

ISABELLA COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2007

A Regular Meeting of the Isabella County Planning Commission was held on April 12, 2007 in Room 225 of the Isabella County Building, 200 North Main Street, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Marilyn Fosburg, Craig Schripsema, Bob Thompson, Jerry Neyer, Gale Willoughby, Richard Recker, Christine Alwood, Vance Johnson.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dan Hess

SUPPORT STAFF PRESENT: Michael Zalewski, Planner/Zoning Administrator  
Brandy Freed, Recording Secretary

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Thompson at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by the Commission.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chair requested if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda.

A motion was made by Mr. Willoughby, supported by Mr. Recker, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Recker, Alwood.

No: None.

Motion carried.

PREVIOUS MINUTES

Minutes of the March 8, 2007 regular meeting were circulated to the Commission prior to the meeting for their review.

Ms. Alwood noted that on page 5, the motion was voted for by Mr. Recker and not Mr. Johnson as indicated. Mr. Johnson was not present at the meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Fosburg, supported by Mr. Recker, to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2007 meeting as amended.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Recker, Alwood.

No: None.

Motion carried.

## LIASON REPORTS

ZBA – Mr. Schripsema reported that the ZBA did not meet last month due to lack of an agenda.

Parks & Recreation Commission – Mr. Willoughby reported that the Parks & Recreation Commission conducted their routine business.

Ms. Alwood noted that the Parks & Recreation Commission placed a bid for lawn care, but it was not the lowest. They also discussed of purchasing a new lawn mower which was not budgeted for and will be talked about at the next meeting.

Board of Commissioners – Ms. Alwood reported that the Board of Commissioners awarded the Commission on Aging design building project to Greenwald Construction. She stated that the architect for the project will be Wakely Associates.

## TOWNSHIP CONCERNS

Mr. Jeff Bean of Vernon Township stated that their board is still reviewing their Master Plan maps. They want to make changes, but in the right way, those changes will be coming. They think that too much of their Ag land is Restrictive Ag land on the Master Plan maps. ~~because that is not necessarily the type of land it is.~~

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Thompson discussed the rules of procedure for public comments.

County Commissioner George Green of 550 N. Nottawa Rd. stated that he was looking for clarification. He also stated that Commissioner Alwood invited himself and Commissioner Haupt to discuss the Private Roads Ordinance. He would like the opportunity to speak when the Commission is discussing private roads.

Mr. Thompson stated that the board would allow that privilege.

## **PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT #07-01**

Chairperson Thompson explained that Deborah Gatehouse is requesting a special use permit to establish a Group Day Care Home in accordance with Article XIX of the Isabella County Zoning Ordinance. The property is located at 7392 W. Blanchard Road in Section 11 of Rolland Township. Parcel # 12-011-40-002-01

Mr. Zalewski explained that Ms. Gatehouse was requesting a special use permit for a Group Day Care Home. Presently she is operating a Family Day Care Home, which is for less than 7 children. She would like to be licensed for up to 12 and this requires being a Group Day Care Home. The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act requires a Group Day Care Home be a Special Use Permit. The only requirement that is not met is that she is within 1500' of 2 other Group Day Cares along Blanchard Rd. This does not prevent the Commission from approving. The Commission is simply not required to do so. He also stated that staff has no concerns with this

other than the hours of operation differing from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. The Planning Commission will have to approve of the requested hours of operation from 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Zalewski read two anonymous letters that were received and submitted as part of the record. He stated that these letters are not a concern of the board. These types of complaints need to be brought to the State of Michigan. The board should be concerned with the use of the property as a Group Day Care and that it meets the requirements of the ordinance to grant the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Willoughby asked if the board had the authority to override the 1500' requirement stated in the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

Mr. Zalewski stated that the requirements of the section shall not prevent local unit of government from issuing a special use permit.

Mr. Neyer asked what the reasoning with having the stipulations included?

Mr. Zalewski explained that it is a requirement of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. He was unsure of where the 1500' requirement came from, but assumed it was in place so as to not require the Commission to approve several day care facilities in the same area.

Ms. Alwood stated that as far as commercializing she can see the point. She also stated that she thinks that 1500' is some what arbitrary.

