

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
October 12, 2004  
6:30 P.M.  
**MINUTES**

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Don Pobuda, James Mortensen, Barbara Figurski, Curt Brown, Teri Olson, and Mark Snyder. Also present was Kelly Kolakowski, Township Planner; Brian Borden and Steve Langworthy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc.; Tesha Humphriss and Gary Markstrom from Tetra Tech, MPS; and Joe Galvin, legal council for the Township. By the end of the work session, there were a few persons in the audience.

Items scheduled for action during the regular session of the commission were discussed.

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING  
7:00 P.M.  
**MINUTES**

The regular session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to approve the Agenda as written.  
**The motion carried unanimously.**

The call to the public was made to discuss items not on the agenda. There was no response and the call to the public was closed at 7:03 p.m. Chairman Pobuda noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

Chairman Pobuda reviewed the procedure for the evening's meeting. He introduced the Staff and Planning Commissioners. Each one stated their name, where they reside and their occupation.

He stated the Township has a legal responsibility to respond to any petitions that are made to them. The petitioner has the legal right to be heard as well as the public has the right to express their views and concerns. After hearing from

everyone, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Township Board and then the Board will make a final decision with regard to the petition. Chairman Pobuda gave an overview of what criteria are considered when a rezoning is requested.

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 1**...Review of rezoning application and environmental impact assessment to rezone 120 acres located in section 17, (11-17-400-013,014,015 and 11-17-200-002,006) on the west side of Nixon Road ,just north of Crooked Lake Road, petitioned by FTAG Investments. The request is to rezone property from AG (Agricultural) and CE (Country Estates) to MDR (Medium Density Residential). (04-22)

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding rezoning application
- B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment

Mr. Carl Hauss of FTAG Investments, Mr. Brandon Rogers, of Brandon M. Rogers & Associates, and Robert D. Schwartz were present to represent the petitioner and answer any questions.

Mr. Hauss gave a brief background of the subject property. In December of 2001, a petition was filed for an extension of the sewer and water to this area and the Township denied it. There have been many informal meetings to discuss a reasonable development of the property, which would be agreeable to the Township as well as allow a reasonable return on the property. The Petitioner is requesting rezoning from Agricultural (AG) and Country Estates (CE) to Medium-density Residential (MDR).

Mr. Hauss advised they would develop the site consistent with the Township and the community. They feel their proposal is reasonable and will provide a reasonable return on their investment. It will fill a need in the community and Township for moderately-priced housing.

He showed the subject property and surrounding property uses and future proposed uses. He feels a precedent has been set in the Township by similar residential density and the utilization of private wastewater treatment and water plants. He added that the wastewater treatment and water plants will need to be in compliance with all DEQ regulations and is allowed by state law. He does not feel that a review of the Master Plan would need to be done before their development is complete. The soils are very poor and make it very difficult to operate a septic system on this site. They would like to be treated equally and be allowed to make a reasonable return on their investment. The current zoning makes the property unbuildable and completely worthless. The permitted uses are unreasonable and do not allow for a reasonable return.

He noted that the Township is proposing to rezone this parcel, and the surrounding area, to CE, which makes the statement that it is not buildable as it

is currently zoned. He would like to work with the Township and develop a possible PUD to receive a reasonable return on their property. He reiterated it would be a beautiful development that would allow reasonable priced housing.

He asked the Planning Commission to advise them of any other information that they should provide that would lead to an approval of their request.

Mr. Brandon Rogers, who is a professional community planner, past chairman of the state board, and has lived in Michigan for 50 years, stated he has been asked to evaluate this proposal. He has done a very thorough study and spoke with developers and property owners, and visited the site and the Township. He reviewed his findings regarding the soils, the topography, as well as the wetlands and areas that need to be preserved. He noted that things have changed since the last zoning map was done in 1993. There has been significant development, such as the middle school, and the proposed church and school across from their property. The Latson Road / I-96 interchange will be completely; however, it is currently on hold due to funding. He suggested that this needs to be pursued. It is definitely needed as there is a stretch of six miles through the Township without an exit ramp. He noted that the petitioner is offering to pave Crooked Lake Road from the site to Door Road, which would help with the school and church traffic. He added that the Preserves of Genoa was developed with a density of 1.5 – 2 units per acre, which is only three miles south of the subject property. He also does not feel it is right to schedule a Township-proposed rezoning of the same property on the same night as a private petition. He disagrees with the statement of 942 total units being able to be built on this site based on the sketch plan and the marketing intended by the petitioner. He feels the plan has merit and would answer any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Hauss stated they would like this item to be tabled this evening as their full-blown traffic study is not complete.

