

GANGES TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting Minutes DRAFT for March 27, 2007
Ganges Township Hall
119th Avenue and 64th Street
Fennville, MI, Allegan County

Chairman **Gooding** called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Roll Call: Chairman Barry **Gooding** – present
Secretary Jim **Birkes** – present
Commissioner Jackie **DeZwaan** – present
Commissioner Sally **Howard** – present
Commissioner Ed **Reimink** – present
Commissioner Dawn **Soltysiak** – present
Board Trustee Terry **Looman** – present

PUBLIC HEARING – “DOLLYBROOK FARM” PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Chairman **Gooding** opened the public hearing and stated that a short presentation by the applicant would be followed by comments of those opposed to the application, and then comments from those who supported the application.

Jim Keag described the project as one of offering tourist lodging to be introduced in 3 phases:

Phase 1 – 18 cottages, retro style

Phase 2 – Up to 12 log cabins for year round rental, rustic, “open dunes” area

Phase 3 – Christmas village reflecting historical design, possibly having a chapel for weddings, etc.

Outdoor basketball court and indoor basketball court with weight room exist at present, in Phase 2 a pool, tennis court, and play area will be added.

The property has existing wells of 5 and 8 inch diameters, if additional wells are needed, they will be added in Phase 3.

A community septic system will be added. Surface water will be controlled using the natural contour of the land, exiting toward the southeast corner of the parcel.

Some clearing and road development has already taken place; future development of roads will be done to protect the wooded, country character of the property.

A dry hydrant will be added to an existing pond for additional fire protection.

Current businesses will continue to operate on the premises. Future plans are to convert the main dwelling to a Bed and Breakfast lodging facility, adding to the “Dollybrook Family Resort.” Concurrent with the B&B conversion, a smaller dwelling will be constructed for the current inhabitants. Provisions in the plan are made for 4 additional single family dwellings for family members.

There are indefinite plans to include “Kimbers Gourmet Foods,” a manufacturer of ketchup and salsa type products, as an additional business enterprise.

The actual timing of the project will be over “several” years governed by the economy and demand.

Paul Zehner, 2091 66th St - Not enough information to be opposed to or supportive of the project. Keag’s have been good neighbors, the plan is nicely presented, but has concerns about the impact on the Township infrastructure. Concerned about the impact on the area wells, the electric demand, traffic, drainage, and septic system operation. The large development will require action on the part of the Township to protect surrounding residents. Does not see any of these concerns being addressed. Suggests that full occupancy of the proposed project will result in over 300 addition people using 66th street and questions that it can handle that additional load. Suggests that an additional entrance on 121st Avenue be considered for access and fire protection. Does not see any of these concerns being addressed with the Health Dept, or a wetlands study, or environmental or economic impact study.

Tasha Smalley, Zoning Administrator – commented that this session is a Preliminary Site Plan Review and that many of the concerns mentioned will be addressed prior to the Final Site Plan Review.

Roy Newman, 6621 121st Avenue – Not for or against the project, but shares concerns expressed by Zehner.

Teresa Wiley, 6633 121st Avenue – Expressed support for the project. Confident that the applicant will obtain all the permits necessary and take all precautions to protect the neighborhood. Feels that the Project will be good for tourism and will support other businesses and local economy.

Paul Zehner - questioned whether the Planning Commission has the experience, along with appropriate rules and regulations to properly evaluate this project.

Shirley Newman, 6621 121st Avenue – questioned Wiley’s objectivity due to her family involvement in the project.

Teresa Wiley – commented that she has no involvement with the project.

Don Karaus, Jr. - Emphasized that phases 1 and 2 will involve cabins only, not dwellings. Stated that many of the concerns and contacts with the appropriate county and state officials will be pursued as the project is continued toward a final plan. Stated that a second entrance off 121st Avenue has been allowed by the road commission.

The public hearing was closed at 7:18 PM.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Don Karaus, Jr. asked if an updated draft version of the PUD amendment being developed by the Planning Commission is available. **Gooding** and **Birkes** responded that nothing other than the suggested draft provided by McKenna Associates is available, and this should not be regarded as a proposed draft by the Planning Commission. **Karaus** asked if a copy of the Conditional Rezoning Amendment is available. **Birkes** responded that it can be obtained from the Township Clerk.