Mr. Johnson stated that he believes the service is needed and they have to be flexible to handle the hours that parents work.

Chairperson Thompson opened the floor for public comment at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Debra Gatehouse of 7392 W. Blanchard Rd. stated that she believes that the letters that were received were from the two daycares across the street. She also stated that she has never let the kids out when guns are being shot. In the past she has had issues with the other two daycares; people have stated that they are bad mouthing her around the neighborhood. There should be no competition because there is a need for daycare. She does not yell at the kids and all she hears from the parents are good comments.

Mr. Thompson stated that the way the facility is operated is not of their concern. They are only concerned with the location and construction issues of the facility.

Ms. Gatehouse stated that the property lines of the other two daycares are close to her property lines, but their houses are quite a distance from her. Noise will not be an issue as she already has a license for 6 children, so there will not be much more noise than their already is.

Mr. John Haupt 1246 S. Gilmore Rd. stated that he does not believe any board should accept anonymous letters. This is an issue that the County Commission has been talking about; he doesn't think that Civil Infractions are right either. He stated that his point is that this board should not be accepting anonymous letters. If a person can not sign the letter then they should

not be able to complain. He said that it sounded like a “sound off” issue.

Mr. Neyer stated that the board is required to acknowledge the submitted letters.

Mr. Zalewski stated that the letters were addressed to the Planning Commission and are therefore required to be submitted for the record.

Hearing no further comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:20 p.m.

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, supported by Mr. Neyer, to approve Special Use Permit #07-01 as submitted.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Recker, Alwood.  
No: None.

Motion carried.

#### PRIVATE ROAD ORDINANCE

Mr. Thompson stated that they have worked for 10 months and held numerous meetings to develop a Private Road Ordinance that they all could agree on. Mr. Schripsema and Mr. Nieporte attended a work session with the County Board of Commissioners. They decided to bring the Private Road Ordinance back to work on it some more. He explained that the definition of a driveway became a bit convoluted; it was intended to be an access from a residence to a private or public road.

Mr. Thompson stated that he, along with Mr. Schripsema, and staff are proposing to scrap the definition of driveway that was in the proposal as read and substitute a shorter definition to say a driveway is a means of access for vehicles from a public road, private road, or approved alley across a lot or parcel.

Mr. Green asked if it could just be put down as a two-track. He stated that two things were the problem, if you wanted to build a single home there was no column there for this. If you own property on the river and want to build a 3/4 of a mile back from the main road, you should be able to do anything you want to get a road back there.

Mr. Thompson explained that if you own access to the road then it is a driveway.

Mr. Green stated that if his kid wanted to build a ¼ mile from the river kicking off from the driveway that is there, now would he have to build the road up to the specifications in the book?

Mr. Thompson stated that if he does not have access to a public or private road, yes.

Mr. Willoughby stated that when the Private Roads Ordinance was done it was not designed as Private Road, it was not even discussed. A driveway is what it is described as here. A driveway can be about anything, but because of the Zoning laws if you have a second home there you do have to have a private road. Once you have a private road then it does have to be built to those

standards. When they started, everything had to be a 66' wide right of way and built to County standards. It has been substantially reduced for the 1 to 3 lots, and that was the concern because otherwise it would cost the public a lot of money.

Mr. Haupt stated that it does not say anything about 1 parcel, just 1 to 3. He asks that the board insert a column for driveway. He also stated that with the 1 to 3 you still have to follow those requirements.

Mr. Willoughby explained that 1 to 3 is when you don't have the proper footage on the public road to start with.

Mr. Haupt stated that in the laws it says that you have to have curb.

Mr. Willoughby stated no you don't have to with 1 to 3.

Mr. Haupt asked if with 1 to 3 you still have to meet the 44' requirements and you have to build up to County road specifications.

Mr. Willoughby read the requirements for 1 to 3 as provided in the Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. John Haupt read the specifications from the 2005 proposed Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Willoughby stated that Mr. Haupt and Mr. Green were reading from the incorrect Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Recker asked if this was the information that the Board of Commissioners was working off from.

Mr. Zalewski stated that he could not speak for Mr. Nieporte, but he saw the staff report that was sent to the Board of Commissioners and it consisted of the correct Zoning Amendment. What Mr. Haupt and Mr. Green have appears to be the proposed zoning ordinance from 2005.