Mr. Robert Schwartz noted the issue stated by the Planner of an “economic analysis” that will support their claim that they could not receive a reasonable return on the property as it is currently zoned. He questioned what is meant by this and if an economic analysis was done by other developers and has the Township done one for their proposed rezoning of the same property. He cited the permitted uses under the current zoning and how they would not allow a reasonable return on the property owner.

Mr. Brian Borden reviewed his letter of October 6, 2004.

He noted the criteria in **Section 22.04** of the zoning ordinance for a rezoning application and stated how this request does not meet them.

1. The subject site should remain agricultural or be developed residential on estate-size lots of five acres.

2. Crooked Lake Road does not have the capacity to handle the amount of traffic that would be generated from this rezoning.
3. There is no public water or sewer on this site and **Section 6.45** of the zoning ordinance states that no future development shall be approved without being inside the sewer and water district.
4. With regard to the I-96 / Latson interchange, the Planning Commission did take this item into consideration when developing their future land use map. It was determined that more intense uses would be focused north of the railroad tracks and this proposed area would remain more rural.
5. The character of the area is currently agricultural, open space, and low-density uses. MDR could allow 900 plus units at a maximum density, which is inconsistent with the area and surrounding uses.
6. The petitioner has not proved that they could not receive a reasonable economic return on their property as it is currently zoned.
7. There are currently areas in the Township that are planned and zoned for MDR, which would meet the demands of this type of uses and density.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the issue of land use character is not so much a matter of numbers and density. Also, traffic quality and not so much quantity needs to be considered with regard to maintaining rural character.. They have done a lot of research on the interchange and it is “deferred” and it has been said “you can look for it in 25 years” and should not be considered as part of this issue and even if it were, he reiterated Mr. Borden’s comments about the Township having a designated area for more intense uses north of the railroad tracks.

He added that the Planning Commission and Board should not make a decision on this request before a complete Master Plan review is done. They recommend denial of this request based on the points stated this evening and in their letter of October 6, 2004.

Mr. Joe Galvin answered Mr. Schwartz question regarding “economic analysis”. It is incumbent upon the private property owner to show that based on the current zoning of the land, an economic return is not possible under any of the allowable uses. He noted that there are economic analysis that can be presented that show how profitable a church and a pet cemetery, which are allowable uses, could be on this site. A church is being proposed for the property across Crooked Lake Road. He suggested the petitioner show an economic viability of farming on this site, which is one of the prime uses. Since they have not done the economic analysis, they have not proved that there is not a reasonable economic return available for this property as it is currently zoned. He stated that the Township has not done an economic analysis because they do not own the property. They are rezoning it based on the Master Plan. He added that the Township’s proposal is not limited to just the subject parcel and extends beyond to other ones in the area.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter of September 1, 2004.

Commissioner Snyder questioned that the petitioner is proposing a well; however, they stated that the soils do not perk and would not support five-acre sites. Mr. Boss stated that if the MDR zoning was approved, a public water supply system would be privately owned and consists of 2 or 3 wells and would service each of the homes. He stated they have not said that the property doesn't perk, but based on the soils, it is likely that it does not.

The call to the public was made at 8:12 p.m.

Mr. Les Priescorn of 1882 Nixon Road has lived here since 1971. He and his neighbors has the following concerns:

1. With the increased traffic on Nixon Road, will the Road Commission increase their frequency of grading it.
2. What will happen with the wastewater treatment plant when the developer moves on? Who will take care of this plant? He feels the burden will be put on the tax payers.
3. Where is the water going to come from for the wells. He is concerned that it is going to affect their wells.
4. He stated that a reasonable return is a very relative term.
5. He feels that the market drives the housing cost and does not feel there is a need for low-income housing in the area.
6. The petitioner stated the wetlands "can" be protected and not "will" be protected. He wants to ensure that when the developer is gone, this will be taken care of.