CORRESPONDENCE

The following correspondence was acknowledged:

1. Letter dated March 21, 2007 from the PC to DJ Associates approving the Glenn Oaks PUD.
2. Notice of the upcoming PC seminar on 3-29-07.
3. Letter from Roy and Shirley Newman expressing concerns about the potential impact on their homes and rural area by the proposed Dollybrook Farm development.
4. Letter dated March 27, 2007 from Robert Soltysiak covering several subjects: personal property rights vs. civic responsibility, regulation of single-wide mobile homes, placement of future site for a mobile home park in the Master Plan, and rebuttal to the concept that it represents "spot zoning."
5. Documentation of Commissioner Soltysiak's 2-27-03 arguments opposing the approval of the Master Plan.
6. Memo from Tasha Smalley to the PC summarizing her discussions with the Fire Chief re: Dollybrook Farm.
7. Mineral Mining annual and quarterly reports from Dan Ciesla.

ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

Township Board – Commissioner **Looman** had nothing to report.

Zoning Board of Appeals – Chairman **Gooding** reported that a variance had been granted to Pedro Crespo and Craig McMurray to allow a carport to be built on a side yard resulting in a 10 foot setback versus the standard 15 feet.

Zoning Administration – **Smalley** reported that the Gauntlett private road application will be on the agenda for the regular April PC meeting.

BUSINESS SESSION

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Birkes suggested that 2 items be added to the agenda under new business: 1) budget and priorities, and 2) upcoming training seminars. It was determined that nothing needed to be addressed with regard to the request for a build-out analysis from the Black River Watershed Project.

Soltysiak moved to approve the agenda with the two additions; **Howard** seconded; the motion was approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF PRECIOUS MINUTES

Gooding informed that the minutes of the March 20, 2007 meeting would be reviewed at the next meeting, since insufficient time was available for examination by all.

Soltysiak moved to approve the minutes from the February 27, 2007 meeting as presented; **DeZwaan** seconded. The motion passed by voice vote. **Birkes** abstained from voting, since he was absent from the meeting.

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW – DOLLYBROOK FARM PUD

Birkes pointed out that the information packet contained both a PUD application and an application for the construction of a private road. He asked if the PC was going to first conduct the Preliminary Site Plan Review and subsequently address the PR application. After a short discussion it was decided that the best approach is to address both issues simultaneously since they are interrelated.

Soltysiak pointed that there are overlapping Sections of the Ordinance that apply to this application, and the PC needs to be in agreement on how it is to be adjudicated, thanking **Smalley** for providing guidance from the Township attorney.

Karaus presented an aerial photograph of the parcel and surroundings.

Karaus presented a more detailed explanation of the proposal, mentioning that phase 2 might be 2 years or so in the future. The parcel is 40 acres; the proposed buildings will occupy about 2.4 acres; existing right-of-ways (ROW) consume 1.9 acres, the current plan will result in 6.2 acres composed of easements.

Karaus pointed out that the Ordinance does not stipulate the front setbacks for cabins, only side and rear setbacks. Due to the absence of front setbacks, **Karaus** introduced a new suggested plan in which the road ROW's were reduced to 45 feet while maintaining the standard width of the improved surface. The benefits of the second plan are threefold: 1) it would

reduce infrastructure costs by reducing lineage of utility runs, 2) it would allow less disturbance of the natural aspects of the land, and 3) it would contribute to better fire response. By reducing the ROW's and the associated setbacks, **Karaus** estimated that about \$38,000 could be saved in infrastructure costs.

Karaus requested that the PC consider accepting the narrower ROW and also establishing a setback from the traveled surface of the road, i.e. 30 feet similar to Saugatuck Township.

Soltysiak asked if approval is being sought for only one phase of the project or of the project in total. **Smalley** advised that the PC should look at the proposal as one project even though it will be completed in 3 phases.

Gooding pointed out that 3-phase electricity is available at the site; and that the 8" well was a good well when he worked at the farm earlier. He then asked if the proposed drain field had been "perked". **Karaus** responded that Excell Engineering had examined the layout, calculated the requirements and designed "pods" to handle each cabin group. He said that the system would be similar to that employed at Campit Resort. **Howard** asked if this was regulated by the DEQ. **Karaus** responded that the County Health Dept. had jurisdiction. **Karaus** stated further that a 30 feet clay barrier protected the field. Isolation distance from the well is about 200 feet and boring samples were satisfactory.

