Minutes of a meeting held on January 17, 2011

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Caledonia Planning Commission held at 7:00 p.m., on Monday, January 17, 2011, at the Township Office, 8196 Broadmoor Ave. SE, Caledonia, Michigan

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chairman Warner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with a quorum present.


Members Absent: D. Koopmans

Staff Present: Michael Clark, AICP, Williams & Works

Others Present: Members of the media and representatives of Brann’s Restaurant

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

A. Warner requested that Election of Planning Commission Officers be added to the agenda.

Agenda accepted as amended.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS (BRIEF – UP TO 2 MINUTES)

A. Warner opened the floor to public comment and found no comment from the audience.

4. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

A. Minutes of the December 6, 2010 meeting.

R. Parent made a motion to approve the minutes of December 6, 2010, as amended. Motion was supported by Duane Gunnink.

VOICE VOTE: All ayes. Minutes of the December 6, 2010 meeting approved.

5. INQUIRY OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A. None.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Election of Planning Commission Officers

ARCHIE WARNER ENTERTAINS A MOTION:
R. Parent made a motion to reappoint current Planning Commissioners for 2011; Archie Warner, Chairman; Mike Kelly, Vice Chairman; Duane Gunnink, Secretary. Motion was supported by T. Morris.


B. Site Plan Review – By Michael Brann Sr., to occupy the vacant restaurant space in the existing center at 6450 100th St. SE to enclose the canopy area at the front of the building, and add a 3-season room to the south end of the building. The remainder of the undeveloped portion of the parcel will be utilized for parking.

Brann stated that agreement was made at the last meeting to eliminate some signage; otherwise the submitted site plan is same.

T. Morris stated that the signage of 121 sq ft. is a little outside of the ordinance, would need to eliminate smaller signage to get approved.

D. Gunnink found from the applicant that signage submitted should be calculated to get the actual size requested.

A. Warner stated that he does not have an issue with 3 signs requested, but may need to downsize to get approval.

Clark cited signage requirements per the ordinance, if shape is trapezoid/triangular could be calculated to give actuality.

D. Gunnink stated that signage design may limit what can be approved.

K. Cavanaugh stated that doesn’t feel that allowing the requested signage would set precedent because each application is considered individually.

R. Parent stated that there is some additional parking that is part of the site plan, hopes that when this does get approval it does not limit the parking opportunities for other possible businesses that may come into the development in the future, would like to afford ample parking for all.

Clark reviewed the parking lot requirements per the Ordinance.

Brann expanded on parking plan and stated he feels the plan will provide ample parking for all.

Brann stated that they would be willing to withdraw the request for additional parking to obtain approval, and went on to formally withdraw the request.

ARCHIE WARNER ENTERTAINS A MOTION:

A. Warner made a motion to grant site plan approval for signage and waive the 10% maximum requirement for parking.

The motion was supported by D. Gunnink.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Review of Draft Sign Ordinance (Chapter 19)**

A. Warner began the review, and invited Commissioners to ask questions as each page was reviewed.

Planning Commissioners discussed changes to portable sign requirements and advertising signage, Clark to provide additional clarification at upcoming meeting.

A. Warner stated concern over section 19.2b and found from Clark that the Planning Commission will need to consider each signage application.

K. Cavanaugh found that “face changes” for signage is not addressed in the ordinance and she feels that it should be approved by application process, is mentioned again in section 19.4b, Clark to provide clarification on, need to provide very clear language.

M. Kelly stated that maximum height should also be considered in section 19.5.

A. Warner questioned the origins of language in section 19.6 regarding foot candles; Clark stated that the language is consistent with other Township Ordinances.

R. Parent questioned if signage companies actually submit liability insurance information to Township Staff and maintain a current copy of the proof, Clark will need to clarify. Stated that if that is a requirement the Township should be listed as an additional insured and a new copy of the insurance certificate should be provided when necessary.

A. Warner questioned requirements for digital signs and found that it is considered only a “message board” and not allowed to have any graphics displayed only language, Clark stated that an image can be used to “express” a message as well, Warner questioned if that language should be clarified to that affect.

