constructed to City specifications and a detention pond is constructed, there would be a limited area for buildable parcels in any given zoning district.

Mr. Cohen suggested because of the lot sizes in different areas of the City, such as the Central City District, there could be a new zoning district which would protect the subdivision within a subdivision situation.

Mr. Cohen stated the density figure is arbitrary and could hinder development from taking place.

Mr. Cohen explained this Ordinance was adopted in 1985, and, at the time, the concern was site condominiums were being treated the same as conventional condominiums. The condominium units would be scattered throughout the site with common space throughout and no lot configuration. This elevated the density higher than what would have been allowed in the specific zoning district. Currently the Ordinance allows site condominiums to be constructed similar to a platted lot. Since 1985 there has been very little residential construction, and only a few site condominiums, such as Paramount Estates.

Mr. Cohen stated it isn't justifiable to make a site condominium applicant use the platted subdivision method, which can take a number of years, and isn't fair to make the applicant seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. It is appropriate to correct the Ordinance text, not penalize a developer.

Ms. Verbeke was concerned that eliminating the density provision would allow a developer a higher density than what the zoning district allows. Mr. Cohen explained the change only concerns that the site condominium density would be equal to what is currently permitted for a platted subdivision. The ordinance as it now stands, discriminates against a developer for doing a site condominium; which is against the law.

Mr. Cohen stated many of the neighborhoods have been rezoned to the appropriate zoning districts, which was done through the neighborhood visioning meetings. Mr. McKissack stated through all of the neighborhood visioning meetings, the discussions were based on density per acre and if any changes are made, it should be to the Schedule of Regulations. Mr. Cohen explained when a city creates a master plan, there is generally a residential density map which shows the specific density in a specific area. The City of Auburn Hills combined the density map with the land use map. This is a separate issue from a zoning map. Mr. Cohen gave the following examples:

- Example 1: When considering a rezoning in a residential neighborhood and 4.5 units per acres is allowed, the zoning considered would be what is closest to 4.5 acres, which would be R-1. If a PUD was being considered, it would not be able to exceed the 4.5 units per acre as stipulated in the Master Plan.
- Example 2: If a developer builds a subdivision in the Churchill neighborhood and the Master Plan states two units per acre and is zoned R-1A, which would result in a 20,000 square foot lot.

Mr. Cohen stated there are two different issues involved, the density within the Master Plan and the Schedule of Regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka stated within her subdivision, the lots are generally 80 feet wide, but zoned R-2. If three lots were combined there is the possibility of constructing more homes than the uniformity of the existing neighborhood. Mr. Cohen suggested the Central City neighborhood be studied and decide on a zoning district that would suit the neighborhood.

Ms. Verbeke stated she agreed with Mr. McKissack, all the neighborhood studies have resulted in the residents wishing to keep larger lots for a lower density. To protect the residents, the square footage in the Schedule of Regulations should be changed. Mr. Cohen stated the square footage cannot be changed without a public notice and the residents should be conferred with. With a change to the Schedule of Regulations, the majority of the City lots would be nonconforming and would need to be rezoned to match the new Schedule.

Mr. Ouellette stated this change to the Zoning Ordinance is to prevent a developer from filing a lawsuit against the City. The change should be made and then proceed with amending the zoning districts.

Ms. Doyle suggested that the zoning be left as is, and in the event of a lawsuit, make it known that the City was planning to review the matter. Responding to Ms. Doyle, Mr. Cohen explained a developer has contacted the City and questioned the ordinance. Mr. Cohen stated, he does not believe the developer is intending to sue the City; the City is trying to right an inconsistency in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Kresnak suggested if the site condominium density isn't broke why fix it and wait until there is a challenger.

Mr. Cohen recalled that Councilperson Henry Knight explained the purpose of the lowering all of the lot sizes back in the 1980's was to promote residential development in the City. The developments never came and the lot sizes were never readjusted; now is the time to rezone some of these areas to larger lot size zoning districts.

Ms. Doyle is not comfortable changing the zoning ordinance, the density numbers have been an issue with the majority of residents as evident in the neighborhood visioning meetings.

Mr. Ouellette explained the following scenario: A judge has been presented with the problem and questions why a site condominium project would be allowed only 2.3 units per acre but on that same lot a platted subdivision would be allowed 4.5 units per acre. The judge would insist that the City not discriminate against the site condominium project and grant the same density per acre.

Ms. Verbeke questioned if this change was made now, how long before the zoning districts could be amended. Mr. Cohen stated it would take time through visioning meetings, but the process could begin soon. The Planning Commissioners agreed for Mr. Cohen to start working immediately on conducting a neighborhood visioning meeting for the Central City District and to request permission from the City Council.