DeZwaan asked about the back-up area; **Karaus** stated that is included in the planned area.

Birkes asked that we change subjects and reiterate the total list of uses that are contemplated in the PUD. **Soltysiak** said she would like to have more detail on the cabins and the type of operation planned. **Keag** responded that the cabins will be for weekly rentals, seeking the seasonal tourist trade. All furnishings similar to hotel accommodations will be provided along with weekly cleaning. Phase 1 will be Nantucket style seasonal units. Phase 2 will be log cabins for year round weekly rentals. Phase 3 will be a small village design catering to large groups such as family and group reunions. The resort will provide affordable family lodging. All lodging will feature kitchenettes.

Soltysiak suggested that perhaps 4 phases exist with Phase 4 being the B&B, and the gourmet foods operation. **Keag** responded that the gourmet foods is really not part of the PUD plan; it was included on the plan so as to be up front with the PC about the interest in operating some kind of commercial venture out of the existing structure. **Keag** and **Karaus** clarified that they would be looking for approval for Phases 1,2, and 3, but not approval for the B&B or food operation.

Birkes opined that the PC needs to approve the uses on the entire 40 acres if all 40 acres are included in the PUD. It was clarified that only the existing businesses should be included in the PC assessment now, but that future commercial ventures might be added. Uses will also include single family dwellings for the family. **Karaus** pointed out that lines on the plan map are in error; there is no plan to split the parcel. **DeZwaan** asked how large the single family dwelling land parcels will be. **Karaus** responded with about 20,000 sq. feet. **Soltysiak** asked how the units will be deeded. **Karaus** responded that they will be part of the PUD; there will no land splits made.

Smalley and **Soltysiak** asked if any retail sales of supplies for the guests will be available. **Keag** responded that none is planned in that the Little Store is close.

Gooding suggested that upon commencement of Phase 3 that a service road be provided onto 121st Avenue. **Karaus** responded that a gravel road already exists on the northeast end of the property. **Keag** mentioned that they did not want to encourage traffic onto 121st in respect for the neighbors.

DeZwaan asked about planned signage and lighting. **Karaus** said typical "in" and "out" directional will be employed. **Keag** added that a sign announcing Dollybrook Farm will be in use along with magnesium cast lights throughout.

Soltysiak asked if any wetlands studies have been conducted. **Karaus** stated that a cursory examination was conducted by Nicholas Gressick, a wetlands specialist. Phase 1 roadways were positioned based on that exercise. DEQ permits still need to be obtained in order to undertake construction of the roadways. **Howard** pointed out that anything short of total compliance and permitting is "just not good enough."

Birkes commented that this is a massive undertaking in an otherwise rural area. He commented on the importance of demonstrating that everything is correctly "nailed down" with regard to the regulatory issues. He would like to see an environmental impact study. He would like to see a statement from the County Road Commission that there will be no significant negative impact on traffic.

Karaus returned to the subject of the ROW width and the required setbacks. He stated that they needed some guidance from the PC so they could move ahead with finalizing their plans.

Howard asked about the green space that is shown along the eastern end of the south border of the property, but does not extend the entire length of the property. **Karaus** explained that even though the green belt is not shown extending into Phase 2, there is green space throughout. He further explained of a plan to develop a walking trail around and through the property.

Howard asked how close the closest dwelling will be to the edge of the property. **Karaus** estimated about 47feet in Phase 3 and 35 feet for one of the single family dwellings.

Karaus outlined the plans to extend the various utility lines into the planned developments, with **Keag** clarifying that it will be done in Phase 1. **DeZwaan** asked about parking for each of the cabins. **Karaus** said it will be provided for in front of the units for 2 vehicles and approximately 20 around the church in Phase 3. **DeZwaan** asked how many spaces for the office; none is specified at this time.

Karaus emphasized that no fencing will be employed, only natural buffers in order to maintain the country wooded character.

Howard asked about improvements to the current entrance. **Karaus** responded that the current drive will be upgraded and an acceleration/deceleration lane added.

Soltysiak reminded all that we have not responded to the question regarding the width of the road ROW and setbacks posed earlier by the applicant. **Birkes** asked for clarification as to why this needed to be addressed at this time. **Keag** responded that it will have an impact on the placement design that needs to be finalized before further study can be initiated.