K. Cavanaugh questioned if the sign transition speed should be examined as well.

A. Warner found from Clark the current requirements for sign transition speed and colors used; stated he has had some feedback from residents that the flashing and brightness of color is offensive.

Clark clarified that the ordinance language will effectively deal with, does address brightness and color requirements for digital signs, will allow color and images.

A. Warner found from Clark that banner approval is not allowed currently, stated that from a business standpoint advertising is important, questioned if banners should be allowed by permit, enforcement is an issue - takes manpower to enforce.

K. Cavanaugh questioned temporary signage requirements and found that they are not allowed in the Township currently, stated she feels that the language should be clear.

T. Morris cited that he has noticed the temporary signs at the Sprint Store and found that type of signage is possibly considered a banner.

A. Warner stated that if banners for advertising are allowed should be regulated, suggested that Clark confer with K. Cavanaugh to clarify language.

R. Parent cited section 19.15 and the parking of vehicles for advertisement, would like clarification.
K. Cavanaugh stated she would consider that a type of advertisement possibly considered a portable sign.

Clark stated that some of that type of advertising is allowed, when it is parked by a business as a form of advertisement for an extended period of time there is some enforcement efforts that can be exercised, again enforcement is an issue – can fine violators but must catch in violation.

A. Warner cited section 19.16, addresses event signage, found from Clark that guidelines do not apply to churches and schools due to the nature of their business, Clark to research some possible language that could be incorporated to clarify.

K. Cavanaugh suggested limiting to one sign per business frontage, could be contingent upon PUD requirements, if you relinquish wall signage perhaps allow additional signage for business.

Clark cited grade for signage, stated that there was a recent application that was denied based on grade; applicant was not able to get the signage that was requested.

M. Kelly questioned if the guidelines should be changed for consistency of signage height, to make more uniform.

K. Cavanaugh questioned setback requirements of 25’ from the ROW, not sure if one standard would be sufficient for all requests, Clark agreed with comment will clarify.

Clark stated that after the review and comment from Planning Commissioners suggestions will be incorporated into the proposed language, will re-present at the next meeting for further review.

A. Warner stated that signage near expressways/highways should be examined, would like to see what other Townships are allowing, may need to allow larger signage.

K. Cavanaugh suggested that a more uniform guideline would be more effective.

Clark cited the Township Zoning Map does not present many parcels that would be effected by highway requirements, two distinctly different areas, if the intent for signage in the highway zoning district is to draw traffic from highway ordinance should reflect that, will clarify.

R. Parent questioned liability insurance coverage again, different ways of listing on policies that effect the level of protection, would like clarification of requirements from Clark at an upcoming meeting.

B. **2010 Annual Planning Commission report to Township Board.**

Clark reviewed the requirements for the report, have created a 2010 brief summary using the Planning Commission minutes, items listed could be possible agenda items for upcoming meetings, required to file the report per Act 33 of the Michigan Municipal Planning Act.

A. Warner stated that it should be added that the possible examination of other Township Ordinances may be required.

T. Morris questioned the schedule for Master Plan, when will it be necessary to update.

Clark stated that the Master Plan needs to be reviewed every 5 years, would require a formal motion to readopt the existing master plan if no major amendments are requirements and Planning Commissioners are comfortable that the needs of residents are still being met with the existing Plan.

R. Parent commented that unless the economy does a major turnaround it may be sufficient.
C. **2011 Meeting Schedule**

Commissioners were supportive of the schedule as presented.

8. **PUBLIC COMMENTS (EXTENDED – UP TO 5 MINUTES)**

Roger Keating, Township resident, cited Knapp’s corner signage, have a huge sign on the property for all businesses, once inside the development there was all kinds of signage, feels that the digital signs and the flashing of them is a distraction.

9. **COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS**

D. Gunnink cited other areas in the country are making an effort to clean up signage, wants to keep the area beautiful, will need to balance requirements.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

R. Parent made a motion to adjourn. Motion was supported by D. Gunnink.

**VOICE VOTE – all ayes – Meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.**
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