Mr. Willoughby stated that it looks to be the originally proposed Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Zalewski asked Ms. Alwood what the Board of Commissioners received in their packets.

Ms. Alwood stated that they received the correct information in their packets.

Mr. Thompson stated that what Mr. Schripsema gave to Mr. Haupt and Mr. Green is the information that is being talked about.

Mr. Green stated that he had talked to Mr. Willoughby about it and thought that 1320 foot requirement was still in there.

Mr. Willoughby stated that the 1320 foot requirement has been removed.

Mr. Thompson asked that Mr. Zalewski speak

Mr. Zalewski stated that what is being looked at is the Private Road Ordinance and has nothing to do with driveways. When you want to build and realize that you have to build a private road you will then look at the Private Road Ordinance. He read from the Private Road Ordinance, where it talks about access. If you own an 80 acre parcel it is 1320' at the road and 2640' deep and you want to build back 2640', you can have a driveway back there because you have 1320' of frontage. If you then split an acre off and build another house back there you would have to build the driveway to these standards in the Private Road Ordinance. He also stated that Mr. Willoughby was referring to as far as the 1 to 3; they have lowered the restrictions considerably from what was originally proposed. These restrictions are no more less than what would be used for a driveway. You would have to have that basic standard and name it to make it easier to find from an emergency standpoint.

Mr. Haupt stated that the rules still state 1 to 3.

Mr. Zalewski explained that you could have 1 parcel accessing off a private road.

Mr. Haupt stated that he was talking about a single house.

Mr. Thompson stated that if you are talking about one house with one owner. You can build a mile back as long as there is frontage for the driveway on the public road or private road. If so, you can put anything in you want.

Mr. Johnson clarified that if you have 80 acres and sold an acre way in the back, a land locked acre, and just wanted to put an easement back to it you would need to put in a private road.

Mr. Willoughby stated that unless you sold it 250' wide.

Mr. Thompson stated that if you have frontage on the public road you can build your driveway anyway that you want.

Mr. Haupt stated that according to this they could come out and say this is 1 to 3 you have to put your driveway up to 4'.

Mr. Willoughby stated that this is not for a private road.

Mr. Neyer stated that you don't have to create private road if you have the proper amount of frontage.

Mr. Zalewski stated that if you create a lot that 165 x 264 in an agricultural district and it has frontage on Nottawa Rd. and you can access your driveway off of Nottawa Rd, you do not need to build a Private Road. If your lot sets back by the woods and you do not have access to the public road frontage then you would need to create a private road to access this parcel.

Mr. Haupt stated that he was still looking at the rules that you could come in and say because it is a 1 to 3.

Mr. Zalewski stated that he could not come in and say that because that is not what the ordinance states.

Mr. Green states that if 3 others build back there, my son, my daughter, and myself, the road stays the same?

Mr. Zalewski stated at 1 to 3 yes, but the minute there are 4 it has to be upgraded.

Mr. Green stated that is what they are arguing about; it should have a category for single home, single dwelling off the road.

Mr. Thompson stated that this is not even part of the discussion. If you have ownership to public road you can build a house or two-track, or whatever you want.

Mr. Haupt asked where it says this.

Mr. Thompson stated that it does not, but it does not say you can not do it.

Ms. Alwood stated that she understands Mr. Green and Mr. Haupt's concerns. Simply for clarification purposes, they are not disagreeing; they would like to see a column that says what a driveway is. For those who are community members who want to be proactive and do not deal with the Zoning Ordinance all the time. They might see this as 1 because there is not provision for driveway.

Mr. Zalewski stated that they had added a note for this.

Mr. Schripsema stated that they do not want to have requirements for a driveway. A driveway could be dirt, grass, or whatever you want it to be. By adding a column in there is it then set in stone what a driveway is?

Mr. Johnson stated that this does not apply to a driveway.

Mr. Willoughby read a portion of the Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Recker stated that they had much discussion about the asterisk to draw an arrow back to driveway. It was the overall consensus that it was assumed that you are one individual, the second it moves to multiple units and your best intention is your son and daughter, then age sets in and you get different ownerships, and then they want the driveway back to a public road.