DeZwaan suggested that we need to maintain the 66 feet requirement due to the number of units proposed. **Soltysiak** agreed. **Gooding** asked how others felt about the issue. **Howard** opined that if the fire department is satisfied with 45 feet,

and it is in a PUD then she can accept that. **Birkes** stated that the fire department only looks at the road surface availability, not the ROW. The 66 feet ROW was chosen to allow for future upgrades should they become necessary, not fire safety, and the size of this proposed development warranted the 66 feet accommodation. **Soltysiak** supported this position, and commented that this road would service 54 units, and questioned why have the requirement in our ordinance if we don't follow it. **Howard** argued that for the foreseeable future this will be contained within a PUD and not be subject to a conversion to a public so the relaxation of the ROW standard is appropriate. **Karaus** stated that the primary request is for a setback distance from the hard surface of the road and suggested a combination of 45 feet and 60 feet ROW widths be considered. **Soltysiak** then argued that the ROW does not affect the setback determination and that the standard ROW should be maintained. **DeZwaan** agreed that the entire 66 feet does not need to be cleared, and emphasized her position that the standard be upheld. **Gooding** expressed support for maintaining the 66 feet standard in the absence of no strong reason for relaxing it. **Soltysiak** stated that there appears to be a consensus to maintain the Ordinance standard ROW and suggested that further criteria wait until the other information that the PC has mentioned is presented. **Karaus** countered that without the setback determination no further placement studies can be done to pursue permits. After a lengthy discussion it was concluded to establish a guideline for setbacks at 6 feet from the edge of the ROW. **Birkes** suggested that the Preliminary Site Plan Review be adjourned at this time and continued at a later meeting. Applicants and other Commissioners agreed.

Birkes moved to modify the meeting agenda to relocate the Ordinance Technical Review to place it before the Old Business section; **DeZwaan** seconded; motion carried by voice vote.

ZONING ORDINANCE TECHNICAL REVIEW

Greg Milliken of McKenna Associates summarized the review purpose as to create a tool for updating the zoning ordinance. In conducting the review he compared our ordinances with, state law, case law, and other ordinances of municipalities. Examination was made to determine if 1) does it comply with state law, 2) is it consistent with our Master Plan, 3) is it organized, and 4) is it user-friendly. He found that it is confusing in areas, and has some serious conformance issues with state law. However, the review was done without the recent amendments to bring the Ordinance into compliance with the MZEA.

Milliken reviewed the written document that was provided on February 27, 2007. The five major deficiencies he identified as:

1. Organization and definitions– difficult to find information pertinent to given subject, incomplete list of definitions and vague definitions
2. Lack of Administration and procedures – particularly the lack of clear standards for review of applications
3. Zoning Districts and permitted uses – consistent with Master Plan, permitted vs. special uses
4. Special regulations missing – signage, lighting, access, better non-conforming use language
5. Miscellaneous – introduce graphics, better zoning district delineation, eliminate legal description of zoning districts, add conditional zoning language

Where does the Township go from here? **Milliken** stated that there is no need to start at square one, but there are definitely some areas that need to be improved. **Howard** asked **Milliken** to identify his highest priority suggestions for improving our Ordinance, items of most urgency. **Milliken** replied: 1) definitions, 2) creating procedures and standards, and 3) review zoning districts, uses for compliance with Master Plan.

Howard asked how to go about updating definitions, can they be borrowed from other municipalities? **Birkes** asked if definitions can be updated as a separate effort from updating the rest of the document. **Milliken** stated that when working to develop a zoning ordinance, the definitions section is the first effort, but then needs to be revisited and modified as the ordinance is written to make all consistent. He stated that one can start with a list of standard definitions, but will need to add to that list based on the individual Ordinance needs. **Smalley** cited an example of a vague definition in our Ordinance height limit of 35 feet, which doesn't explain where the measurement is to be taken.

As for addressing the short-comings of the Ordinance **Milliken** suggested that a 12 to 24 month plan should be devised recognizing the entire scope of the effort, rather than concentrating on one piece without a plan to incorporate that into the larger effort. This will avoid a lot of repeat activity and effort. **Birkes** commented that he recommended placing the budget and priority question on the agenda tonight in order to begin addressing a strategy for reconciling the Master Plan and the technical review into our future plans, noting that our budget request is due in April.