He would like the Planing Commission to take action on this request this evening and not table it.

Mr. Ed Bishop of 2455 Nixon agrees with the concerns of his neighbor. Where is the water going to come from, reasonable return, etc. The petitioner purchased the property assuming they would come tot he Township and rezone it to gain a very nice return at the expense of the tax payers.

Ms. Peggy Custer of 2662 Nixon thanked council for pointing out that there is economic return available for the permitted uses. She is against the MDR. They lived in a very densely populated area and moved here to the county. They currently live across from the truck and bus entrance for the school and they have to deal with the traffic of 500 kids going to and from that school. She noted that the proposed church with the school will change the character further and add problems to the area and affect their property values in a negative way. She does not want a wastewater treatment plan in her backyard. She is concerned that their existing well will be affected by this proposal. She stated there is a gas pipeline running through this property. This could cause a devastating accident. She agrees with the five-acre zoning proposed by the Township. It would help control the growth.

Ms. Laura Lawrence of 3148 Beck Road is a 12-year resident and has a background in animal science. She disagrees that agricultural zoning is not feasible. It is a feasible option to leave it as it is currently zoned, 5 to 10 acre parcels.

Mr. Tom O'Brien of 4290 Sweet has lived here for 32 years. He is concerned about safety of the neighbors walking down the road. With all of the construction traffic and equipment, they will not be able to do that.

Mr. Jim Latson of 3740 Beck Road has lived here all his life. He asked the Board to ask if this is what they want for the gateway to Genoa Township. If the interchange is put in, then this area could be the gateway.

Ms. Sandra Deckowski of 3414 Pineview does not feel that MDR developments are beautiful. She would prefer five acre parcels. They have lived here for 10 years and have seen changes with development. She agrees with what was said by her neighbors.

Mr. Leo Nicholas of 2290 Nixon questioned if the surrounding area property owners going to lose money. They purchased their property knowing what the Master Plan was. If the property is not worth anything, why did the petitioner purchase it. He noted that there is a stream running through the proposed Lots #45 through #47 and it is not shown on the plans. He suggested the development of this site was a horse community with a horse arena and large lots. There would be a need for that. They are not showing any recreational land or open space on their plan.

Ms. Beth Baker of 2510 Nixon is part of the group that met and wrote a letter that was submitted to the Planning Commission. She read that letter aloud.

1. FTAG is proposing 313 units
2. The lot size does not meet the Master Plan or the surrounding area.
3. They are concerned with water drainage and runoff
4. Will this affect the current water table.
5. They are concerned with the increased traffic.
6. There are currently wild animals that live in this area and there are wetlands on the site.
7. This will negatively affect the property values in the area.

They are opposed to any density greater than five acre lots. They request the Township stay with their Master Plan.

Mr. Joe Miller of 3432 Beck Road has lived here 10 years. He moved here due to the five-acre parcels. He stated that since the school has been built, their environment has changed significantly. He does not like that he has to wait in a traffic jam to get into and out of his own driveway. He noted that many of the required studies have not been done and/or submitted by the petitioner. He is not in favor of this.

Mr. Tom Dakowski of 3414 Pineview purchased his property in 1976 and built his home in 1985. He was born and raised in Detroit and moved here to get away from the urban sprawl. This is a drainage problem in this area and all of the water that is currently on this property will run off onto their property.

Mr. Bruce Baker of 2510 Nixon feels the planners and engineers have stated the issues well and showed inconsistencies with the Master Plan and surrounding community. He noted there is a high density housing plan in the Master Plan for the Township. There are adequate areas in the Township that will provide this need. He is a professional hydrogeologist and noted that a lot of the groundwater will need to be taken from the surrounding area to supply these homes, which currently supplies the surrounding residents. A subsurface aquifer will be used for this well and will it affect their wells.

Mr. Greg Leblanc of 3444 Beck Road stated the petitioner's plan does not conform with the area. If this is approved, he would like to rezone his property so he can profit.

