ELK RAPIDS TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes – Thursday June 5, 2008

Chairwoman Mischel called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM at the Government Center, 315 Bridge Street.

Present: Jean Derenzy, William Larson, Jim Lundy, Emile Sabty, Shen Smith and Renee' Mischel

Absent: Don Glowicki

Also Present: Leonard Harrett, Zoning Administrator, Larry Nix, Planning Consultant and audience of 4

New Member **–** Jean Derenzy, newly appointed Planning Commission member, was introduced and welcomed by Chairwoman Mischel

Appointment of Vice Chairperson - Chairwoman Mischel nominated and appointed Shen Smith to fill the vacated position of Vice Chairperson. The appointment was approved unanimously.

Because of a previous engagement, Chairwoman Mischel had to leave the meeting a 6:40 PM. Vice Chair Smith assumed the Chairperson position and the meeting continued.

Adoption of Agenda: Agenda for 6-5-2008 meeting was adopted by consensus.

Approval of Minutes:
M/S – Larson/Lundy. Minutes for 5-1-2008 meeting were approved unanimously.

Public Forum: None.

Public Hearing: None.

Old Business:

Section 19.07 – Special Exception
A memo draft of May 2, 2008 by Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant with rewrites since the draft of April 24, 2008 was opened for review and discussion. Written comments prepared by the members were brought forward and text changes were made.

- Sec 19.07-H proposed applicant was changed to potential applicant.
- Sec 19-07-H-3 new text was added to read … meet the intent and purpose of the Township Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.
- Sec 7.06-C … to operate from the Group Retreat facility was changed to Group Retreat Center.
- Sec 7.06-A as to why not have a Group Retreat located in another zone. It was explained that this is addressed in Section 19.07-H which allows for such a request to be made on its own merits.
- Sec 7.06-J comment will be discussed later during the Sec 7.06 review.

As there was no further review or discussion, Vice Chair Smith asked for a vote of approval.

M/S – Sabty/Larson. Move to approve Zoning Ordinance Chapter 19 - ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT, Section 19.07 – SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS write up of May 2, 2008 with corrections.

Roll Call Vote: Yes – Derenzy, Larson, Lundy, Sabty and Smith
Motion passed 5-0-0. Section 19.07 as newly written is approved and will be noticed for a public hearing on August 7, 2008.

Section 7.06 – Group Retreat Center "Ken" from R. Clark Associates, Inc. reviewed their memo of May 27, 2008 (copy on file) proposing amending the standards on review to add individual accessory sleeping

quarters units, mainly bedrooms, bathrooms and sitting area with no kitchens, which extends the main quarters of a Group Retreat into smaller structures that blend in with the character of the property and compliments the neighboring properties within the R-1district. He stated that this would comply with the Master Plan quoting from Chapter 3, Commercial & Manufacturing Land Use. He recommended adding a clause to the standards being developed that reads, *"Accessory Sleeping Quarters may be allowed as an amendment to the Special Exception Use only after the Group Retreat has been in operation for at least three (3) years. The owner may make an application to amend the special exception permit for the Group Retreat to allow detached sleeping quarters subject to conditions and approval of the Planning Commission. A request to consider detached sleeping quarters with a Group Retreat will require a new application for a special exception and site plan review as required in Sections 19.07 and 17.01 of this zoning Ordinance*

Vice Chair Smith gave a summary on the accessory sleeping quarters to date saying that during the last meeting this Commission determined that there would be no sleeping quarters except in the main structure. The Bed & Breakfast (B&B) ordinance when adopted specified that there will be no addition to the structure, and that everything will be contained within the main structure. In November, 2007 Ms. Lee informally inquired about allowing her home to become a Group Retreat within the dwelling structure. We approached this in terms of the B&B in R-1 Zone ordinance and how it is handled. Not adding additional structures, or expansion prior to it becoming a B&B, it was restricted to the number of guests they could have in it. Ms. Lee stated then that she has eleven (11) bedrooms and she wants to run a Corporate Group retreat. Later in January, 2008 we received a proposal from her planner showing an increase to 48 overnight sleeping guests; unless they are all put in the eleven bedrooms, it meant that they planned to add additional sleeping units. This was considered in the last meeting and the Planning Commission said absolutely "NO".