DeZwaan suggested that if we do not meet state requirements in parts of our Ordinance that should be a high priority.

Birkes questioned if improving the standards for review would address the problems encountered in the earlier preliminary site plan review and standardize the procedure for evaluation. **Milliken** answered in the affirmative and stated they should also apply to special uses and other proposed project applications.

A lengthy discussion ensued in which there appeared to be a consensus that we need to make major improvements to the Ordinance and that the current effort to address the trouble spots one at a time, while it may be successful will require several years to complete. **Milliken** said his experience suggests that a concentrated effort to address the entire ordinance over a 9 to 12 month interval will be more cost effective than our current effort. **Milliken** noted his observation that our PC preferred to do more of the ordinance development work ourselves as compared to other townships. **Birkes** countered that it is not a preference for him, but it is the responsibility of the PC to make these decisions for the Township.

Gooding stated his interest in getting our commercial intensity standards developed and implemented along the corridor areas.

DeZwaan stated that her priority is to address those areas where we are not in compliance with state law.

Gooding asked **Milliken** which areas he identified where the Ordinance is not in compliance. **Milliken** answered that the only glaring one is the Open Space Amendment, now that we have amended the Ordinance to comport to the MZEA, since his review.

Gooding commented on the need to finalize an amended PUD ordinance so that we have a good statute to work from, because we will continue to get more proposals in the future. **Birkes** said we should continue our monthly work sessions and not place any thing on the agenda except the PUD amendment development. **Milliken** suggested that we use him more, since he authored the draft from which we are working. He stated that he can shortcut some of our effort usually at no additional cost. He does not need to be at the work sessions, but can be sent questions.

Howard asked if the use of committees, as was employed before, might accelerate our effort. **Gooding** responded that the PUD ordinance was very complex and that everyone's ideas contributed. **DeZwaan** suggested that the group might continue with the PUD effort, but have committees address other areas. **Birkes** stated that a committee might move the PUD effort along faster simply due the more focused effort that is possible. **Troehler** commented that committees should be made up of members with varying opinions.

Milliken commented that he could see the opportunity for committees to address: 1) Procedures, 2) Uses and Districts, and 3) Definitions.

Milliken offered to author a memo to the PC to suggest a strategy for moving ahead on the Ordinance revision if desired. The PC wholeheartedly endorsed this suggestion.

OLD BUSINESS

PUD ORDINANCE

Gooding asked if the group was in favor of forming a PUD committee. A short discussion concluded that the total PC would continue to work on the PUD ordinance. Our special work sessions will be devoted entirely to that effort.

CONDITIONAL REZONING (CR) AMENDMENT (CRA)

Gooding posed a question about the potential misuse of the CRA in which a Commissioner might suggest the use of the tool inappropriately. **Milliken** commented that a PC can not: 1) make a rezoning approval contingent upon certain requirements; nor 2) suggest restrictions that would become part of a CR.

Gooding and **DeZwaan** reported that the instructor in a recent training class stated that a PC member in a casual conversation could not suggest that CR be investigated as a possibility without placing the Township in jeopardy. **Milliken** disagreed with this assessment, but suggested that these matters should be referred to the Zoning Administrator.

Milliken suggested that any CR that is enacted be identified on the zoning map.

Birkes asked if all Commissioners are satisfied with the responses received from the attorney with regard to the previous draft of the amendment. None expressed further concern.

Howard moved to make the CRA draft dated 1-10-2007 the subject of a public hearing at our next regular meeting on April 24, 2007; **DeZwaan** seconded the motion; the motion passed by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

PLANNING COMMISSION BY-LAWS REVIEW

DeZwaan reviewed her concerns that 1) we don't follow Roberts Rules of Order correctly in our meetings 2) we don't follow announced procedure in our public hearings and meetings, and 3) the By-Laws are not complete, and "if it isn't written, it isn't so"

A committee was formed consisting of **DeZwaan** (chairperson), **Looman**, and **Howard** to study the By-Laws and make recommendations for updating, and to suggest procedural changes to conform more closely to them.