Mr. Jay Lock of 3401 Pineview agrees that the area surrounding the drain overflows onto his and his neighbors' properties and there are times when the road is under water. When the school was first contemplated, the Nazarene church simultaneously began proposing to purchase their property and assist with the cost of the infrastructure development in this area. That was denied and the utility service was only sized for the school so that no other tap could be put in. He suggested that the Planning Commission stay with the current Master Plan.

Mr. Alex Asher of 3496 Pineview Trail moved here to live on 10 acres. There are wild animals and a stream on the proposed site and he does not want anything to negatively affect this. He agrees with his neighbors and is against this.

Ms. Judy Hodson of 3561 Crooked Lake Road stated that she used to own the subject property. She purchased it in 1990 and in 1994 had to sell it. She sold it to Mr. Hauss. She says that everyone feels they live in the country, however, there are a lot of subdivisions being developed in Genoa Township. Only one horse is allowed on five acres in the Township. Five acres is very restrictive. You can not do anything with it in the Township.

Ms. Jodi Monarch of 2627 Chilson agree with what the neighbors have said. She is against this density. They looked at the Master Plan for the County before moving out here from Redford to ensure that the area would remain the same. Three Fires is already filled to capacity and if 942 more units are building, it would greatly affect this school.

Ms. Gail Nixon of 3510 Crooked Lake Road stated that her husband's family owned this property for many years. She is concerned about the quality of the neighborhood. This density will negatively affect the area. They are 5 ½ miles from a hospital and 5 ½ miles from a police station. She wants them to make a profit but does not want their neighborhood affected. She is confident that the Board will take the public's concerns into consideration when making their decision.

The call to the public was closed at 9:04 p.m.

Chairman Pobuda called for a short break and the meeting resumed at 9:12 p.m.

Ms. Kolakowski summarized a letter dated October 11, 2004 submitted by Southwest Gas Storage. They own the 20-inch high-pressure natural gas transmission pipeline that crosses the subject property. They are concerned with the proposed roads that will cross the gas pipeline on the site. They would like to be provided detailed prints that show the pipelines locations before they would approve any development.

Commissioner Mortensen noted that the petitioner has requested to be tabled this evening so he could provide his traffic study. Commissioner Mortensen is opposed to this request based on the facts in the letters received by the consultants. He showed the public the zoning map and how the subject property is surrounded by "white" and "yellow" zoning. He noted that as the colors get darker, the density of the zoning increases. He stated the dark orange colored zoning is what is being proposed for this site. Looking at that, you can see that it is inconsistent with the surrounding area. He is prepared to make a motion to vote against this.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Commissioner Mortensen. He feels this is the worst place in the Township to put a high density zoning. He showed how the surrounding areas would eventually be rezoned and how the character would change for all of the people who purchased five acre parcels in the area. He would like to stay with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Olson asked the petitioner if he is planning to pave Crooked Lake Road and not Nixon. Mr. Hauss stated yes, they will pave Crooked Lake to connect to the primary County road.

Mr. Hauss stated they are proposing 313 units and not 900. He understands the neighbors' concerns. There are a lot of other issues that would prohibit them from putting 942 homes on this site. There is absolutely no demand for the other permitted uses.

Commissioner Olson noted the Fire Department's letter citing concerns regarding no Township supplied fire protection. She asked how these concerns are being

addressed. Mr. Boss stated that if this were developed, under state law, there would be to be storage for fire protection. Chairman Pobuda noted that this water supply has not been accounted for at this point. Mr. Boss concurred. They have not done any well capacity configurations as it is premature.

Commissioner Figurski agrees with Commissioners Brown and Mortensen. She feels the traffic would be a problem. It is too dense and not in accordance with the Master Plan. She is also concerned about the gas line.