Vice Chair Smith went on to state that she personally view the last paragraph in the memo of May 27, 2008 as threatening the Planning Commission. She thinks that Ms. Lee and her project group should realize that if they want to sell the property they can certainly do so. If they want to develop condos, that's within the Ordinance. If they want to parcel it out and put several homes on it they can do that. In our last Planning Commission meeting we determined that, no additional structures for sleeping would be allowed, this may still carry if we again poll the Planning Commission.

Mr. Larson emphasized reinforcing our decision that no accessory sleeping quarters are allowed.

Ms. Derenzy stated that the subject is still new to her. She noted that this property involves seven acres which makes it different from a B&B ordinance. First reaction is why not allowing additional structures.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator advised that this project reflect future use. Should it be terminated, the structures would become an unwanted burden. The main structure goes back to becoming a single family dwelling without the need for the structures for 31 people. What would you do with it in future time? The concept of a Special Use is allowing something that does not have a physical impact but may have a use impact that can be regulated. Like somebody is doing accounting work or hair styling in a home, once they move out the home is still a home, and the residential property is still a residential. On the other hand, with accessory structures to the magnitude proposed, it does not go away, it remains there in this alleged single family home, it looks a lot more like a summer camp.

Ms. Derenzy went on to state that looking at what is being proposed today, that in three (3) years if it is successful, and they go forward, then we can always put in restrictions that if the Group Retreat is terminated, the burden will be back on the property owner to take care of those restrictions on demolishing the added structures so that it is no more a Group Retreat, it is not a camp. Including such provisions would not be too restrictive on that property, that they can not build any more sleeping dwellings on it.

Vice Chair Smith responded, an R-1 is meant for a single family home, the special exception allows for them to increase the use within the single family home; if it revert back or is sold, with all the sleeping structures, then there is a camp and would probably never revert back to single family; then it would only go on to become something larger, which you really don't want in the R-1 Zone. The Master Plan says that R-1 in lake front areas can only be single family homes, not corporate retreats, not condos, not resorts, nor motels but only single family homes. So a special exception here should be considered very carefully before putting a

whole camp ground down on a single family lot. What is being done is breaking the single family zoning. A precedent would have been set for any one to have a piece of water front property to sell it for a motel.

Mr. Lundy stated that he would not be opposed to adding some smaller structures; however he would not want to see the main structure there get bigger than it is through enlargement. Putting up smaller structures on seven acres with pre set controlling restrictions should the use change can be considered.

Vice Chair Smith said that exploring Mr. Lundy's approach would be close to the last paragraph, option 3 in Mr. Clark's memo that says they could parcel it into additional site parcels. With this thought, they could put four or five additional single family homes, where each one is properly sectioned, and shown on the site plan, the five additional homes could be parceled out and sold individually when the primary home is sold.

Mr. Sabty stated that Mr. Clark's memo of May 27, 2008 implied a commercial retreat venture, a commercial entity. The quotes from the Master Plan are from Chapter 3, Commercial & Manufacturing Land Use. This is not associated with the residential part of the Master Plan. It leads me to believe that they are advocating a commercial entity in an R-1 zone through the Special Exception Use loophole. This back door approach, regardless of what it is called, is nothing more than Spot Zoning. Spot Zoning by definition, "*is rezoning into a classification quite different from and incompatible with the use of surrounding lands. It serves to benefit an individual land owner rather than the broad public interest and is inconsistent with the Master Plan*. *Spot Zoning is considered illegal and can be invalidated if challenged in court."* What is being proposed through the Special Exception loophole is to force Spot Zoning on this Township; that is neither fair, nor acceptable for the people who live in the R-1 residential zone. I don't think it should be there, I don't think it should be allowed under whatever name it is called, for at the end, it is Spot Zoning, and that should not be allowed.

Vice Chair Smith asked if this applies to the additional sleeping use or the entire project. Mr. Sabty responded that the additional sleeping use is only part of this total project. The whole project does not belong there. The Zoning Ordinance does not allow it, the Master Plan does not allow it and that should be enough for us to say we do not agree to approve a Special Exception that takes away from our residential zone.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator, stated that in addition to his earlier statement, a use is regarded as a temporary thing that could go back to being what it was, so a Special Exception has more to do with the use than the main physical property. The main physical property can go back to its traditional use at time of change, but once you build a number of additional structures, the possibility of going back to traditional use is very remote. A B&B is a good example of this.