Mr. Haupt stated that he has no problem with this, but he is looking out for the new home owner that is going to build a house and sees standards for 1 to 3. When he wants to get permits to build, is somebody going to tell him he does not have to put private road in?

Mr. Thompson stated that the 1 to 3 is under the bold heading of private road. The only time that the chart is used is when you are talking about private roads.

Mr. Recker explained that there was concern about putting another column in for driveway

because it would carry another set of requirements and be more confusing.

Mr. Willoughby read from the Private Road Ordinance about the construction of 1 to 3. He stated that a driveway will very likely be built to the standards for 1 to 3. Beyond that it only asks for 4 inches of gravel.

Mr. Thompson stated that these construction standards are not for a driveway, but a private road.

Mr. Zalewski stated that a person would first have to apply to the Planning Commission; once they come into the office we will tell them that they don't need a private road.

Mr. Haupt asked if this was guaranteed that it will be told to these people each time they come in.

Mr. Zalewski stated that every time someone comes in and makes out an application the Zoning Ordinance has to be properly administered. It is guaranteed that these people would be told that they do not need a private road.

Mr. Green stated that if 80 acres is owned and a parcel in the back is sold off with an easement given to it, now does this have to be brought up to private roads standards?

Mr. Thompson stated that this would have to be brought up to private road standards and it would be a one lot private road.

Mr. Haupt stated that many people don't read the fine print.

Mr. Thompson stated that Mr. Green and Mr. Haupt's position is appreciated, but there is concern that the 9 townships have not shown any concern by coming to the meetings. We have been dealing with this for 10 months; there must be a resolution at some point. We have done all we can to refine the language as is reasonable. We are just recommending changes to the board of commissioners.

Mr. Green stated that they are trying to address something that is not written down properly.

Mr. Thompson stated that the need to be able to get a fire truck or ambulance back there. It is not for your families who are building, but those third parties who get involved. The law is trying to protect those individuals. At Coldwater Lake, everyone was happy with the two-track when it started, but when you get more and more houses it becomes a mess. I would like to see the Board of Commissioners come back with some language or rewrite it.

Mr. Willoughby stated that the 46,000 lbs is not an arbitrary number, it is a loaded 10 yard tandem dump truck.

Discussion was held on professional surveyors and professional engineers.

Mr. Thompson stated that it would be confusing to have a column for driveway when the ordinance is for Private Roads.

Mr. Bean explained that if they were to put in a separate column it might allow for boards down the road to put more stipulations on a driveway.

Mr. Schripsema suggested that they leave the asterisk because this section of the ordinance is not intended to driveways.

Ms. Alwood suggested revisiting the placement of the asterisk because she could see where the confusion came from and that is why she suggested placing it there to begin with.

Discussion was held on where the asterisk was placed in the Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Bean stated that he could understand where Mr. Green and Mr. Haupt were coming from being confused with the 1 to 3.

Mr. Thompson stated that looking at the definition of a private road it would depend on who owns the public road.

Mr. Schripsema explained that it would apply to 1 lot if there was no frontage to the parcel.

Mr. Thompson stated that definition of driveway will change to be just those 8 or 10 words.

Ms. Fosburg stated that this has nothing to do with the chart or the Private Road Ordinance, it is just the driveway.

Mr. Zalewski stated that there is a section on private shared driveways, but this does not have any construction specification in it. This section will be replaced by the Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Johnson asked how just any citizen know if they have to have a driveway or a private road.

Mr. Zalewski explained that there is a note at the bottom of the table.

Mr. Neyer asked if a chart could be used to show the frontage that is needed in each district. He stated that this would spell out when you would use a driveway or a private road.

Discussion was held on the language that is used in the definition of a driveway and where it should be placed in the document.

Mr. Thompson stated that if the governing body is unclear on the language they should provide some other language.

Mr. Haupt asked if the copy that was received tonight was the revised version.

Ms. Alwood explained that the copy did not include the simplified definition of driveway or the information on the professional surveyor and professional engineer.

Discussion was held on about Article II of the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion was held on placement of Private Road Ordinance.

Mr. Thompson stated that changes can be made at the Board of Commissioners level. This board can only suggest, but not recommend changes unless they hold another public hearing.