**Moved** by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the request to rezone 120 acres located in section 17, (11-17-400-013,014,015 and 11-17-200-002,006) on the west side of Nixon Road, just north of Crooked Lake Road, petitioned by FTAG Investments. The request is to rezone property from AG (Agricultural) and CE (Country Estates) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) for the following reasons:

1. The Township Planner's, LSL, letter dated October 6, 2004 and the letters from the Township Engineer, TTMPs, dated September 1st and October 6th point out grave concerns with this potential rezoning.
2. The rezoning is inconsistent with Section 22.04 of the Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance, some of which, but not all, are as follows:
  - a. The petitioner has not provided evidence regarding inability to make an economic return on the property as it is presently zoned.
  - b. The requested MDR rezoning is inconsistent with the Master Plan Future Land Use Map and is out of character with the immediately surrounding properties and uses.
  - c. There are serious concerns regarding the effect on infrastructure, fire protection, schools, and police
  - d. This rezoning would completely change the character of the area and lead to possible uncontrolled future growth.
  - e. The Township Engineer has concerns with the aquifer, traffic, drainage, and potential on-site sewer system.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the Impact Assessment with a revision date of September 22, 2004 to rezone 120 acres located in section 17, (11-17-400-013,014,015 and 11-17-200-002,006) on the west side of Nixon Road, just north of Crooked Lake Road, petitioned by FTAG Investments. The request is to rezone property from AG (Agricultural) and CE (Country Estates) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) for the same reasons as stated in the recommendation for denial of the rezoning application. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Chairman Pobuda noted that the Preserve of Genoa is a completely different development and can not be compared to this proposal.

Chairman Pobuda thanked the residents for their participation the evening. He wants them to know that the Township does listen to their concerns.

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2**...Review of rezoning application and environmental impact assessment to rezone nine parcels approximately 308 acres in Sections 8 and 17 (11-08-400-001, 008,017,018; 11-17-200-004,005,006;11-17-300-004 and 11-17-400-015), located south of I-96, west of Nixon Road and north of Crooked Lake Road petitioned by Genoa Township. The request is to rezone property from AG (Agricultural) to CE (Country Estates). (PC04-24)

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding rezoning application.
- B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.

Ms. Kolakowski showed a map of the area that the Township is proposing to rezone. It is all currently zoned Agriculture (AG). On September 7, 2004 the Township Board directed staff to request this rezoning and they have followed through with that request.

Joe Galvin wanted to answer the question as to why this is being requested. When the Township received and reviewed the rezoning application that was just discussed, they determined that the Township's Master Plan called for the County Estates zoning on a number of parcels, including the previously-discussed parcel. This request by the Township is an implementation of the Master Plan. Based on the previous application, it was noted that other petitioners may be requesting the same density rezoning and The Township wants to give recognition to the existing land uses in the area as well as upcoming and proposed changes (i.e. the I-96 Interchange). The Township's wish and desire is that this property be developed in the County Estates District.

Mr. Borden stated the Township is requesting to rezone 308 acres from Agriculture to Country Estates. The Master Plan identifies the vast majority as Agriculture and County Estates and another area as large lot or rural residential zoning. They have reviewed the request and note the following:

- 1. It is consistent with the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map.
- 2. It is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan with respect to land use.
- 3. Five acre lots would not require capacity increases in infrastructure as well as it being able to be serviced by gravel roads.
- 4. It is compatible with the environmental features in the area and would preserve the unique natural features.
- 5. Some permitted and Special Land Uses are the same for both zoning districts, with the only difference being the minimum lot size.
- 6. All surrounding properties are currently zoned Country Estates so it would be consistent with the surrounding area.
- 7. The public service impact would be minimum.

8. There is a demand for the uses permitted in this district. There is growth occurring in the County and the Township wants to strike a balance with this growth.

Ms. Humphriss agrees with the planners. No utilities would be required due to the lot sizes. They are able to handle well and septic.

The call to the public was made at 9:50 p.m.

Mr. Mike Boss of 3139 Char Ann Drive, Howell is concerned with the procedure that has been done this evening. The Planning Commission stated that the previous applicant did not meet all of the criteria for the rezoning; however, the Township has not shown evidence that this area will be able to be supported by well and septic. The standard that has been set in the Township needs to be maintained.

Mr. Carl Hauss, who represents FTAG, the owner of 120 acres of the proposed 308 for rezoning concurs with Mr. Boss. They have seen no evidence that the proposal will provide a reasonable return for his client's property as well as other people in the area. He is strongly opposed to the Township's petition. He feels it is unreasonable and a further confiscation of his client's property. He feels that if FTAG did not initiate their petition, the Township's application would not have been made. FTAG can not control what the Planning Commission has done in the past nor can they control the market. Everyone has acknowledged that this is a fast-growing area. The Planning Commission's petition confirms that farming is not a feasible use in this area. If the Township is open to discussion, they would like to work with them. The zoning classifications go from either 2 units to 8 units. That is a large gap. Is there any flexibility? The petitioner has tried for years to utilize their property and this move by the Township is not treating FTAG equally. He requested consideration that the Planning Commission remove their request so they can discuss something that would allow a reasonable return for their client and other residents in the area.