Mr. Nix,, Planning Consultant, said anything other than a single family house such as B&B is a commercial venture, it is being done for profit, so is farming, it has to do with the nature of the business and the characteristics of that. There are different things that go on in a single family R-1 district that are not always single family homes, like churches, schools, day care facilities that are complimentary to a traditional single family use. This Commission is under no obligation, at all, to continue with this process. You can come to the conclusion at this meeting that we don't think we want to take this to a public hearing, we don't agree with it, and just drop it. You can say, at this Commission level, put it together and take it to a public hearing; you can include accessory sleeping quarters with some restricting language as mentioned earlier or four satellite units, which actually would say to the applicant, demonstrate in your plan how if the group retreat fails, how it would be proposed to be reused as legal conforming uses in lots on the property itself. The proposed accessory sleeping quarters would then need a kitchen facility. Adding a kitchen makes it into a house, how can that be placed on the property, how can it be divided into a lot and make it legal into an R-1 lot of 100'x200'. This Commission has some choices to do, so far it has been a response to a request that has come forward, and then try to work through something that could accommodate this request. So far there have been varying opinions about the use on this property. There are many factors that influence opinions. This Commission should take a positive approach in reviewing the applicant's request. If it goes to a public hearing, then the Township residents can have their say during the hearing. Holding a public hearing does not mean that the Commission has to recommend to the Township Board, which have the last say, that they approve the amendment, the Commission can say, "here it is, but we don't think you should approve it." So far, much effort went into this amendment, now new ideas have come through. You can completely kill the idea of accessory sleeping quarters. On the other hand, accessory sleeping quarters applied for after three years of

properly established use of the main facility, then standards are developed for those sleeping quarters if the request is to be made, and what would the standards be? It could be design standards, property division to accommodate and comply with the structures as specified in R-1 Zone. This piece of property has split zones on it, and to make application they have to be merged into one R-1 Zone, and any accessory sleeping quarters down the road would have to comply with the R-1 Zone standards.

Vice Chair Smith stated that personally she would not want to approve the additional sleeping quarters but would see how something in line with ideas brought forward today; saying in essence that if the project falls apart, then each additional sleeping unit would become a split legal lot. Then she asked the members to sum up their thoughts.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator, said he worries about what may happen if it fails or is sold to anther group.

Mr. Larson stated that he is concerned about the future, and feels that no additional sleeping units should be added.

Ms. Derenzy stated that she need further review of proposed structures put forward in a request. At this time she feels that any additional structure should be able to stand alone in the future if the project is discontinued.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, added that a special exception is no more than an overlay over an R-1 Zone. The R-1 integrity is still there and the zoning is not broken. The applicant would be given a special permission to use the seven acres and the large home, initially for a Group Retreat Center. After they have established that, and three years later as they proposed it, they could come to amend the special use to allow the accessory sleeping quarters, demonstrate where those buildings would go and how they could be located on legal lots. First is the initial consideration of the application, then three years later if they so choose to do that, they bring another application or amended application to consider the accessory sleeping quarters.

Vice Chair Smith asked if all this can be considered when they come forward with the initial application. Mr. Nix, responded that he would not suggest that, because during the first three years of operation, there may be things that take place at the property, or there may be complaints, or other problems that we may want to address when they come with an application for accessory sleeping quarters. You should hold back and don't do it all going in. During that time if something is not working, you don't want to have that activity there because it is disturbing the neighbors or whatever that might be.

Mr. Lundy stated that he would look at allowing additional accessory sleeping units if they conform to our Zoning Ordinance for R-1 Zone and they are stand alone structures as explained.

Mr. Sabty stated that as far as accessory sleeping units, this Commission said NO. But as long as this idea is only that, let's see how this approach comes out as long as the accessory sleeping units are stand alone and would be of legal size on R-1 lots that meet all the R-1 Zone standards.

Mr. Larson addressing Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, asked if he was suggesting that the special exception amendment, three years from now, could be amended to accept accessory sleeping quarters within these parameters? Mr. Nix responded, "Yes". Mr. Larson then asked whether it would be amended or applied for through a new request. Mr. Nix responded that he will be spelling out the process we will have to go through to achieve accessory sleeping quarters. It will be an amendment to the special exception. Mr. Larson then asked if it will offer the possibility and not a given? Mr. Nix responded, "Yes".

