



**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Cedar Springs Planning Commission**

**Tuesday, January 6, 2015
7:00 p.m.**

**Cedar Springs City Hall
66 S. Main St.
Cedar Springs, Michigan**

1. The Meeting was Called to Order by City Clerk **Linda Christensen** at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
The City Clerk issued the Oath of Office to newly appointed members: **Clinton Conley, Lisa Atchison, Perry Hopkins, Craig Owens and Sherri Foster**.
The Clerk took nominations for the position of Chairperson.
Motion by Perry Hopkins, supported by Kathy Bremmer, to nominate Craig Owens for the office of Chairperson.

Vote:	Lisa Atchison	Yes
	Kathy Bremmer	Yes
	Sherri Foster	Yes
	Jerry Hall	Yes
	Perry Hopkins	Yes
	Craig Owens	Yes
	Clinton Conley	Yes
	Dale Bray	Absent
	Mark Laws	Absent

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

The Clerk issued the Oath of Office to **Owens** as Chairperson.

Owens opened the floor to nominations for the office of Vice-Chairperson.

Motion by Bremmer, supported by Atchison, to nominate Hopkins for the office of Vice-Chairperson.

Motion by Hall, supported by Foster, to nominate Atchison for the position of Vice-Chairperson.

Vote for Hopkins:

Atchison	No
Bremmer	Yes
Foster	No
Hall	No
Hopkins	Yes

Owens No
Conley No

VOTE: 2 – 5, Motion Denied.

Vote for Atchison:

Atchison Yes
Bremmer No
Foster Yes
Hall Yes
Hopkins Yes
Owens Yes
Conley Yes

VOTE: 6 – 1, Motion Carried.

The Clerk issued the Oath of Office to **Atchison** as Vice Chairperson.

2. ROLL CALL:
- | | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Ms. Lisa Atchison | Present |
| Mr. Dale Bray | Absent |
| Mrs. Kathy Bremmer | Present |
| Ms. Sherri Foster | Present |
| Mr. Jerry Hall | Present |
| Mr. Perry Hopkins | Present |
| Mr. Mark Laws | Excused |
| Mr. Craig Owens | Present |
| Mr. Clinton Conley | Present |

3. City Planner **Carmine Avantini** was recognized as being in attendance.

4. **Motion by Atchison, supported by Hopkins, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 2, 2014.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

5. **Motion by Atchison, supported by Hall, to approve the agenda.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

6. There were no public comments.

7. There were no scheduled public hearings.

8. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Sign review for Independent Bank:

Avantini stated Independent Bank had requested replacement of an existing nonconforming pole sign with a less nonconforming monument sign.

(attached Item A) He explained the City's ordinance state a nonconforming sign shall not be replaced by another nonconforming sign with the exception of pole signs, which could be replaced with a ground or monument sign that is not in compliance with the requirements for ground signs. The bank's pole

sign is currently at 22 feet and the monument sign they are requesting would be at nine feet in height. **Avantini** was recommending eight feet. The bank was also requesting an electronic message sign. He reviewed his letter dated December 30, 2014. **(attached Item B)**

Hopkins asked if the sign was brought down if it would obstruct the view of someone wanting to turn into the bank.

Hall asked if what they were requesting wasn't simply a short pole sign.

Avantini suggested it was more of a hybrid sign.

Bremmer thought it would be better if there were different height for the signs in that area of 17 Mile Road.

Avantini said the area had different elevations.

Conley asked what the negativity to pole signs was.

Avantini stated it was a question of aesthetics.

Owens said both signs, whether pole or monument, were nonconforming.

City Manager **Thad Taylor** stated the bank was trying to be more conforming.

For example, he explained, they were going to reduce the amount of wall signage from four signs to two.

Motion by Bremmer, supported by Hall, to approve the signage for Independent Bank with the following stipulations:

- 1. The height is approved at nine feet.**
- 2. Compliance with the requirement for electronic message signs in Section 40-456(f) of the City's Ordinances.**

VOTE: 7 – 0, Motion Carried.

9. OLD BUSINESS.

- A. **Avantini** continued the discussion regarding establishing a downtown PUD. Commissioners reviewed a preliminary map regarding future planning uses for the downtown area. **Avantini** will provide a revised map for review in time for the February Planning Commission meeting.

10. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.

A. There was no correspondence.

B. Staff Comments:

Taylor stated a preliminary site plan review for Advanced Auto Parts, which would be building at the site of the former Family Fare gas station, was in process and Quality Farm and Home would be going into the former Family Fare building.

C. There were no comments from the members of the Planning Commission.

11. **Hall** reported good things were coming for the City.

12. There was no report from the Planning Consultant.

13. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

ITEM B



CIB PLANNING

Community Image Builders

December 30, 2014

City of Cedar Springs
PO Box 310
66 S. Main Street
Cedar Springs, MI 49319

Attention: Mr. Thad Taylor, City Manager

Subject: **Sign Review, Independent Bank**, located on the north side of 17 Mile Road, east of U.S. 131, application dated 11/18/14.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

At your request, we have completed our review of the above sign request for Independent Bank, which would allow for the replacement of an existing nonconforming pole sign with a less nonconforming monument sign. *Section 40-548(b), Non-Conforming Sign*, of the ordinance states that "A nonconforming sign shall not be replaced by another nonconforming sign with the exception of pole signs, which can be replaced with a ground or monument sign that is not in compliance with the requirements for ground signs in this Chapter, subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission. Proposed is a nine (9) foot high sign with an electronic message reader board that is to replace a 22 foot high pole sign with neon drive-up/open lettering. The property is zoned HC, Highway Commercial and monument signs, a maximum of six (6) feet in height are permitted in that district.

Please note that the applicant and their design professionals shall be responsible for the accuracy and validity of information presented with the application and on the site plan. Based upon our review of the submitted documents, we offer the following comments for your consideration:

REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Permitted Sign Area. The ordinance allows a maximum of 72 square feet of sign area per side and the proposed sign is 46.29 square feet in area; thereby meeting ordinance requirements.

2. Electronic Message Sign. *Section 40-546(f), Additional Sign Standards*, of the ordinance allows up to 1/3 of the sign area to be an electronic message sign, meeting the other standards of this section. The proposed reader board is 13.70 square feet in area and is less than 1/3 of the total sign area; thereby meeting ordinance requirements. It is important to note that all other requirements for electronic message signs must also be met and maintained.

17195 Silver Parkway, #309
Fenton, MI 48430

Phone: 810-335-3800
Email: avantini@cibplanning.com

3. Pole Sign Replacement. *Section 40-548, Non-Conforming Signs*, calls for the replacement of nonconforming signs with conforming signs, including a change from pole to monument signs. While the existing sign is clearly a pole sign there is some level of interpretation for the proposed sign. While the proposed sign does not resemble other traditional monument signs, the unique design with a wrap-around base can be considered a monument sign by the Planning Commission, if so desired. A monument sign is defined as "A three dimensional, self-supporting, base-mounted freestanding identification sign, consisting of two (2) or more sides extending up from the base..." while a pole sign is defined as "A sign supported on the ground by a pole or braces, without a monument base..." With this particular request, the base is not a pole and the sign is attached to the proposed base on two sides, including the bottom and side. We would consider this to be a form of monument sign as opposed to a pole sign, if the Planning Commission agrees with our rationale. If there is concern that this can be considered a pole sign, the bottom of the base could be extended farther toward the middle of the sign.

4. Sign Height. The ordinance permits a maximum height of six (6) feet and the applicant is requesting a height of nine (9) feet. As cited above, the ordinance allows the Planning Commission to substitute a nonconforming pole sign with a less nonconforming ground or monument sign. If the proposed sign is considered to be a monument sign, then the Planning Commission can approve the increased height. Other communities have allowed an increase in the height from six (6) to eight (8) feet for those signs located on major thoroughfares. 17 Mile Road is a major thoroughfare and we support an increase in height but recommend that the maximum be placed at eight (8) instead of nine (9) feet.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the above review, **we recommend approval of proposed sign for Independent Bank**, conditioned upon the following:

1. The height being reduced from the proposed nine (9) feet to eight (8) feet.
2. Continued compliance with the requirements for electronic message signs in *Section 40-546(f)* of the ordinance.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING



Carmine P. Avantini, AICP