Ms. Alwood stated that it could be brought back to the second meeting in April with the updated information.

Ms. Fosburg stated that the title should go on page 3.

Discussion was held on the Rolland Township board meeting.

Ms. Alwood requested a 3 minute recess.

Discussion was held about proper motion procedure.

A motion was made by Ms. Fosburg, supported by Mr. Willoughby, to return the Private Road Ordinance as is back to the Board of Commissioners for approval. If the Board of Commissioners decides further clarification is needed, the Planning Commission has provided suggested language as discussed tonight so the changes can be made by the Board of Commissioners prior to adoption of the ordinance amendment.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Recker, Alwood.

No: None.

Motion carried.

#### REVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT MATER PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Thompson stated that many of the comments that were received in last month's packets were grammatical so there is no reason not to change those.

Mr. Zalewski stated that comments were received from the County Parks and Recreation Director consisted of changing the name of the County Park's Master Plan

Discussion and a presentation were held on the changes made to the Rolland and Denver township maps.

Discussion was held on the Vernon township map that has yet to be submitted.

Mr. Zalewski stated that comments received from Mr. Lilley were mostly grammatical, but he also provided suggested language for the purchase of development rights.

Mr. Thompson stated that there have been comments about the purchase of development rights. He also read the suggested language that was provided by Mr. Lilley.

Ms. Alwood stated that the Master Plan is not a platform for talking about the fundamental concerns of the program.

Mr. Neyer thought that it was too specific because other programs are not mentioned such as Transferred Development Rights.

Mr. Thompson stated that Transferred Development Rights is in another section.

Discussion was held on what is currently in the Master Plan.

Mr. Johnson stated that by removing the last paragraph, as Mr. Lilley has done, would bar anyone from reconsidering the decision and having a mechanism for purchasing back that which was sold.

Mr. Thompson explained that the Master Plan is used to describe the overall structure of the program and to describe what is available, not to create rules for the program.

Ms. Alwood stated that the language that is proposed is accurate but limiting.

Mr. Neyer stated that this language is too descriptive. It needs to be left open for other types of programs.

Discussion was held on the problems with the current language.

Consensus of the board was to leave the current language as is and change all grammatical errors suggested by Mr. Lilley.

Ms. Alwood stated that in the document it refers to the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, they have since changed their name to Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Nation.

Mr. Johnson asked if the bullet at the bottom was something to be looked at further.

Mr. Neyer explained that it is something that needs to be looked at more as you prepare ordinances.

Mr. Thompson stated that densities were taken out.

Mr. Neyer explained that densities were a hot topic issue. People did not want the densities in there because they were too restrictive.

Mr. Thompson stated that the comments from Montcalm County stated that they respected what is being done.

Mr. Zalewski stated that the Rolland Township concerns were addressed at their board meeting and changes to their future land use map were made accordingly.

Mr. Thompson stated that the comments from Lake Isabella were detailed.

Ms. Alwood stated that Lake Isabella would like to be recognized as an entity.

Mr. Zalewski stated that their census data was not available at the time, but is since and will be updated.

Ms. Fosburg stated that the comment regarding being due west of Bay City should be changed to Midland. Also the word Mecca should be changed.

Discussion was held on the definition of Mecca.

Ms. Alwood asked about the Broomfield existing land use map.

Mr. Zalewski explained that the existing land use map was not created by our office, however the future land use map has been changed to properly show the areas.

Mr. Thompson stated that these corrections have been made by staff and manager of Lake Isabella.

Ms. Alwood asked what the next step of the process is.

Mr. Thompson explained that once a formal package is decided upon, then we should hold a public hearing at our next meeting.

Ms. Alwood asked if the review would be in May and then the public hearing in June.

Mr. Zalewski explained that the changes that have been recommended will be done and the document will go to public hearing in May. Then you propose to adopt it, at that point it will go to the Board of Commissioners who have the final decision on the document. He also stated that the only portion left is the Vernon township map, which can be put in the final document and if at the public hearing it is not agreed with, the changes can be made at that time. Changes will be made as discussed and the document will be ready for public hearing.

A motion was made by Ms. Alwood, supported by Mr. Recker, to set a public hearing for the May 10, 2007 meeting of the Isabella County Planning Commission to consider the Master Land Use Plan of Isabella County.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Recker, Alwood.

No: None.

Motion carried.

## REVIEW OF UNION TOWNSHIP REZONING REQUEST

Mr. Zalewski explained that this area is along the business 127 route. The request was not consistent with their master plan. However, this property is zoned agricultural whereas the adjacent properties are zoned B-5 or some form of business district. Staff has no concerns with the request.

The Planning Commission had no concerns with the request and directed staff to respond to Union Township accordingly.

## DRAFT UPDATED BYLAWS

Mr. Willoughby expressed his opposition to the by-laws part E. Duties of all members item #6 which states "The duty of the member is to represent the majority opinion" with the following statement.

"I want to make my position perfectly clear, no one can be muzzled or their first amendment rights be rescinded by a majority vote of this board.

I hold to the same philosophy best expressed by one of our forefathers who said something to the effect that, although I vigorously disagree with what you say I will fight to the death for your right to say it.

He also wanted to say that I can not believe that anyone in their right mind would imply in their conversations a different outcome to a vote by this board than that which actually occurred. It is after all a matter of record and implying otherwise is a blatant lie."

~~Mr. Willoughby read from page 6 of the Draft Updated Bylaws. He also stated that he wanted to make his position perfectly clear, no one can be muzzled or their first amendment rights be rescinded by a majority vote of this board. He holds to the same philosophy best expressed by one of our forefathers who said something to the effect that, although I vigorously disagree with what you say I will fight to the death for your right to say it. He stated that he can not believe that anyone in their right mind would imply in their conversations a different outcome to a vote by this board than that which actually occurred. It is after all a matter of record and implying otherwise is a blatant lie.~~

Ms. Alwood stated that there should be a definition of an excused and unexcused absence because there might be extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Zalewski explained that the Bylaw subcommittee changed the wording from 'delinquency shall' to 'delinquency may'.

Ms. Alwood stated that as a County Commissioner who would be making these appointments, she would like to know if they were excused or unexcused

Mr. Thompson stated that it would be up to the Board of Commissioners to decide what is meant by delinquency.

Mr. Zalewski stated that if you miss 3 meetings you are missing 25 percent of the meetings for the year and that is a substantial amount of absences.

Ms. Alwood stated that she could come up with some language for this.

Mr. Thompson stated that they would consider that at the next meeting.

Discussion was held on the section about resources.

Ms. Alwood stated that she had a concern with conflict of interest. Following she read a section about conflict of interest from the Bylaws.

Mr. Zalewski explained that it is where as, if your neighbor is requesting a special use permit you would then have to abstain.

Mr. Thompson clarified that you are the person who owned property within 300' of the applicant.

Mr. Zalewski further clarified that you would receive a public hearing notice in the mail, determining that you have a conflict of interest.

Mr. Thompson stated that you should then excuse yourself because you would have a personal stake in whether it passed or not.

Ms. Alwood stated that commas need to be inserted.

Mr. Thompson stated that he had a comment on number 2 of conflict of interest. He asked if the chairperson was to determine if there was a conflict of interest. He also stated that he would provide more language on this.

Mr. Zalewski stated that this is the language that Larry Burdick recommended.

Mr. Thompson asked when he was supposed to notify other commission members and how does he go about notifying them?

Mr. Thompson stated he would also come up with some other language for the section on subcommittees.

Discussion was held on consistency of the order of business and the meeting agenda.

Ms. Alwood ask if changes should be brought to the next meeting

Mr. Zalewski recommended that they get these changes to him 2 weeks before the next meeting so they can be added to the document and sent out in the monthly packets.

BYLAW REVIEW/ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

None heard.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Jackie Curtiss stated that Denver Township appreciated Mr. Zalewski attending their last board meeting.

STAFF COMMENTS

None heard.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Discussion was held by Mr. Recker on a field day at his business on September 6<sup>th</sup>.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Willoughby, supported by Ms. Alwood, to adjourn at 9:28 p.m.

Yes: Johnson, Fosburg, Schripsema, Willoughby, Thompson, Neyer, Johnson, Alwood.

No: None.

Motion carried.

---

Jerry Neyer, Secretary

Brandy Freed, Recording Secretary