Vice Chair Smith looked for a new write up that moves the process forward. Mr. Larson responded that we are going forward with the new draft that the Planning Consultant is going to produce. Vice Chair Smith stated that we change our minds at every meeting. Mr. Sabty responded that if we change our minds every meeting, it means we are not yet set in our thoughts on the subject. Once the issues begin to settle and common grounds become apparent, then the minds start getting closer, and there will be consensus. Then we see a result.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator, asked if at some point we will need an updated site plan of the property.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, responded that once an official application for a special exception is submitted, a site plan review will require an up to date site plan. He then went on to say that what he is going to do, based on this input, is take this May 27, 2008 memo from Mr. Clark and create the ability under Section 7.06 for the applicant to apply for accessory sleeping quarters, we are going to define that term and allow them to apply three years after this has been in operation and establishing some criteria of what has to be in that plan for submission and consideration of those accessory sleeping quarters. He would be mailing the new draft as soon as it is ready for comment and then discuss it at the next meeting.

Ms, Derenzy asked why is it required in item "I" on page 6 of the draft, to submit a year summary of activities to the Zoning Administrator. The answer given is summarized in that by doing so, the Township can keep abreast of what goes on year to year and with minimal control they can see to it that no uncalled for activity takes place, especially with a Group Retreat located among R-1 Zone residents.

Mr. Sabty addressed the written comment referred to earlier regarding Sec 7.06-J stating that in the case of selling the Group Retreat Center the burden of notification and acquiring the necessary operating information and procedures should fall on the seller/buyer and should not be the responsibility of the Zoning Administrator nor the Township Government. Voidance of the Special Exception may take place if this is not done. This was advocated in the April 2008 meeting, but the draft showed the opposite where the burden is put on the Township government. That is not right and should not be that way.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator stated he is in agreement with this approach of having the burden of contact on the seller/buyer. This will eliminate any excuses of ignorance such as "the seller told me I can do it, or I was not told I can not do it".

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, stated that it was drafted this way so that if there is a sale, the owner notifies the Zoning Administrator of the new applicant name, address and phone number. All the Zoning Administrator has to do then is take the special exception approved minutes and all the conditions, put it in an envelop and mail them to him, so if something goes wrong on the property and I start doing something improper or outside the approval process, then the Zoning Administrator can say, I sent you all this information via registered mail to the address the seller provided me.

Mr. Sabty pointed that no where in the Ordinance the burden is put on the Government in a sale, whether a registered letter or any other method; and this is not different. The burden should be on the individual.

Mr. Harrett, Zoning Administrator, pointed out that he never did, nor will, accept money or what else by registered mail. It can sit in the Post Office until it expires, but he would never accept it.

Vice Chair Smith suggested that we should modify 7.06-J to adopt some of the suggested comments text and show that the buyer and the seller should notify the Township. Then the Zoning Administrator can follow up by sending out a letter of particulars.

Mr. Sabty stated that the point in all this is that the Township Government should not be obligated to do what the buyers/seller should be doing; they should be carrying the burden. At no place in the Zoning Ordinance the obligation is on the Government to do this, it is always on the individual involved. What I am advocating here came from the Planning Consultant statements during the April 2008 meeting. He advocates an approach and we concur with it, then when he put it in writing it comes out completely different. That is not right.

Vice Chair Smith stated that the jest of it is that the buyer and seller would go to the Township when a property is sold.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, stated that this is a very minor item, to be honest. Then he suggested changing Sec 7.06-J to read:

The Special Exception Use permit issued to the original applicant can be assigned to subsequent owners. In the event the property is sold and a new owner who proposes/intends to continue the operation of the Group Retreat Center, the seller shall notify the Zoning Administrator of the name, address and phone number of the new owner. The new owner shall be required to contact the Township for the purpose of review of all the conditions and operational procedures associated with the Original Special Exception.

There was consensus and the Planning Commission agreed to the change as written.

US-31 Corridor

Carried over from the May 1, 2008 meeting, the draft of April 24, 2008 was put forward for review; Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant stated that the draft on hand is based on the Ad hock Committee recommendations and suggestions.

