

**OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD MARCH 27, 2014

Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING: REVIEW OF APPLICATION FROM SCHLEY ARCHITECTS ON BEHALF OF OB-GYN, P.C. FOR REZONING OF A 4.78 ACRE PARCEL ON THE WEST SIDE OF 11TH STREET NORTH OF PARKVIEW AVENUE LOCATED AT 2854 SOUTH 11TH STREET. THE REQUEST IS TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM R-3 RESIDENTIAL TO C LOCAL BUSINESS WITH VOLUNTARY CONDITIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REQUEST. (PARCEL #3905-25-355-070)

PUBLIC HEARING: REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 50 AND 60 OF THE TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE RELATED TO THE 9TH STREET AND WEST MAIN STREET SUB-AREA PLANS AS WELL AS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD).

A meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, March 27, 2014, commencing at approximately 7:00 p.m. at the Oshtemo Charter Township Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Antosz
Dusty Farmer
Pam Jackson
Millard Loy
Terry Schley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Wiley Boulding Sr.
Richard Skalski

Also present were Greg Milliken, Planning Director; James Porter, Attorney; Martha Coash, Meeting Transcriptionist; and 11 interested persons.

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Schley at approximately 7:00 p.m., and the "Pledge of Allegiance" was recited.

Agenda

Chairperson Schley asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the Agenda. Hearing no changes, he called for a motion to accept the Agenda as presented.

Mr. Loy made a motion to accept the agenda as presented. Mr. Antosz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chairperson noted that agenda item #6, a public hearing regarding a request from his firm, Schley Architects, was a conflict of interest for him. He would step down from the chair and as a voting member for that item, and Mr. Loy would be acting as Chair during that time.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Chairperson Schley called for public comment on non-agenda items. Hearing none, he proceeded to the next agenda item.

Approval of the Minutes of March 13, 2014

Chairperson Schley asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the minutes of March 13, 2014. Hearing none, he asked for motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Antosz made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Public Hearing: Review of Application from Schley Architects on Behalf of Ob-Gyn, P.C. for Rezoning of a 4.78 Acre Parcel on the West Side of 11th Street north of Parkview Avenue Located at 2854 South 11th Street. The Request is to Rezone Property from R-3 Residential to C Local Business with Voluntary Conditions Associated with the Request. (Parcel #3905-25-355-070)

Chairperson Schley stepped down from the dais due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Loy assumed his duties and asked Mr. Milliken to review the application.

Mr. Milliken explained the applicant was requesting rezoning of a 4.78 acre parcel on the on the west side of 11th Street north of Parkview Avenue to the C Local Business district with conditions. He noted the parcel is currently located in the R-3 Residential zoning district, has over 360 feet of frontage on 11th Street, and was recently split from a larger parcel owned by the Kalamazoo Area Christian Retirement Association, who supports the request.

He noted the unique element to the request is the fact that the applicant has submitted conditions associated with the rezoning application. The conditional rezoning process follows the same process and procedure as a traditional rezoning request with the exception that the applicant may offer conditions that place additional restrictions or limitations on their property within the requested zoning district.

Mr. Milliken explained that in the Future Land Use Plan, this parcel was designated "Transitional Mixed Use". These areas were designated as such for one of two reasons. Either the area serves as a buffer to transition between areas of significantly different intensity, or the area is in transition from a low intensity, predominately residential use to a higher intensity, predominately non-residential use. He said this particular area falls into both categories. It serves as a transition between the heavy traffic and commercial use of Stadium Drive and the rural residential character of Parkview Avenue. However, it is also an area that is in transition as commercial / office uses spread south along 11th Street and along Parkview Avenue.

He said the Plan provides specific text describing the desired uses for this area, and the types of characteristics that are important for development here.

Mr. Milliken pointed out one of the unique aspects of conditional rezoning is that it allows the applicant an opportunity to introduce proposed plans for development associated with a rezoning request. With a traditional rezoning request, it is inappropriate for there to be any discussion of proposed development. He said in this case, the applicant desires to develop the site for a 13,860 square foot medical office building. This primarily one-story building with a walk out basement would be served by one access point onto 11th Street and approximately 75 parking spaces. Storm water retention would be provided at the rear (west) end of the site with more than enough room available along the perimeter of the property to provide screening and landscaping as required.

Mr. Milliken acknowledged it is reasonable to inquire why the rezoning request is necessary when there is a medical office across the street in the same R-3 zoning district. The R-3 zoning district allows for a limited amount of non-residential uses through the special exception use process, including medical and dental offices. However, one of the conditions is that the building be no larger than 10,000 square feet in area. The applicants require between 13-15,000 square feet.

He pointed out they could seek a variance, but it is unlikely the Zoning Board of Appeals would grant a variance for this type of request. Based on the criteria in the Ordinance for a variance approval and the requirements in the Zoning Enabling Act, there is no "practical difficulty" that would allow the ZBA the ability to grant the variance. Therefore, in order to achieve the desired development, the applicants are seeking rezoning to the C – Local Business district.

Mr. Milliken explained that after discussing the situation with the applicant and reviewing the Master Plan language cited earlier, Staff recommended the applicant consider Conditional Rezoning for this request. The language in the Master Plan is intended to limit the intensity of development and protect the character of the community in that particular area. The applicant has submitted conditions that would restrict the uses that would be permitted to be developed on that site. Therefore, instead of allowing all of the uses in the C district, only those uses identified in the letter from the applicant would be permitted.

He said the list includes more uses than just a medical office, which is reasonable and typical for this type of request. In the future, should the practice decide to lease out half its office or relocate to another location, this provides some flexibility for future use without having to come back through the rezoning process and amend the conditions. He said a review of the proposed list demonstrates that the identified uses are all uses that are allowed within the R-3 district as special exception uses. In other words, everything proposed in the conditional rezoning is already allowed in the R-3 district with the difference being that in the R-3, the development is limited to 10,000 square feet and is a special exception use.

Mr. Milliken concluded, saying as with a traditional rezoning, compliance with the Township Master Plan is a substantial element of the decision-making process, and the Planning Commission ultimately makes a recommendation to the Township Board, who will make the final decision on the request. He asked if Board Members had any questions for him.

In response to a question from Ms. Jackson regarding the setback difference between R-3 Residential and C Local Business districts, Mr. Milliken said he would need to confirm the distance for R-3, but that it was 85 feet for C.

Mr. Loy asked the applicant to address the Board as there were no further questions for Mr. Milliken.

Mr. Kris Nelson, Schley Architects, 4200 S. 9th Street said he represented OB-GYN P.C., and noted two representatives of the practice, Molly Lacy and Dr. Wendy Bauer, were in attendance. Mr. Nelson said he'd like to expand a little on the information provided by Mr. Milliken, but first introduced Ms. Lacy to talk about the practice.

Ms. Lacy told the Board the independently owned practice has been around since the 1930s, has six physicians and currently rents space, but they are changing their business model and feel they need to own their own building. The majority of their patients are from Oshtemo Township and they would like to be convenient to them. She spoke with representatives of Rheumatology P.C., who would be neighbors and are also independently owned, and they are supportive of the application. She was unable to speak with another neighbor just to the north.

Mr. Nelson reiterated some of the points made by Mr. Milliken, noting the main reason for the request to rezone from R-3 to C, is that they feel they will be over the 10,000 square footage maximum allowed in R-3. He added they feel the business will be good for the Township as well as advancing its long-term goals. They believe the office building fits what the Township is looking for in this transitional area from more to less intensive use of space. They feel the C is a good fit – other uses allowed in C would be more intensive. He provided an example of what they might build on the site to provide an idea of how much of the site would actually be used and how much parking would be provided. A lot of open space will remain. When there is a final plan ready, they will return to the Planning Commission with a site approval request. He thanked the Board for their consideration of the request and offered to answer any questions Commissioners might have. if the rezoning request was approved

Mr. Antosz asked Mr. Milliken whether, if the rezoning request was approved, the option would be available to build a facility of less than 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Milliken said that if the request is approved to rezone to a C parcel with the provided conditions, a building would be allowed of any square footage. He noted the Planning Commission would review any site plan with specific requests at a later date. He also addressed the earlier question about setbacks, saying a C zoned parcel requires an 85 foot setback from the north, south and west. If it remained in the R district the setback would be 20 feet or the height of the building at its closest point, whichever was greater.

In answer to a question from Attorney Porter, who wondered if the landscape provision increases with the C designation, Mr. Milliken said that it did.

Mr. Loy asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the public meeting and moved to board deliberations.

Ms. Farmer asked how long the rezoning would be in effect with conditions, if approved.

Attorney Porter replied that one year to construct would be allowed; after that period, if there is no construction, the zoning would revert back to R-3.

Mr. Milliken added that after construction, the zoning would remain, as approved, until someone else wanted to change the conditions or rezone again. Requests for amendment would have to go through the rezoning process again at that time.

Attorney Porter pointed out that additional landscaping and a greater setback helps to protect surrounding properties.

Commissioners all indicated they were supportive of this request.

Mr. Loy asked for a motion to recommend approval of the request to the Township Board.

Ms. Jackson made a motion to recommend approval of the request to the Planning Commission from Schley Associates on behalf of OB-GYN, P.C. for rezoning of the 4.78 acre parcel from R-3 to C Business District with the conditions as provided by the applicant. Mr. Antosz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

At this point, Chairperson Schley returned to the dais and resumed the Chair.

Public Hearing: Review of Proposed Amendments to Sections 50 and 60 of the Township Zoning Ordinance Related to the 9th Street and West Main Street Sub-Area Plans as well as the Requirements for Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Chairperson Schley said the next item on the agenda was a public hearing regarding proposed amendments to sections 50 and 60 of the Township Zoning Ordinance related to the 9th Street and West Main Street Sub-Area Plans as well as the requirements for Planned Unit Development (PUD). He asked Mr. Milliken to review the application.

Mr. Milliken explained the Sub-Area plan was developed a couple of years ago and was subsequently incorporated into the Master Plan for a variety of commercial and residential properties along 9th and West Main Streets. Putting the zoning together is necessary to implement that vision. Work began on it a few months ago. Zoning language was drafted and tonight's public hearing is for the purpose of discussing that draft. He said that although the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance have been discussed previously by the Planning Commission, it is early in the process. This hearing is earlier than is typical because it was desired to notify affected property owners now, and to receive their input because of their previous involvement in the sub-area planning process. He concluded by saying the purpose of the hearing is to receive feedback on the amendments draft. It is likely any further action will be tabled to allow more time for consideration and feedback. It is a work in progress.

Chairperson Schley explained that Mr. John Jackson of McKenna Associates, the consultant working on this project, would speak next, followed by the hearing to receive public comment, and afterward the Planning Commission would have time for discussion and then then the opportunity to table any further action. He stressed this is a work in process and asked if anyone had any questions about the process. Hearing none, he turned the meeting over to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. John Jackson, McKenna Associates, said the project started a few years ago when the Township updated its Master Plan and established two sub-area plans. He referred to a map of the boundaries of the two Sub-Areas, and indicated the West Main Sub-Area is a lower intensity, non-residential gateway to the community, with the

intention to transition to residential, which may include townhouses or duplexes, to the north and south. Another important inclusion is the continuation of circulation of traffic in these areas. It was felt important that development continue to address and accommodate the natural features and characteristics of the community and that requirements be included in the plan.

He continued, saying the second Sub-Area Plan addresses the 9th Street area south of West Main Street to KL Avenue. Existing is a residential area to the east of 9th Street. To the north and West of West Main Street is a lot of commercial development; the desire was to keep it contained in that area. This Sub-Area would provide a transition to residential behind 9th Street. A lot of natural environment is already preserved south on 9th Street. The intent is to be sure that continues to occur.

Mr. Jackson said at one of the first meetings with the Planning Commission a variety of zoning options were considered in order to accommodate creativity in property development. It was also required that the principles of the Master Plan were followed, that natural features are intact, that there would be transition from commercial to residential, and that the type of development was appropriate in terms of scale and intensity.

He explained the approach the Township is taking is 3-tiered: 1) property can be developed as currently rezoned, 2) through the proposed Overlay District, or 3) through the revised PUD Ordinance, which would grant maximum flexibility on property, subject to requirements. These would provide three different approaches to take in order to develop a property within these two Sub-Areas.

Mr. Jackson said it was most difficult to create text for the Overlay District and indicated the meeting tonight was to receive feedback on both that and the PUD Ordinance. He noted the Overlay District is a single ordinance, but addresses both Sub-Areas. He reviewed the draft language and what is permitted for the Overlay Zone including principles, four different use categories, special use exceptions, design standards, and review criteria, and provided examples of the types of residential and commercial uses that could be included in the two corridors and consistent with the overall Plan.

Chairperson Schley thanked Mr. Jackson for his review and hearing no questions from Commission members, he asked Mr. Milliken how he wished to proceed.

Mr. Milliken said he would like to hear comments from the public on both the Overlay District and the PUD concurrently. He said the goal is to expand options to provide somewhat of a universal tool for all types of development opportunities beyond residential.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that unless one was developing something within the Overlay District that requires special exception, the development in the Overlay would be by right, and would just require a regular site review. With the PUD, development

would require going through the same basic process as a special exception use. It would be up to the developer to work with Township staff to come up with a creative plan for property development. Through that process, a plan would be developed that meets or exceeds Township requirements and expectations with respect to landscaping, building design and layout, internal access, etc. In return for exceeding Township standards, there would be some flexibility in terms of other standards, for example, density or building size. That is the purpose of the PUD.

Mr. Jackson continued, saying currently you can do a residential PUD and you can have a small amount of non-residential uses, 20%, in a residential PUD, and commercial uses only are allowed in the CR district. Basically what is being done now is combining the two into a single section, allowing developers to utilize either the residential or commercial PUD, depending upon which would be more appropriate. Under the combined PUD, all requirements would have to be met with the baseline being the standards currently in the Ordinance.

Mr. Milliken noted there were no changes to the draft documents from those presented previously to Commissioners because it was assumed there would be changes from tonight's discussion, and he wanted to avoid multiple confusing revisions.

Hearing no questions from Planning Commissioners, Chairperson Schley opened the meeting to comment from members of the public, saying Commissioners would go through their deliberations following public comment.

Ms. Sheri Mohmand, 6147 Old Log Trail, and property owner on the south side and adjacent to Wal-Mart, in the 9th Street Sub-Area Plan spoke first. She said her property is one of only about three large parcels still undeveloped there. She is disturbed by the permitted uses listed in the plan and feels they are so restrictive for 9th Street frontage that there won't be any commercial development. There are already so many banks that no more will be needed; restaurants without drive-thrus is too limiting for today's trends and would eliminate almost all restaurant opportunity on her property. She said Century Highfield, the development of 40 acres on the corner of Drake and Stadium, did not have to jump through the same hoops, although it contained many more natural features than her property.

Ms. Mohmand continued, saying the Township is squeezing the Muslim property owners of the three large properties in the 9th Street sub-area into little areas, and that these new requirements are a way to scare away commercial development. She said the "green belt corridor" restrictions remind her of the restrictions Israelis place on Palestinians who own prime property, which are lifted when a favored person gets the property. She added that the 60 acre property behind T.G.I. Fridays has suddenly appeared as commercial when it was previously zoned R2 and R3 in the Master Plan. She concluded by saying this is restrictive, that favored property owners are treated differently, it's not right, and she believes the intent is to discriminate which will have to be left up to the courts to decide.

Mr. Kadir Mohmand, 6147 Old Log Trail, and property owner in the 9th Street Sub-Area, spoke next in the name of the God Mustafa, God Most Gracious. He said this plan is shameful and disgusting and the same thing that was done on the development in the Century Highland area and with that good old boy network, with the 60 acres of T.G.I. Fridays. He said they should act like human beings. He stated the Township's attorney came and threatened to shoot him and threatened his property.

Attorney Porter interrupted at that point, and said if Mr. Mohmand didn't stop, he would file an action for defamation.

Mr. Mohmand replied, "Good, do it. You threatened me."

Chairperson Schley told Mr. Mohmand he was not using his time very wisely, that the Commission would like to hear from him, but asked him to keep his comments respectful and on point.

Mr. Mohmand said he wants to see the Planning Commission follow the law and the American Constitution when they swore to follow the law. When he comes before the Commission they give him a hard time and what they have just done is disgusting. He wants them to follow the law with no discrimination.

Mr. Paul Snyder, asked about some of the technical specifications in the PUD, particularly the basis for the percentages used in the draft Ordinance. He inquired about Section 60.404 that limits a deviation to not more than 10%, Section 60.414 that states non-residential use cannot be started until the PUD development is 60% complete, and Section 60.415 that requires 5% open space. He wondered how the percentages came about.

Chairperson Schley said they would try to answer that question after public comments were concluded.

Mr. Dave Ash, 6404 West Main Street, said he appreciated the Board's work and felt it was a long time coming, and noted verbiage in some areas bothered him. He thought the current zoning had been well done and felt some buffer zones might be helpful, but the difficulty in use is that no one wants to buy 100 acres and also build apartments and commercial property. He thought the 60% requirement is too high. Adjusting the PUD and making it more flexible would be helpful. He believes adjacent residents would like to see a 300 foot buffer zone. He concluded, saying he trusts the Planning Commission and feels a flexible PUD is the best way to go.

Mr. Jeff Bertolissi spoke for himself, the owner of a 3.2 acre property contiguous to Ethan Allen to the west, and for Mr. Ken Bertolissi, his father, who owns the office building across the street. He said in 2006 he, his father, and Mike Seelye proposed PUD zoning for this particular area. The PUD was denied, as they understood it, because there wasn't a bike path included in the site plan. They are concerned whether the planner understand the topography of the eastern half of the West Main property in

the Plan because there is a large gully surrounded by a valley on their property, and a large pond behind the five acre car lot. There are seven property owners on that side of the street who would be asked to put together a difficult “jigsaw puzzle” in order to develop the land. Multiple property owners, interior roads, landscape buffers, bicycle paths, street lights that are a quarter of a mile apart, and natural topography are all concerns. He was concerned how the property could be developed and felt the Plan was not realistic. He also wondered about the desire for low intensity. The overlay zone in existence has been in place since 1991 and there has been no development. He asked for flexibility and said the Township needs to look at what the demand is for the property, not necessarily what the Township wants for the property.

Ms. Marilyn Longjohn, 4011 Burkewood, said she is part owner of 38 acres of the West Main north area next to Meijers and questioned the desire for rural ambiance of an area that includes Meijers and Wal-Mart. She agreed with the previous speaker about whether it is realistic to fine tune requirements for 38 acres next to Meijers. The topography is much less desirable than the area that was leveled at Drake Rd and Stadium Drive. She informed the Board the assessor has changed her property from residential to commercial. City Hall told her the assessor said the only use the land is good for is commercial development.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairperson Schley closed the Public Comments section of the hearing and moved the meeting to discussion by the Board. He asked Mr. Jackson to refresh the Board’s understanding of the premise of choosing the overlay approach vs. straight defined rezoning.

Mr. Jackson explained the overlay approach was chosen over establishing four new zoning districts for logistical reasons to avoid amendments all throughout the Zoning Ordinance, but especially compelling is the opportunity to encourage the use of the overlay district by removing the hoop of rezoning single family residential to commercial, provided the design standards are followed. It is a give and take to encourage people to develop according to the standards in the Overlay District.

Chairperson Schley addressed questions from earlier public comments about percentages, saying the Board has had discussion regarding some percentages included in the draft and that there has been no conclusion on those yet, saying that input on the draft is the purpose of holding the public hearing. Previous discussion regarding the percentages is available in meeting records.

Mr. Milliken noted the 60% requirement for dwelling units in section 13 before non-residential uses is the standard that exists today – there was no change to that. Similarly, the 5% of open space requirement, which has been discussed by the Board and is actively being evaluated, is also the existing standard, but that they are being evaluated and considered.

The Chairperson said that in general we want residential development to support non-residential development – it is not an end around.

Mr. Jackson said the 10% is also in the existing PUD, but that all of the numbers and percentages are open for discussion. The numbers were carried over to be sure new development is not that much different from existing development. He noted that in his experience the 5% requirement for open space is low, but the intent is to not be overly restrictive.

Chairperson Schley reiterated the percentages are not written in stone. The Chairperson said some of the comments heard were from property owners who were concerned with the intent for public uses as well as the Overlay and the whole structure of public zoning and land uses. He said those questions were initially voiced by Commissioners themselves and noted there would be further opportunity for specific public comment and specific suggested alternatives. He queried Board members whether they remain comfortable enough with the Overlay District and PUD concept to leave it open beyond this meeting to let Staff know they are comfortable with this type of structure.

Mr. Antosz pointed out they had heard from land owners this evening but not from those from outside the area who would be affected. He said it seems the Overlay is a nice way to open the areas up for innovative development and felt the PUD and Overlay concepts offer a lot of options for how properties can be developed. He likes that structural approach.

Mr. Loy felt the Overlay option was a lot better than hard rezoning resulting in spot zoning, which the Board has tried to eliminate over the years, and thought a buffer between the two zones needs to be explored further.

Ms. Farmer said she liked the structure but looks forward to more input from business owners and residents regarding real changes that should be made. She noted this is the second time she has seen the PUD. She reiterated that the Board is not ready to move forward before real input and continuing discussion, and that at no point is anyone on the Commission trying to make a decision this big on such very short notice.

Ms. Farmer also understood that people in the community have had issues with past Zoning Boards and Planning Commissions and noted that she has been on both the Planning Commission and Township Board about a year, and that one other Commissioner has been on the Planning Commission for one year and a third Commissioner has been in place for only one month. It is important to keep in mind that as time moves forward, Boards and Commissioners change, which means that opinions change. She said she would hate to take on the burden of opinions or of how anyone might have been treated in the past. She explained that when she makes decisions they are based on the Master Plan that was decided upon by many people in the community, years before she arrived, and that her duty is to see the Master Plan realized, in conjunction with discussion from the community and the business owners involved.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairperson Schley asked for any further Board comments.

Ms. Jackson felt there should be discussion with community members regarding usage issues and how they fit the Overlay. She'd like to hear what is wanted that is different than what is contained in the draft documents. She agreed with Ms. Farmer's comments regarding experience and acknowledged that this is her first chance to make positive decisions for this community.

Chairperson Schley encouraged those who have specific contest with the proposed draft to try to understand the preference is not to start over. The Master Plan focus groups were foundational to what has been developed. It is appropriate for community members and property owners to point out specific problematic items. If other uses should be considered within areas, it will be helpful to provide written suggestions as to how the documents can be made better, or to bring them forward at a future meeting.

The Chairperson commented that investment in outcome is a very long process, that Commissioners heard concerns tonight about some types of uses not present and wants to consider those. The Plan will be developed in sequence based on the good work in our community, considering past studies and the Master Plan as it goes forward. The Planning Commission will try to balance all comments with an overall understanding of what the community wants to do, which includes business owners and residents alike. He thanked those who spoke, said the Commission heard all comments and concerns, as intended, and will appreciate further comments on specifics, such as different sizing or scale, or inappropriate or too restrictive uses, if the Commission chooses to move forward.

Mr. Milliken said he and Mr. Jackson could identify 3-4 key issues that would provide some context for a more focused discussion at the next meeting.

Chairperson Schley said he suggests specific suggestions for further consideration if further action is tabled. He said without any kind of argument to the contrary, the Commission's basis for consideration is information presented by Staff, their own knowledge of the Ordinance, the foundational public work through studies and focus groups, and the long continuum that has been followed in this area. He said he did not hear that the Planning Commission has a closed mind to obfuscation – in fact that is the express purpose of the Public Hearing. Additional commitment would be to table to a specific date certain. He encouraged public comment in an appropriate forum at public meetings or contact with the Planning Director who would transmit comments to Commissioners.

Mr. Milliken suggested allowing a month for processing and that the next discussion be tabled to the regularly scheduled May 8 Planning Commission meeting if Commissioners wish to move forward.

Mr. Loy made a motion to table this item until the May 8, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Antosz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

Any Other Business

Mr. Antosz suggested that some background information on specific topics to inform new board members would be helpful and might be included on upcoming light agendas.

Ms. Jackson agreed with his suggestion and also expressed her interest in the upcoming MSU Citizens Planners Classroom Series.

Chairperson Schley said it was appropriate for new members to speak up and ask for explanations when needed, and encouraged them to do so.

The Chairperson noted there will be no need for the regularly scheduled April 10 meeting and cancelled the session.

Mr. Milliken reminded the Board of the Sunburst Run on April 26, the need for both volunteers and runners, and that last year's run raised \$7000 for Flesher Field.

Ms. Farmer said she would like to see a goal established to update language in the landscape ordinance by the end of the year to make it consistent with the Master Plan regarding landscaping and related requirements.

Planning Commissioner Comments

There were no comments from Commissioners.

Adjournment

Having exhausted the agenda, and with there being no further business to discuss, Chairperson Schley asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Loy made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Antosz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Chairperson Schley adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 8:50 p.m.

Minutes prepared:
April 1, 2014

Minutes approved:
April 24, 2014