

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MONITOR
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 3, 2012

The meeting was called to order by Chairman J. Bellor at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those present.

Members present: J. Bellor, J. Frank, D. Darland, Earl Arnold, C. Hoyle,
Members absent: B. Campbell, M. Morin
Also present: R. Sheppard, Planning Attorney; J. Jackson, Planner; D. DeGrow, Building
Official; Harold Miller; Nicki Ross; Robert Jarema, Attorney for Mr. Miller;
Ken Malkin

Motion by Frank supported by Hoyle to excuse Campbell and Morin. Motion carried.

Motion by Hoyle seconded by Frank to adopt the agenda as presented.
Motion carried.

Motion by Hoyle seconded by Frank to approve the minutes of the March 6, 2012 regular meeting as corrected. Public *hearing* is changed to Public *Input* and *admissible* is changed to *permissible*. Motion carried.

Public Input/Comment

Chairman Bellor opened public comment at 7: 02 p.m. No public comment.

Motion to close Public Input by Hoyle supported by Frank. Closed at 7:03 p.m.

Items for Consideration

Harold Miller/Batschke Project Site Plan Review 09-100-037-400-050-00

Planner Jackson gave an overview of his review letter dated March 29, 2012. The site plan for the addition that was originally approved was for 5200 sq. ft. A loading well has been filled in and the dimensions have been modified which requires a site plan amendment.

The other issue which is not necessarily under consideration at this meeting, but to understand the context, is that the area that was shown as a 6200 sq. ft. Garden Materials Storage Area was demolished and rebuilt as a new showroom. Because it was torn down, it lost its non-conforming status and the applicant will have to seek a variance for that new building. That also has repercussions with respect to parking on the site plan.

For context, when they came to us last time for the expansion on the north, they also got a special use permit because they were expanding a non-conforming building. Depending on what happens at ZBA, they either need a variance for the south side because the building is encroaching into the setback area or they need to amend their special use permit.

Due to the increase of square footage and the change to showroom and display area from storage, thirteen (13) additional paved parking spaces would be required and could be placed on the north side of the building behind the area not approved for **any use**.

The existing non-conforming sign has been removed and a new sign must meet current zoning ordinance requirements.

There are rental trucks using parking spaces. If that is going to continue to be part of the operation, they will need to identify on the site plan how many trucks there are and where they are going to be located. This will allow it to be noticed for special use. They can't take up allocated parking spaces.

Attorney Sheppard noted that, while we are not at this meeting to detail the south building renovation, that will now be calculated into the parking requirements. The warehouse area that was marked on the plan as not being used for anything has not been calculated into any parking requirements. Any approval should also be reviewed by the Drain Commission and/or Township engineer. With increased paving, we need to make sure that the drainage doesn't run off onto neighboring properties.

DeGrow would like to get the north end of the building approved so that work can commence. He interprets the sign ordinance Sec. 15.09 to say that the sign area for a multi-tenant building is one hundred (100) square feet. Commissioners will discuss this for clarification and get back to Mr. Miller.

DeGrow noted that there is a 12' x 14' building that will be relocated. Its purpose and new location should be noted on the site plan.

Miller says that the size of the building is smaller than the original site plan. There is agreement that some of the dimensions on the original site plan were incorrect. He felt that approvals were given by the previous building inspector. He questioned why water is now an issue when it wasn't before.

Sheppard noted that an engineering report wasn't given before because the 5200 sq. ft addition to the north was not thought to be a significant change to the storm water conditions on the property because there were some greenhouses that would not absorb water and some of those were going to come down. Now because more paving is going to be needed, we need to make sure that drainage is going to be adequate.

There is not a way to approve the north structure at this time due to all of the conditions that still need to be met. Darland noted that a couple of years ago the Planning Commission agreed that they would not conditionally approve plans that have more than one or two small issues because of the pressure that it puts on the inspector to make sure that all the conditions are met.

Motion by Darland supported by Frank to table the site plan review to the May 1 meeting with the items of concern mentioned in the meeting and/or listed on pages 5 and 6 of the McKenna review dated March 29, 2012 to be included on the new site plan with authorization to publish for public hearing.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Arnold, Bellor, Darland, Frank, Hoyle

No: None

Absent: Campbell, Morin

Motion carried

Nicki Ross of 2104 Karl Dr asked about the ability to require specific landscaping and Planner Jackson said that the alternative to landscaping on the south side would be a solid wood fence and, since that area is tight, a fence may be a better choice.

Review of Chapter 15 of Ordinance 52 re: LED Signs

Memo received from the Clerk requesting Planning Commission review of the ordinance.

Sheppard noted a few things on signs. When this was reviewed a few years ago, safety, traffic distraction, time changes were all considered. At that time it was the Board that said changes should not occur more than once every four hours. Three to four minutes was considered by Planning Commission to be a safe changing time.

Arnold reported that the Township Board does want LED signs. Sec. 15.06 says that LED signs may only be incorporated into a Ground sign, only 15% of the total sign, allowed in Industrial and Commercial. There are now two that were issued mistakenly.

DeGrow said that he tries to be practical and a change every four hours is not practical. LED signs are here and are not going to go away. Errors in issuance can be corrected but cost is involved. The State allows a change every 5 seconds. Whatever is done needs to be fair, equitable, enforceable, and practical. We are here to serve not only the taxpayers, but also the businesses.

Bellor would like to gather information on what other communities have done. We need to clean up the language in the Ground and Pylon signs to make the ordinance less confusing. Darland would like to limit LED-style signs to numeric and alpha characters only and allow no images.

Discussion regarding many aspects of signs.

Commissioners recommended that the Building Official address the Township Board and get a consensus on the scope of the sign review before the Planning Commission spends a lot of time reviewing and writing a new ordinance that will not pass.

Master Plan Update

Memo from Clerk regarding the Board's approval to update the Master Plan was noted. Jackson handed out a packet regarding the goals and objectives, the current land use map, and the zoning plan which relates to future land use for commissioners to look at for the next meeting.

Reports-None

Communications

Motion by Hoyle to accept Communications seconded by Darland. Motion carried.

Hoyle moved to adjourn, supported by Frank.

Meeting adjourned 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Darland
Secretary

DD/jw