Mr. Sabty distributed a summary memo (copy on file) of all the previous minutes on this subject starting with the initial April 4, 2006 meeting until it was approved by the Planning Commission at the public hearing of June 7, 2007. He stated that it does not include any of the subsequent happenings that took place after the June 7, 2007 meeting. Highlighted sections gave a chronology of how the Commission reviewed the different drafts submitted over time, and what was the format they finally decided on. It also brought out the initial intent of the Commission to keep the write up short and be contained into one Section. At the November 7, 2006 meeting the Commission did say that the overlay would not involve the East side as long as the agricultural use continues; however if that changes to a different use, then the overlay would take effect.

Again on December 5, 2006 it was requested by the Planning Commission that the draft be revised and be limited to the 1) Corridor Area, 2) Mixed Use, 3) Structure Setback and 4) Landscaping Plan; this would be the extent of the US-31 Corridor overlay zone.

During the January 2, 2007 meeting, and upon advise of the Planning Consultant, there was consensus by the Commission to exclude from the site plan review would be one/two family houses and farms (R-1, R-2, & Ag). They further agreed that there will be two additions to the Zoning Ordinance. 1) Establish a uniform setback from US-31 Centerline, 150 feet. 2) Establish a landscaping Plan for all non-residential construction and agricultural uses.

On February 6, 2007 the Commission unanimously voted 6-0-0 to include alternative “A” creating section 2.02 showing corridor ordinance details, and alternative “B” which references the setback requirements from US-31 to be inserted in the Ordinance at appropriate locations.

On April 3, 2007, a year from the start, the draft with the revised text format was reviewed and accepted. It eventually was approved in the public hearing of June 7, 2007 with some changes. The Planning Commission approved amendment included in Part one (1) Section 2.20 with its four provisions, and Part two (2) which amended each of Chapters 6-13 of the Zoning Ordinance to add a section that guides the user to refer back to Chapter 2 for supplemental requirements and height, area and yard restrictions.

Eventually the first part regarding Section 2.20 was referred back to the Commission for further study because of the 150 foot setback stated in Sub Section “A”. The second part which amended Chapters 6 through 13 was adopted as Amendment 2007-03 of August 23, 2007.

The point in all this, Mr. Sabty said, was that we agreed and voted on Section 2.20 to be home for the US-31 Corridor standards and on Part 2 where we said in different chapters to review Chapter 2. In the draft of April 24, 2008, two years from the start, the whole format and its content that we spent months developing got disregarded in the draft, and now we find ourselves right back where we started. There was nothing wrong with Section 2.20-B,C,D and part two is already in the Zoning Ordinance. Just what is going on?

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, asked where is the motion you made that we deny the whole thing that went to the Township Board. Mr. Sabty responded that what he just went through does not go beyond June 7, 2007. At the same time, the motion referred to was to recommend to the Township Board to deleted Section 2.20 from the total amendment packet on hand and table it for further review.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant, went on to say that, you are leaving out of your analysis the part after it went to the County and there was a lot of public input and it came back here before it went to the Township Board and a motion was passed by this Commission, even though they have approved it, to deny the request. Mr. Sabty responded that again, to set the record straight on what you have stated, after the County did not approve Section 2.20 amendment and they sent it to the Township Board for their action, The Planning Commission recommended to the Township Board to not approve Section 2.20 and send it back for review.

Mr. Sabty went on to say that, had we stayed with our original premises, just leave what is there as it is, and only apply the amendment to the future; we would not have had any problems. Between all the constant write and rewrite and the changing drafts and discussions to finally arrive at the desired format, somewhere we lost our original mission. That is why I am presenting this fact summary to this Commission, so that we can get back to our voted format and our original mission for the US-31 Corridor with its simple format and content that was developed.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant then said, "What you are suggesting is that we go back to where we were so that we can go to a public hearing again and get beat up."

Mr. Sabty responded that No one gets beat up if the Planning Consultant was to write his drafts to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission up front. During the May 1, 2008 meeting you were asked to go back and write up what you may come up with pertaining to the Corridor esthetics, but leave the setback out for the time being. Instead, we got back the current draft with the setups spread over it. The Advisory Committee did not indicate that there is a problem with the proposed Section 2.20 format or the content for the US-31 esthetics. Their primary concern was with the 150 foot setback applying across the Corridor to all properties. That was the one that created the problem. Nothing is wrong with the rest of it.

At this time I am not addressing the content of the latest draft we received, that will come later. This draft format spreads the amendment over the Zoning Ordinance when it should be concentrated in Section 2.20 as The Planning Commission agreed to and voted on previously.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant said that basically what I did is take the recommendations of the Ad hock Committee and apply them to the Zoning Ordinance as they have suggested. So what you are suggesting is that I no do that but I go back to what was put together last summer, ignore what the Ad hock Committee is telling us, and do it where we were originally.

Mr. Sabty stated that what he is suggesting is that whatever is going to be done should stay within what the Planning Commission established under Section 2.20. We voted where this thing would be located in the Zoning Ordinance, and that the second part of the amendment was adopted and is already in the Ordinance. What we have to do is go back and review then proposed Section 2.20 and if language needs to be changed, put it in there.

Vice Chair Smith asked what is wrong with the current draft? Mr.Sabty responded that, in brief, it should be written under Section 2.20 A,B,C D and kept short. If one wants to know about the US-31 Corridor, they would go to Section 2.20 and find out all there is about the US-31 corridor ordinance. The way this draft is presented, one has to read the whole Zoning Ordinance to find what is there about the US-31 Corridor; you would need and index to point out where to find the information. Vice Chair Smith went on to say that according to what was voted then, Corridor information was also going to be repeated in various pertinent Chapters. Mr. Sabty responded that this is true, It was developed under part 2 of the Corridor amendment, it started as 2 or 3 repeated statements under each chapter involved, then it was developed by the Planning Consultant into the current format that was adopted stating to, "See Chapter 2, General Provisions for supplemental requirements and height, area, and yard restrictions".

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant stated that one of the primary issues that came out at the public hearing and the meeting after the recommendation was made, was the application of this as a general provision in an overlay. We originally proposed Section 2.20 which was a general provision that applied to the Corridor US-31, and that when the Elk Rapids Township watch group was created. That created such an objection to what we were doing. One of the primary recommendations that came out of the Ad hock Committee was this only apply to commercial property, and this suggestion to us in their report of February 08 to have it apply only to commercial property, that way there is absolutely no confusion or application to these setbacks for these standards to the agricultural land on the East side of US-31. That's why I wrote that suggestion based on the Ad hock Committee.

Mr. Sabty responded that had we stayed with what our mission was, we would have reached that goal, but we had to keep going through all the rewrites and in the process we lost track of our original concept.

Mr. Nix, Planning Consultant said, I guess it was my fault that this had failed then. You have no responsibility. Mr. Sabty responded that we have responsibility; and it was that we forgot to follow and insure our conceptual mission while we went through all the writes and rewrites throughout a whole year.

Vice Chair Smith stated that from the summary points presented, we are back to where we started. Now the only thing we need is to apply the setback on the commercial property. Nothing in there about required setback on non commercial properties, we ran there into serious problem with that. Look at how the Wooden Hammer developed their property, why object to that. Mr. Sabty responded that had this been written then, where it would say this setback does not apply to anything existing today, but apply only to future development, we would not have had any problem

Vice Chair Smith asked the Planning Commission members of what their thoughts are on this subject?

Mr. Larson stated that he thought there were two objections. 1) No one understood that it just applies to future development. 2) The other was parking only in the rear. Other than that it would have passed. As to the setback of 150 feet, it would apply to the East side, but not to anything that is already established or agricultural. A property sold for development the setback becomes 150 feet and the applicable front parking would also apply.

The other Commission members responding expressed their agreement with Mr. Larson's statement and emphasized that it only apply to future development and not to what is already established.

At this time Vice Chair Smith advised the Planning Consultant that as the Planning Commission had originally voted that this would be located in two places in the Zoning Ordinance, in Section 2.20 and referenced in the individual zones. To prepare a new draft that includes a newly revised Section 2.20 that is based on the points brought forward by the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Smith asked that a new item be added to the Future Agenda items, "Identify more R-3 Zone parcels". She also recommended that because the next scheduled meeting is on July 3, which is the eve of a holiday, that we cancel that meeting and that the next meeting will be on Thursday August 7, 2008. The two suggestions were unanimously approved and adopted.

Having no further business, Vice Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 9:15 PM.

E. S. Sabty, Secretary
6-5-2008

Minutes Approved <u>8-7-2008</u>

Minutes are subject to approval at the next regular Planning Commission meeting.