Mr. Cohen continued reviewing his letter dated December 27, 2004 with the following recommendations for duplexes:

3. *Attached housing units may not be desirable in one-family residential districts, thus should not be permitted.*

Perhaps, attached units could be allowed in certain transitional locations or exchange for open space preservation in R-1 thru R-4 districts provided it is demonstrated by the applicant that the density yield would not exceed the number of lots normally permitted in the underlying zoning district if the parcel were developed as a typical subdivision or site condominium.

4. *Concern has been raised by some members of the Planning Commission and City Council that Planned Unit Developments (PUD's) should not be used in one-family residential districts.*

R-1A, Open Space Development Option is proposed to be reworked as a Special Land Use permit.

Suggested Change:

- *Page 11 – Removed reference to duplex units / Attached units no longer permitted*
- *Page 13-15 – Reworked the R-1A, Open Space Development Option*
 - *Deleted reference to attached/duplex units. Proposed to only allow detached units no smaller than R-4 lots size in exchange for 30% preserved open space.*
 - *An applicant seeking approval under the option shall follow the requirements and procedures of Section 1818. Special Land Uses Permitted – not PUD. If the project meets the requirements of the ordinance, then it should be approved which perhaps should be the intent of the option. However, the loss of PUD review process means significant loss of City discretion.*
 - *The R-1A, Open Space Development Option proposed to only be permitted in those areas designated as two and one-half (2.5) dwelling units per acre on the City's Master Land Use Plan and Northeast Corner Neighborhood Master Plan.*
 - *Side yard setbacks can be 5 ft., instead of 7.5 ft. in open space projects.*

Mr. Cohen suggested possibly adding a duplex zoning district to be used in a transitional area.

Mr. Cohen explained PUD's were designed originally to allow for mixed use development, but have since evolved to being a solution to difficult sites. The use of PUD's is generally a benefit to the City and its residents. Mr. Cohen stated PUD's are great in residential transitional areas and for commercial use.

Mr. Cohen proceeded with the next item in his letter of recommendations.

B. Condominiums Regulations

Key issues:

1. *Condominium developments should be permitted use by right and should follow site plan review requirements per State law. Unlike, land divisions the Planning Commission and City Council will determine if all applicable zoning ordinance requirements are met. No public hearing is required for site condominiums. They are treated like a typical site plan ... if the project meets ordinance requirements, then it should be approved.*

Suggested Changes:

Section 1829 is totally reworked.

Mr. Cohen gave the following definitions:

- Conventional Condominium – A development in which ownership interest is divided under the authority of the Condominium Act and in which the condominium unit consists primarily of the dwelling or other principal structure and most of the land in the development is part of the general common area. In regard to residential development, the term “conventional condominium” shall be used to describe a condominium development with two or more one-family housing units in one structure.
- Site Condominium – A development in which ownership interest is divided under the authority of the Condominium Act and in which the condominium unit consists of a building site, with or without structures, which along with associated limited common elements, constitutes the equivalent of a lot. The term “site condominium” is used to describe a condominium development with detached one-family housing or nonresidential units.

Mr. Cohen stated for either type of condominium, the project must meet all ordinance requirements such as the setbacks and density as stipulated in the Schedule of Regulations. Site condominiums will be treated as a lot, and must meet the bulk and density requirements in the Schedule of Regulations.

Mr. Cohen noted site condominiums can also be non-residential developments such as Auburn Mile.

Currently the City’s Ordinance stipulates that a site condominium be approved through a Special Land Use. Providing the site condominium meets all ordinance requirements, it cannot be denied. Therefore, Mr. Cohen recommended that condominiums be treated like plats and site condominiums like site plans. Additional requirements would include sidewalks in developments, a development agreement draft provided at site plan approval and no action taken on any site until the development agreement has been reviewed by the City Attorney. Building permits may be issued for the sole purpose of constructing model homes; however, until the infrastructure is complete no occupancy permits will be issued. Mr. Cohen indicated Master Deeds must also be provided for the condominium projects.

Mr. Cohen also noted, there would be no public hearing for condominium projects; they would follow the typical site plan review process.

It was the general consensus of the Planning Commission to amend the duplex section of the ordinance and to remove the Special Land Use for condominiums.

Mr. Cohen stated Section 404. Lots of Record in the R-1A District is an addition to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 405. R-1A Open Space Development Option, has been re-worded by removing the PUD option and replacing with a Special Land Use. Mr. Cohen noted this Open Space Development option is a State law and cannot be denied. Mr. Cohen noted wetlands may not be included in determining density, but can be included as part of the overall open space. Mr. Cohen reminded the Planning Commission that a development of less than 10 acres did not have to have useable open space and could be wetlands; however, anything over 10 acres must include a total of one acre useable space such as walking trails, a tot lot, lighting, etc.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to leave the Open Space Development option as a PUD. By using the PUD process recommendations suggested by the City would be more aptly applied.