Mr. Ed Bishop of 2455 Nixon Road is the owner of the small farm and the move toward mini farms is becoming popular and is has proven to be economical.

Mr. Leo Nicholas of 2290 Nixon Road noted that the first applicant is only proposing to build 300 homes; however, they could change their plan and build the maximum allowed. He reiterated his idea for an equine arena for all of the residents to use.

Mr. Les Priescorn of 1882 Nixon cited Timber Trace in Pinckney, which is surrounded by a golf course and equestrian recreation. He encouraged the Planning Commission to support the present proposal and stay consistent with the Master Plan. It will allow FTAG to receive a reasonable return.

Mr. Tom O'Brien of 4290 Sweet lives on five acres and is a realtor. There is a demand for five acre parcels. He would be able to sell 60 five acre parcels.

Mr. Nicholas noted that all of the neighbors want this proposal to be approved.

Mr. Hauss stated he is strongly opposed to this request. He would like to question the Township's economic analysis. Has one been done to show how it will affect his client as well as the other property owners? He questioned the demand for 60 five-acre lots in the Township.

Mr. O'Brien stated there is definitely a demand for five-acre lots in Genoa Township.

The call to the public was closed at 10:05 p.m.

Chairman Pobuda addressed Mr. Boss' concerns regarding the well and septic. Mr. Markstrom stated they do not know the feasibility of well and septic in this area; however, they can do a study of the soils, make a determination, and then report to the Township.

Chairman Pobuda asked for clarification that the Township has been having meetings on this rezoning prior to the petitioner's submission of his application. Ms. Kolakowski concurred.

Commissioner Mortensen stated it is not uncommon for a proposal to come in and the Planning Commission will look at the surrounding area and may sometimes rezone that also. He noted that going from AG to CE is a natural transition.

Mr. Galvin addressed the issue of economic return. What the Township is doing is implementing the Master Plan. It is not a property owner and it is not the Township's burden to show that any property owners in the area are going to receive a reasonable return on their property. He noted that there are more parcels being proposed to be rezoned than just the subject parcel of the previous application. By requesting this rezoning, the Township is not admitting that this area cannot be farmed. It can be farmed under both the County Estates and AG zonings. The permitted uses are the same for both of these zoning districts.

Chairman Pobuda advised the petitioner that schools can be built anywhere and are not subject to the zoning rules.

Commissioner Brown questioned that some property owners will be affected as 10-acre parcels would be able to be split to five-acre parcels. Mr. Galvin concurred.

Commissioner Snyder asked if there is a study that could be done to determine that well and septic could be supported in this area. Mr. Markstrom stated they could do this study to determine what the soils would support.

**Moved** by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the rezoning of nine parcels, slightly less than 309 acres located north of Crooked Lake Road, south of Beck Road, East of Chilson Road, and West of Nixon Road from AG (Agricultural) to CE for the reasons set forth in the application prepared by the Township Consultant, LSL, dated October 5, 2004, some of, but not all, of which will be in this motion:

1. It is consistent with the Master Plan
2. It meets the requirements of Section 22.04 of the Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance.
3. County Estates zoning is consistent with the adjacent properties.
4. Minimum infrastructure requirements as well as impact and roads, police, fire and schools are needed with Country Estates zoning.
5. Public sewer and water are not required in such zoning.
6. There are minimal traffic impacts for this zoning.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated October 5, 2004 for the rezoning of nine parcels, slightly less than 309 acres located north of Crooked Lake Road, south of Beck Road, East of Chilson Road, and West of Nixon Road from AG (Agricultural) to CE for the same reasons stated in the motion recommending approval of the rezoning application. **The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski to approve the minutes of September 27, 2004. **The motion carried unanimously.**

### **Member Discussion**

The meeting adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary