

Holly Township
Planning Commission – Regular Meeting
Minutes of May 11, 2009

Call to Order: Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn called the May 11, 2009 Regular Meeting of the Holly Township Planning Commission to order at or about 7:00 p.m. at the Holly Township Hall, 102 Civic Drive, Holly, Michigan, 48442.

Roll Call:

Commissioners Present:

LaLaine Kilbourn, Chairperson
George Barton
Lloyd Kernen
Mark McHalpine
Ted Gurski

Commissioners Absent:

Steve Ruth
Rick Stevens

Others Present:

Brian Oppmann , Carlisle/Wortman
James Burton, Hubbell, Roth & Clark
Jesse Lambert, Holly Township Supervisor
Larry Lilly

Staff Present:

Laura DeVault, Building & Zoning Administrator

- **Commissioner George Barton moved to excuse Commissioners Steve Ruth and Rick Stevens from the meeting. Commissioner Mark McHalpine supported the motion. A voice vote was taken; all those present voted yes; the motion carried.**

Agenda Approval:

- **Commissioner Ted Gurski moved to approve the Agenda, as written. Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn supported the motion. A voice vote was taken; all those present voted yes; the motion carried.**

Public Hearings: No public hearing.

Approval of Minutes:

Commissioner Gurski indicated on the first page, under Others Present, “Ed McLeod” should be “Ben McLeod”. On Page 9, Line 43, “Mr. Ed McLeod” should be “Mr. Ben McLeod”.

Commissioner Mark McHalpine noted on Page 16 at Lines 42 and 43 the minutes read, “they did working” and should read “they did woodworking”.

- **Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn moved to approve the minutes of April 13th, 2009, as amended. Commissioner Ted Gurski supported the motion. A voice vote was taken; all those present voted yes; the motion carried.**

Communications: No communications.

New Business:

1. 2009 – 2010 Mining Permit application for parcel #01-12-201-001, Green Thumb Landscaping

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

2. 2009 – 2010 Mining Permit application for parcel #01-13-401-003, 01-13-426-001, 01-24-227-001, Holly Disposal
3. 2009 – 2010 Mining Permit application for parcel #01-12-251-001, 01-12-251-009 & 010, Middleton Sand & Gravel
4. 2009 – 2010 Mining Permit application for parcel #01-12-101-004 and 01-12-326-001, South Flint Gravel, Inc.
5. 2009 – 2010 Mining Permit application for parcel #01-12-126-001, 01-01-376-002 – 005 Tri-City Aggregates

Mr. James Burton, Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC), reviewed with the Planning Commission a summary document from HRC entitled Mining Permit Applications, dated May 11, 2009.

Commissioner George Barton questioned what the bond amounts were per the Consent Judgments.

Mr. Burton indicated he believes they are \$3,000.00 an acre being mined.

Commissioner Barton questioned whether \$3,000.00 an acre was an adequate amount for the bonds.

Mr. Burton stated if the Township had to reclaim one of these sites, it would cost more than \$3,000.00 an acre. It's a typical number that communities use. This is the amount listed in the Consent Judgments.

Mr. Brian Oppmann indicated Carlisle/Wortman's reports from last year still stand.

Commissioner Gurski questioned whether Green Thumb was under a Consent Judgment. If they're not, they should be following Township ordinances. Rather than using it as a storage facility, it may be appropriate for the area to be reclaimed.

Mr. Burton stated Green Thumb is not mining the site. It is a contractor's storage yard. There are areas that need to be reclaimed. In that regard, the mining is not finished until they have reclaimed the old mine. If they came in and applied for site plan approval, they could get out of the mining permit. Because they continue to submit mining permit applications and continue to pay their bonds, they are treated as a mining permit.

Commissioner Gurski noted in the Consent Judgments there are requirements that mining be done or start reclaiming the property. On Page 14 of the ordinance there is an item (k) that says if they don't mine it after X number of months, they need to start a reclamation process. They may be using the mining permit application to avoid applying for a special land use permit with the possibility it wouldn't be approved.

Administrator Laura DeVault stated the Board had been in touch with Green Thumb indicating they would have to submit for rezoning, special use and site plan to operate as a contractor's yard.

Commissioner Gurski indicated every year we see the same shortcomings on the same mines and they have to be reviewed two or three times and it's still not completed. According to the Consent Judgment, the mining actually starts by January 15th, and they have to have their mining permit applications ready by May. He questioned whether that was the right way to do business with them.

Mr. Burton stated some of the operators are much more willing to work with you; when you get out there, they show you what they're doing. Some of them are working on reclamation. You are seeing the same kind of things because that's the nature of the business to some extent.

There is a correction needed on HRC's May 8, 2009 letter. On Page 1 in the fourth paragraph, middle of the sentence, it reads "0.51" and it should read "0.051".

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn noted HRC's letter from May 4, 2009 states that Middleton Sand & Gravel needs an updated bond.

Mr. Burton stated the updated bond has been submitted and there is a rider on the bond. The aerial photograph is still needed and a revised updated plan. It is HRC's opinion additional grass growth is needed and other things.

Commissioner Mark McHalpine indicated there are resident concerns that the slopes at the Middleton site have encroached on other people's property and actually eroded some of their property lines, and that slopes were not proper. He questioned whether that was true and what the remedy would be.

Mr. Burton stated he has heard secondhand there was an encroachment onto a property which was under an agreement between the property owners. Slopes get steep when they're mining and they need to be rectified. Some of the area they are reclaiming, other areas they are planning on actively mining. He went to the site and saw mine slopes. We should be working with them through the inspections in the summer, make sure those are not getting steeper and that they stay within the setbacks and buffers that the Consent Judgment ordered. Tonight the applications are up for approval. Second to that is if there are violations through the inspections, they would have to be addressed. Anywhere that they encroach, they have to pull back and remedy those sites.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted Holly Disposal, Green Thumb and Tri-City Aggregates have updated their reclamation bonds.

Administrator DeVault indicated South Flint has updated their bond also. Holly Disposal, South Flint and Middleton have requested reclamation certification in some areas. Holly Disposal and South Flint are making the attempt but the turf wasn't established well enough to be satisfactory.

Mr. Burton stated he believes South Flint reclaimed a parcel of property and then mined more of it. Then they put it all back and then mined part of it. When they are permanently done mining, HRC will review it for reclamation certification. He would suggest at the next inspection the applicants be there to punch list out the areas they're done in separately. The engineer of record for most of the sites is Kieft Engineering. Middleton has brought someone new in but they're working off the old Kieft plans. One mining operation is using a different engineering firm. HRC is double checking to ensure when we get to the middle there are no big problems.

- **Commissioner George Barton moved to recommend approval to the Board of Trustees the mining permit for Green Thumb Lawnsaping, parcel #01-12-201-001, for the 2009-2010 mining permit year, per our engineer's report and letter dated May 11, 2009. Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn supported the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Kernen: Yes; Kilbourn: Yes; Gurski: Yes; McHalpine: Yes; Barton: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.**
- **Commissioner George Barton moved to recommend tentative approval to the Board of Trustees the mining permit for Holly Disposal, parcel #01-13-401-003, 01-13-426-001 & 01-24-227-001, for the 2009-2010 mining permit year, subject to receipt of the updated reclamation bond, per our engineer's report and letter dated May 11, 2009. Commissioner Mark McHalpine supported the motion. A roll call vote was taken. McHalpine: Yes; Barton: Yes; Kernen: Yes; Gurski: Yes; Kilbourn: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.**
- **Commissioner George Barton moved to table Middleton Sand & Gravel, per our engineer's report and letter dated May 11, 2009 as the reclamation plans must be updated and resubmitted before further review. Commissioner Ted Gurski supported the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Kilbourn: Yes; Kernen: Yes; Gurski: Yes; McHalpine: Yes; Barton: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.**

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

- **Commissioner George Barton moved to recommend approval to the Board of Trustees the mining permit for South Flint Gravel, Inc., pending receipt of the updated reclamation bond, per the engineer’s report and letter dated May 11, 2009, parcel #01-12-101-004 and 01-12-326-001, for the 2009-2010 mining permit year. Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn supported the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Barton: Yes; McHalpine: Yes; Kilbourn: Yes; Gurski: Yes; Kernen: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.**
- **Commissioner George Barton moved to recommend approval to the Board of Trustees the mining permit for Tri-City Aggregates, per the engineer’s report and letter dated May 11, 2009, parcel #01-12-126-001, 01-01-376-002 – 005, for the 2009-2010 mining permit year. Commissioner Lloyd Kernen supported the motion. A roll call vote was taken. McHalpine: Yes; Kilbourn: Yes; Kernen: Yes; Barton: Yes; Gurski: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.**

6. Annual Report
7. Budget

Chairperson Kilbourn noted everyone should think about things they would like the Planning Commission and/or Carlisle/Wortman to work on so money can be budgeted accordingly. She requested Mr. Oppmann to let the Planning Commission know of things other township planning commissions are doing that would be beneficial for Holly Township to do. The Commission can consider what priority should be given to budget items also.

Commissioner Barton suggested there should be a matrix for the Annual Report reflecting the number of meetings and public hearings that were held. Everything else is contained in the minutes. He will have that done by the next meeting.

Old Business:

1. Bylaws

Commissioner Barton questioned whether any other townships Mr. Oppmann works with have tenure limitations for positions on their planning commissions, such as the chairperson.

Mr. Oppmann stated Oxford Township’s bylaws indicate after four consecutive terms the positions must be changed. Springfield Township’s Planning Commission is in the process of updating their bylaws. The State law is silent on that so it’s just a preference. Oxford Township has a caveat that if you are a first-year member of the Commission, you cannot be an officer.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted it was interpreted that the new township enabling act requires officers not be reappointed unless it was stated within the Township’s bylaws.

Commissioner Gurski stated if there is a limit, it gives others the opportunity to be officers if they so choose.

Commissioner McHalpine noted in Article IV of the bylaws, where it states, “An officer may be re-elected to his or her office” that should remain and the remainder of the sentence should be stricken where it reads, “provided that no officer may be re-elected to the same office for more than four (4) consecutive terms”.

- **Commissioner Mark McHalpine moved to approve the bylaws, as amended; under Officers, Article IV, “An officer may be re-elected to his or her office” will end the sentence, and the remainder of the sentence will be stricken. Commissioner George Barton supported the motion. A roll call vote was**

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

taken. McHalpine: Yes; Gurski: Yes; Barton: Yes; Kernen: Yes; Kilbourn: Yes. The motion carried by a 5/0 vote.

2. Green Infrastructure Draft Map Review

Chairperson Kilbourn noted there were approximately 12 changes made to the green infrastructure draft map and submitted to Oakland County without Planning Commission input.

The Planning Commission and others reviewed the green infrastructure draft map as a group.

3. Master Plan Update

Chairperson Kilbourn noted regarding Trustee Janet Leslie's recommendations, the Planning Commission conducted a Master Plan update and it wasn't a major redo. Public input was obtained at a visioning workshop during the previous major review of the Master Plan.

Commissioner Gurski indicated at all Planning Commission meetings public opinion has been offered, including times when the Master Plan Update was on the Agenda. Opportunity was there for the public to give their opinion.

Commissioner George Barton noted there will also be a Public Hearing regarding the Master Plan Update before it is adopted.

Mr. Oppmann indicated on the safety path master plan East Holly Road and Grange Hall Road are shown as being safety path routes and can be listed as recommendations on page 67 for the "East Holly Corridor Recommendations", as well as on page 69 regarding the "Grange Hall Road Corridor Recommendations".

Chairperson Kilbourn noted regarding Mr. Jeff Wren's recommendations, "Black" will be changed to "African Americans". Also, "mobile homes" will be changed to "manufactured homes". Regarding Ms. DeVault's remarks, many of them are corrections of the text.

Mr. Oppmann stated he had Ms. DeVault's comments dated February 5, 2009. Many of these are simple text changes. The first item where Ms. DeVault questions "why" is after the comment "Prioritized Planned Road Improvements/Rood Road is deleted".

Ms. DeVault indicated Rood Road was in there and that section no longer exists in the draft. The previous township supervisor, with the Oakland County Road Commission (OCRC), targeted the area for improvement.

Commissioner Barton stated when Oakland County paves something, they clear-cut 60 feet and destroy; there's no such thing as a natural beauty road when they get involved. That's a natural beauty road if we ever had one in the township. Eddy Lake Road has been done to Genesee County standards and it's quite nice. Oakland County would have gutted the whole area. Coming in on East Holly Road from 75, Oakland County put in curbs and gutters. Putting in curbs and gutters would destroy Rood Road completely. Most counties have multiple levels of paved roads; we have one level. It's not that we don't appreciate the heavy-duty infrastructure the county puts in; it's that we shouldn't be cutting back 20 feet of trees on either side. If it were widened a little bit and paved, it would be wonderful.

Mr. Oppmann noted on Page 3 it reads, "Changed future land use designation of Victoria Lane from medium to low density estate residential. Explain."

Ms. DeVault stated the Victoria Lane area has already been fully developed and split out. She was curious why the future land use designation was changed.

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

Chairperson Kilbourn indicated the Victoria Lane/Oak Drive area was inconsistent with the zoning and she believes one property needed to be rezoned to make it consistent with the area.

Mr. Oppmann stated the next item reads, “Changed future land use designation for Holly Academy and residential property on East Drive from Mixed Use to medium density. Explain”. Originally the Holly Academy area was intended to be mixed use because at one time it was thought the academy would be sold and redeveloped. At this point Holly Academy is not going anywhere anytime soon.

Ms. DeVault suggested the future land use designation would be public institutional, as other properties are that are improved as schools, instead of giving it a residential zoning.

Mr. Oppmann indicated that could be done.

Ms. DeVault stated the remaining smaller parcels would be a residential future use.

Mr. Oppmann noted he looked at the lot sizes and they could be medium density.

Ms. DeVault indicated she had questions about the institutional and local recreation categories. There seems to be two very different ideas together. She looked through the new Springfield Township Master Plan today and noticed they have public and semi-public categories, then there’s another category for institutional for something like Rose Hill and other types of development features that are not necessarily recreational or public lands.

Mr. Oppmann stated the designations weren’t changed on the map; they were kept consistent through the last few updates. Public could be the township building, parks or churches. There are many categories that can fall into that. In five to ten years when a major Master Plan update is done, that’s when we would address all the categories. They tried to meet the limited budget and focus on a few areas of the map that have come up in the past few years.

Chairperson Kilbourn suggested setting an amount in the budget each year for the Master Plan so there would be money set aside each year for it.

Ms. DeVault indicated Oak Drive was designated as multi-family, wanted to change it to low density. However, the way the color for multi-family is indicated, the piece of property actually has some frontage on Oak Drive. It appears you could have an entrance to an apartment facility off of Oak Drive and she doesn’t believe that’s the intention of the Township. She believes it should be single family residential development and if there is multi-family, then they have access off of Fish Lake Road. That would be a dual future land use designation.

There are some areas that she pointed out that aren’t indicated as institutional. They were previously on the Master Plan we have now. They’re on North Holly Road; the slim parcel where the two Township park farm structures and the pole barn are. She questioned whether that would be the institutional color blue. Then the parcel that’s the water tower on Quick Road, there’s a white square there so you’d want that to be blue because that is municipal local institutional property.

Commissioner McHalpine noted the new fire station area needs to be identified also.

Ms. DeVault indicated the three new parcels that the Township now owns from Silverman, only one of them is indicated in blue. There’s one on the south side of Academy and a 16 acre parcel by the Shiawassee River. She questioned, if there’s any open space property that’s part of the Riverside development, whether they should be a color other than white. That would mean they’re an underlying future land use category AGRE, but we’re preserving them.

Mr. Oppmann noted they are not parcels, they’re rights of use.

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

Ms. DeVault questioned whether they should be Resource Conservation, which is green, and Mr. Oppmann agreed.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted on Map 8, existing land use, “mobile home” will be changed to “manufactured home”.

Mr. Oppmann asked for clarification regarding Ms. DeVault’s comments for “page 53, Policy 5, Roads, third paragraph”.

Ms. DeVault indicated some residents talked to the supervisor about dangerous road situations. It was thought the Township should have the ability to address that.

Mr. Oppmann noted page 53, Policy 5, the third paragraph, the last sentence is, “No attempt will be made to propose costly road relocations or alter basic road patterns which have been established for years”. He questioned whether we want to retain that or leave it open some day to realign intersections or at least leave the option on the table. He believes we should.

Commissioner Barton agreed.

Chairperson Kilbourn suggested adding the language “may consider” on page 53, Policy 5.

Ms. DeVault indicated in her note “Consider revisions to Policy 9 Extractive Lands”, the Board of Trustees has asked the Township attorney and engineer to draft a mining reclamation overlay that will be part of the zoning ordinance. The Township will also work on Farmland Preservations in the zoning ordinance in the next five years to get more agricultural tourism.

Mr. Oppmann stated the Board of Trustees wanted a corridor study done on North Holly Road, which is essentially a review of land use, existing and future zoning and development patterns. At the subcommittee level it was decided land uses were reviewed during the Master Plan update process.

Commissioner Barton noted this is in the wake of Genesee County telling us we don’t get water or sewer. When we had competing movie theaters going, Genesee County reminded us that they control the water and sewer. Anything in that area can’t be done without water and sewer.

Ms. DeVault noted the Township has adopted a community septic ordinance.

Commissioner Barton indicated you wouldn’t think of putting in industrial if you were going to develop the area with a package plant. You’d have to tap Genesee County sewer.

Mr. Oppmann stated the density is limited in the North Holly Road area because of the natural areas up there; wetlands, soil conditions. Those are factors.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted language was added for the North Holly Road area.

Mr. Oppmann indicated he would prepare something for the Board of Trustees to better explain the thoughts on the area. The subcommittee spent quite a bit of time on the area.

Ms. DeVault requested Mr. Oppmann to speak regarding where it says, “Page 71 North Holly Road Corridor Recommendations. The first bullet item is a change from the previous text: limiting density to existing zoning. This is a contradiction to the future land use designation of Map 10 as low density estate residential 1 dwelling unit/2.5 acres”, when actually they have AGRE zoning.

Mr. Oppmann stated regarding North Holly Road, AGRE zoning is there now and it’s Master Planned for rural estate, which is 2 ½ acre zoning. If we’re limiting density to existing zoning, we need to change the map or tweak the sentence. It would be a maximum density of 1 to 2 ½.

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

Ms. DeVault noted further down there is another comment about Rood Road that's not well placed with the other comment on the previous pages. The future right-of-way is proposed at 120 feet and she thought it should still be listed in the Master Plan. It's not a major corridor from a layman's point of view and is something you wouldn't expect.

Mr. Oppmann indicated the build-out analysis was discussed at the subcommittee level. There were e-mails to Charlotte Burckhardt at the county about that. There were a number of factors, one of which was cost because that's a costly analysis to do. He will provide a copy of the e-mail to Ms. DeVault.

Commissioner Gurski noted where Mr. Oppmann was talking about the master right-of-way plan, in the first sentence it says the Holly Township Master Right-of-Way Plan is shown on the following page, and the map is actually two pages back. It could be changed to refer to the Right-of-Way Plan as Map 13 at the bottom of page 73.

Mr. Oppmann indicated page 88 is the implementation page and gives examples of ways to implement what's in the document.

Ms. DeVault noted they use those very often. The fire prevention one was updated completely in the last year. She noted a zoning plan having some kind of narrative legend or table is needed. It would help in discussing it with developers and property owners.

Mr. Oppmann indicated that needs to be placed in the future land use section. It's not a zoning plan, it's a table. The table has a land use designation and density.

Ms. DeVault stated when Middleton was being discussed, it was mentioned we need to know what zoning category met their future land use category and there was some play in that discussion. It would help the Township be more specific.

She questioned if an area is Resource Conservation, colored green, then the underlying future land use designation is the 5 acre minimum AGRE. She didn't know if the plan was specific to explain that or if it was something she knew from a matter of interpretation, or if it was something that needed clarification. Another example would be if there was state land that sold as private land, there should be some kind of explanation for those kinds of situations.

Mr. Oppmann indicated there is a statement in there that if state land is sold, we would review the future land use for that property. Resource Conservation is 5 acre zoning in the current Master Plan. It's no different than AGRE in terms of density except for the fact that those are properties that have some kind of significant natural features. If it's Resource Conservation, the Township will encourage some sort of alternative development pattern instead of doing a private road and 5 acre splits; we'll encourage cluster or we'll encourage other innovative techniques to develop the land and have open space. That's the main differences between the two categories. The map used to have many overlays. All that does is put the Planning Commission and the Board in a tough spot when you try and interpret it. It's better to assign it by parcel. The County supported the Township in doing that. They preferred this map over the previous one.

The zoning plan is a chart at the end of the land use section to coordinate future land use categories with the density and a typical zoning category. We talked about doing Research/Office zoning. That's something that needs to be put on the list for next year. One of the requirements of the new enabling act is the front of the Master Plan has to have an approval sign-off. The supervisor and clerk would sign off it was approved on this date.

Ms. DeVault noted the water sewer district was larger on the updated map than on the previous map.

Mr. Oppmann indicated it should be exactly the same and he'd double-check it.

Public Comment:

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

Mr. Larry Lilly, 110 Clarence Street, indicated when he first came in the door, he was surprised that there was a lot of information there; it's a good start. A gentleman commented he couldn't hear the Commission. You could use the PEG channel money to get that; you have \$36,000.00 in there for communication. You're collecting money from Comcast, you should use that for communication. Something should be done here. You'll notice people don't stay. There's no information and they can't hear you.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted in two of the last five years she's gone before the Board to request that. It's being worked on. The Commission can't hear the public at times either.

Mr. Lilly stated you have to have communication with the public and give them information. He goes to all the meetings so he can comprehend what's going on. With the mining, people were here and you told them in May or June, you can come back when they apply for their mining permits and we'll get things done. You didn't do that tonight. You should listen to the residents that live near the mines, find out what's going on. When they get upset at meetings, you know they're real concerned and passionate about those problems. He'd appreciate it if you listened to them.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted if they were still here, they would.

Supervisor Lambert stated he spent time downstairs with them.

Mr. Lilly indicated he would like to see the whole Holly community cooperate with one another, using all the resources we have here. He's been preaching that for ten years. We're all family here. He would like the community to unite. They're using his money, his time, ten years of it, and he would like to see something accomplished. It's got to be soon because he's not going to be around forever and he'd like to see it done as soon as possible.

Reports:

Commissioner McHalpine questioned whether Oakland County Parks came forward with any other information.

Ms. DeVault indicated she owes them a call-back. She spoke with Dave Schang and questioned how it worked with Rose Township when Rose Oaks came to town. He said it was a very good exchange of information. They indicated it may be 10 to 30 years before they did any development there. It's been passive recreation with a small parking area. They're talking about allowing hunting there, which is a big issue. They want to have signature parks, they want to have a draw for our residents outside of Oakland County also. There's an opportunity for Holly Township to express what our heart's desire would be and see if they can fit that into their future planning and make it a jewel in Oakland County, building on our up north image. The unique thing about it is it will be in cooperation with Genesee County parks also. More than likely the major entrance will be out on Dixie Highway in Grand Blanc Township, but there's certainly an opportunity for an entrance in Holly Township. In Rose Township they have two separate entrances. The land is actually bisected by wetlands.

Chairperson Kilbourn welcomed newly appointed Planning Commission member Lloyd Kernen. She also indicated she would like to have the Board approve money to have Carlisle/Wortman write the language for a Research/Office zoning ordinance this year.

Mr. Oppmann indicated he would put together a cost estimate.

Commissioner Gurski stated the YMCA said they were going to plant trees and they did do that and tore down another house. There are always a lot of things with the mining operations that come right down to the end and it goes to the Board. When looking at the minutes from the Board of Trustees, there's the same list, the mines are

Holly Township Planning Commission – Minutes of May 11, 2009

going to do this and this. Every year it comes back, we'll make a recommendation for approval provided you do this. It appears nothing is being enforced.

Chairperson Kilbourn noted there wasn't a code enforcement officer in the past.

Commissioner Gurski stated when the public comes in, they're not aware the Planning Commission is not the rule enforcer and that the Commission only has set criteria to look at.

Ms. DeVault indicated some of the neighbors to the mining operation personally contacted Commissioner Steve Ruth. He was very disappointed he couldn't be here tonight. He wanted to make sure comments were addressed regarding the reclamation that needs to be done for any types of encroachment.

Adjournment: Chairperson LaLaine Kilbourn, hearing no other business, adjourned the meeting at 9:32 p.m.

Zo Turner, Recording Secretary
Holly Township