Mr. Roger Saylor, explained his company is proposing a site condominium, which fronts an existing road. He hopes to bring a site plan and development agreement to the Planning Commission very soon.

Since there were no further questions, Ms. Hurt-Mendyka closed the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Moved by Mr. Beidoun to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed Text Amendment 05-02, to Zoning Ordinance No. 372, which includes Article 4, R-1A, R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4, One-Family Residential District; Section 1829. Site Condominiums; and Article XVII, Schedule of Regulations. R1-A Open Space Development option will remain a PUD and not a Special Land Use.

Supported by Ms. Doyle.

VOTE: Yes: Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendyka, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke

No: None

Motion Carried (8-0)

4. TA 05-03, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 372 – Public Hearing

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka presented the request for TA 05-03, Amendment to Section 1804. Off-Street Parking Requirements and Section 1805. Off Street Parking Space Layout Standards, Construction and Maintenance.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka opened the public hearing at 8:47 p.m.

Mr. Cohen reviewed his letter dated December 27, 2004 with the following recommendation:

The City Council recently amended the size requirements for parking spaces and maneuvering lanes within the VC, Village Center District. As part of that review, it was suggested by some members of the Planning Commission that the City consider amending the parking layout requirements to the new Village Center standard for all new developments in the community. The enclosed text amendment addresses the above issue along with other minor changes.

The following is a general summary of the proposed changes:

Section 1804

1. Page 9 Removed reference to “fee in lieu of parking” in the Auburn Heights Central Business District since it is now covered in the VC, Village Center district.
2. Pages 12-13. Amended Handicapped Space Requirement based on 2003 Michigan Barrier Free Manual.

Section 1805

1. Page 13. Maneuvering lane width reduced from 25 ft. to 24 ft. and parking space depth reduced from 20 ft. to 18 ft. to match the VC, Village Center District. Removed old parking layout illustrations and merged the two parking layout tables into one table.
2. Pages 14-17. Reformatted Section 1805, Items 3-20 into an easier to read format. Review new Items 3-7.
 - *General Changes: Reduced carport space size; increased garage size; clarified Fire Lane size; added provision for bump-out for maneuvering in dead end aisles; clarified that ingress/egress drives in the Village Center may be located across from single-family residential zoned areas; new provision provided to allow permeable pavement systems as an option for developers; clarified sidewalk size; added parking structure provision as SLU.*

After the public hearing, if you find your questions satisfactorily answered it would be appropriate to move to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 372.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka explained for Ms. Verbeke the width of the parking spaces was not changing, the maneuvering lane would be 24 feet wide as opposed to 25 feet and the parking space would be shortened by two feet. Mr. Cohen stated Great Lakes parking lot has the proposed size spaces. The striping will remain at current standards.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka suggested expanding the greenbelt area as stipulated in Section 1805. 5. A., Landscaping. Ms. Hurt-Mendyka explained large vehicles extend beyond into those areas and can damage any trees or bushes planted in that space.

Mr. Cohen stated Eric Olson reviews the landscaping for parking lots and will insist moving a tree or plant if he feels it is inappropriately planted and is vulnerable to the vehicles.

Discussion proceeded determining if making greenbelts wider would be beneficial for landscaping materials such as trees and bushes. By shortening up the maneuvering lanes and parking space length and extending the greenbelts the number of parking spaces available would be very small, if any. The members agreed upon an eight-foot greenbelt (a one-foot curb and seven-foot green space).

Mr. Cohen noted the following changes:

Section 1804. The “fee in-lieu of parking” has been deleted from this section and has been added to the Village Center portion of the Ordinance.

Section 1804., 2003 Michigan Barrier Free Design has been adopted.

Section 1805., Off Street Parking Space Layout has added additional information for easier understanding.

Section 1805. Number 3 through 7 have been reworded.

Section 1805. 4. Parking Surface has an added “B. Permeable Pavement Option”. This option must be approved by OHM and the Fire Department.

Regarding 4.A.3., Mr. Cohen stated he would check with City Attorney Beckerleg to amend the wording “...when not completed due to winter weather, it shall be completed no later than May 15th following construction.”

Mr. Cohen stated backing a vehicle into a roadway should always be discouraged.

Section 1805. 10. Parking Structures, is an addition to this Section.

Since there were no further questions, Ms. Hurt-Mendyka closed the public hearing at 9:12 p.m.

Moved by Ms. Doyle to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 372, including the changes to Parking, regarding a raised curb eight feet from the property line, together with a seven-foot greenbelt.

Supported by Mr. Beidoun.

VOTE: Yes: Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendyka, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke

No: None

Motion Carried (8-0)

5. TA 05-04, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 372 – Public Hearing

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka presented the request for TA 05-04 to amend Zoning Ordinance No. 372, Amendment to Section 1811. Signs.

Mr. Cohen requested this item be tabled until the January 20, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.

Moved by Mr. Pierce to table TA 05-04, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 372 – Public Hearing to the January 20, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.

Supported by Ms. Verbeke.

VOTE: Yes: All

No: None

Motion Carried

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Cohen reviewed the Planning Commission agenda projections noting the following:

- January 20, 2005
 - * Presentation regarding proposed Auburn Financial Center by applicant including 3-D computer model.
 - * Discussion regarding outside seating in B-1 district – text amendment (Panera Bread)
 - * Section 1811. Signs (including Mr. Cohen looking into Real Estate signs)
 - * Initial discussion/draft policy/guidelines – when to use contract zoning vs. PUD's in Auburn Hills.
- January 27, 2005 – Joint meeting with the Environmental Review Board (refreshments to be provided by City)
 - * Presentation/Training Seminar – Protecting and Enhancing our Environment through Sustainable Stormwater Management and Green Building Design. (Mr. Cohen stated this is a very invaluable meeting and requested all Planning Commissioners attend.)
- February 3, 2005
 - * MEEMIC Office Building – SLU, SP
Opdyke Road between Coe Ct. and Willot
 - * Bank/Office Building/Restaurant Building – SLU, SP
University Drive, west of LaShish
 - * Auburn Business Center – last lot – Jared Roth – SP
M-24 and Superior Ct.
 - * Village Center Parking Lot – SP
Primary/Grey
 - * Capri Investment (expansion of Happy Hour Party Store building) – SLU, SP
Auburn Road, west of Astoria Park in Village Center
 - * Pat Ray – Private Road Review –Development Agreement
Extension of Rex
 - * Text Amendment
Outside storage of vehicles in residential districts
- February 17, 2005 – Joint meeting with Environmental Review Board (pot luck)
 - * Final review and recommendation regarding amendments to the Woodlands Preservation Ordinance.
- March 3, 2005
 - * Proposed amendment to the Dutton Tech Park PUD (step one)
 - * Palace of Auburn Hills – building expansion
 - * Auburn Financial Center – Five Points area
- March 17, 2005
 - * Opdyke Road Corridor Study – tentative

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the Opdyke Road Corridor Study could be put off until a later date and work should begin on the neighborhood visioning meetings as discussed earlier this evening.

Mr. Cohen noted Mr. Culpepper would be helping out with some of the preliminary work for the Corridor Study.

Moved by Ms. Verbeke to instruct Mr. Cohen to request City Council approval to move forward with a neighborhood visioning meeting concerning the Central City District for the March 17, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.

Supported by Mr. Kresnak.

VOTE: Yes: Beidoun, Doyle, Hurt-Mendyka, Kresnak, McKissack, Ouellette, Pierce, Verbeke

No: None

Motion Carried (8-0)

OLD BUSINESS – none.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Verbeke had a number of concerns with sections of the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Hurt-Mendyka suggested that any and all concerns with the Zoning Ordinance be forwarded to Mr. Cohen at his office. Mr. Cohen noted any concerns or questions can be e-mailed to him, not only those regarding the Zoning Ordinance.

There was general consensus by the Planning Commission that Mr. Cohen research how other communities deal with funeral homes, as to what type of zoning districts they are allowed in.

Ms. Hurt-Mendyka noted according to the Planning Commission by-laws, an election of officers must be held each year. The election took place as follows:

Mr. Kresnak nominated Ms. Hurt-Mendyka for Chairperson. Supported by Ms. Doyle. There were no more nominations.

The vote was unanimous, Ms. Hurt-Mendyka, Chairperson.

Ms. Verbeke nominated Mr. Kresnak as Vice-Chairperson. There were no more nominations.

The vote was unanimous, Mr. Kresnak, Vice-Chairperson.

Mr. Kresnak nominated Ms. Verbeke as Secretary. There were no more nominations.

The vote was unanimous, Ms. Verbeke, Secretary.

6. New State Law – Contract Zoning

Mr. Cohen noted the packet contained information on the topic and it would be discussed at a future meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING - The next regularly scheduled meeting is January 20, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no objections the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Kathleen Novak
Records Retention Clerk

O:clerks/PLANNING COMMISSION/2005/010605