BUDGET AND PRIORITIES

Birkes developed a list of major efforts that need to be addressed by the PC categorized by Ordinance improvement needs and Master Plan implementation needs. They are:

Ordinance Improvement	Master Plan Implementation
PUD	Mixed Use Zone Definition
Mobile Home Ordinance	Commercial Classes
Site Condominiums	M89/BSH Overlay Zone
Definitions	Form Based Zoning – Glenn
Commercial Classes	
Procedures	
Review standards	

Birkes expressed his opinion that redoing the Zoning Ordinance should be a high priority, because the current code is lacking in many ways with current standards, and asked if others agreed. All concurred. **Looman** stated that past implementation had relied on the sole interpretation of the Zoning Administrator rather than having clear standards specified.

Gooding pointed out that activity is increasing as evidenced by the number of PUD's addressed this year vs. previous years. **Gooding** further point that our Township is poised for significant growth. **Smalley** stated that many people interpret our effort to define our standards as placing more restrictions on activities, but most of the improvements being discussed simply eliminate ambiguity.

Gooding asked about the budget for this year, how much was it and how are we doing against it. **Looman** said he had seen the results, didn't remember them exactly, but we were tracking satisfactorily. **DeZwaan** commented that our budget would be taxed if the printing of the Master Plan comes out of it. **Looman** stated that McKenna was providing some copies of the plan and then the Clerk was prepared to have other copies made. **Looman** stated that he did not believe the PC budget would be used for this effort. **Gooding** commented that he believed there would be a charge to citizens for copies. **Looman** concurred.

Gooding asked **Birkes** to check on the status our budget and YTD expenses for review in preparation of the upcoming annual request. **Birkes** agreed to have the information in the packets for the April meeting. **Birkes** stated that he foresees the need for some continuing consultant fees as we address the workload identified earlier. **Soltysiak** commented that she prefers to have something to work from, i.e. the PUD draft. Several members commented on the need to continue dual meetings each month, one for ZO and Master Plan activities, and the need for additional committee work. All of this would need to be reflected in our budget request.

Soltysiak expressed the view that it might be cheaper in the long run to address the ZO rewrite in an overall effort rather than do it in piecemeal as we have been doing. **Howard** agreed, stating that it would represent a large expense in the upcoming year but cheaper overall, be less intrusive on the lives of the Commissioners, and complete the effort much earlier with less confusion.

Howard commented that if we wanted to pursue a total rewrite of the ZO the PC would need to go to the Board with a well articulated plan, stating why the ZO needs to be rewritten and why we need the assistance of a professional due to the importance and complexity. Comments were made that some Board members don't understand why the PC members can't rewrite the Ordinance without the aid of a Professional. **Howard** stated that she believes the next step is one "crisp" presentation that clearly explains out strategy, the benefits to the Township, why it needs to be done, and why this the best approach.

Soltysiak pointed out that **Milliken** had identified the Open Space Amendment as one area that did not comply with state law. That amendment had been written by a PC member, at a cost of \$6,000 to the Township. **Birkes** opined that the environment has become a lot more sophisticated than when our present Ordinance was constructed, and being reluctant to undertake the rewriting of the Ordinance without professional help is not an abdication of responsibility. He stated that he has received as much training and studied as much as anyone, but would not feel comfortable performing a rewrite without professional help.

A discussion ensued on how much consultant fees would be for rewriting the entire Ordinance. Information from other Townships indicates that it could be from \$50,000 to \$75,000. **Soltysiak** pointed out that it will cost this amount whether it is done over several years or in one effort. **Howard** commented that is feasible to organize the effort and pay schedule to allow for a two-year payout.

Howard suggested that she would do a draft presentation to the Board to present our position on the budget. **Birkes** volunteered to help.

UPCOMING SEMINARS

Gooding, Soltysiak, Looman, and Howard plan to attend the Allegan County PC seminar on Thursday, March 29.

Birkes stated that he has enrolled in the Form Based Zoning seminar offered by MSU Extension Office in Lansing on April 11, 2007.

A third opportunity is offered by the Citizen Planner program on April 12th and 19th in Allegan. **Birkes** would like to go, but the Board would need to approve the \$90 expense. **Gooding** will follow up. Four commissioners are interested in the session on April 12th.

LAND DIVISIONS

None to review.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The next regular meeting date is April 24, 2007. A PUD work session is scheduled for Tuesday, April 17, 2007

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bob DeZwaan – When Don Karas introduced the new map, the PC had the right to table the Preliminary Hearing at that point.

ADJOURNMENT

Looman moved to adjourn; **Howard** supported; motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 10:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Birkes, Planning Commission Secretary