

Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes May 16, 2011

Call to Order: Chairman Commissioner Steckling called the May 16, 2011 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Dean Baker
Bill Leddy
John Steckling
Roger Lamont

Commissioners Absent

Ruth Ann Hines
Beverly Shaver
Neil Willson

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann, Planner

Approval of Agenda: Approved as presented.

Public Comment: None.

Consent Agenda: Minutes of the April 18, 2011 meeting.

Commissioner Baker moved to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2011 meeting as presented. Support by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Leddy, Lamont, Steckling, Baker. Voted no: None. Absent: Hines, Shaver, Willson. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None.

New Business:

1. Zoning Ordinance revision – Definition of Family

Chairperson Steckling stated that as a result of the codification process, the definition of family was examined. Greg Need, Township Attorney, responded with sample language that was before the Commission which is mirrored after the Ann Arbor ordinance.

Commissioner Leddy stated that he liked the example offered by the Attorney. He stated that a broad definition was good enough.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the recommendation offered by the Attorney was good.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the procedure was to come up with Ordinance language then follow the ordinance procedure with publication and a public hearing.

Commission Lamont stated that at the Township Board meeting it was offered that the Ann Arbor language was defensible and appropriate; however, it was a bit too liberal. The last sentence of Greg Need's stated that this was intended as a guide, it is not necessary to allow six unrelated individuals; a lesser number such as four would be defensible. The Township Board members agreed to change the definition, but felt that Ann Arbor's was too liberal. It was felt to change it to "four unrelated individuals and their offspring." This is the motion that was passed and carried by the Township Board. This is going back and forth because it has to have the Commission's input. The Board has already seen it because of the codification process.

Commissioner Baker stated that looking at the Ann Arbor draft, he questioned if Commissioner Lamont was looking at item C.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it was also in 5.74 as defined, this would be changed to four.

Commissioner Lamont made a motion to move forward with the definition of family as outlined in the Ann Arbor ordinance, changing the number "six" to "four unrelated individuals and their offspring". Support by Commissioner Baker. Voted yes: Leddy, Lamont, Steckling, Baker. Voted no: None. Absent: Hines, Shaver, Willson. Motion Carried.

Old Business:

1. Sign ordinance-proposal and overview

Chairperson Steckling stated that for both the road signage and the building signage, it allows the business to use some of the excess allowable area that is not used for one type of signage to be used in other types of signage. They still must meet the maximum size for ground sign and building sign, but it allows the business to allocate between them. He would like to go one step further and use the square foot allocation to other types of signs. He stated that pennants are mentioned and portable signs are mentioned. He stated that his approach would be that the business is allocated a certain number of square footage and as long as they do not exceed sizes in certain categories, the business person should be able to allocate it as needed. He stated that some of the definitions describe building frontage. This is defined as, "the portion of the building that principally relates to the public right of way." He stated in looking at different businesses up and down the street, there are some businesses that are perpendicular to the right of way that currently have signage and that are visible from the road, but he does not think the definition covers it. He would like to include these orientations. He stated that he would like to use this as frontage to compute signage area. For example, it does not have to be linear and parallel to the highway. He would like this clarified.

Calvin Bordine, 9930 King Road and 8600 Dixie Highway, stated that they have a current sign that is 25 years old. It met the standards 25 years ago of what was allowed and they would like to update with an electronic, changeable sign. He stated that churches and schools have changeable signs. He drove to Bloomfield and looked at signage. He doesn't feel like the current ordinance language allows them to update their sign. He

stated that on their side of the road, there are wires and those will not be moved. When he drove down Telegraph, he noticed that there were poles that were 3 feet from the road. He stated that the utilities are there for good, and therefore they should be able to put their sign close to those. He stated that he felt the same way about parking spaces; he doesn't understand the necessity of a greenbelt. He stated that since the utilities are there, they should be able to use this area too. He would like to update their sign and for new businesses coming in, they should encourage signs that are competitive. He suggested looking at the ordinances south and north, because businesses have their choice of where they are going to locate and he would hate to lose businesses to Independence Township.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Bordine to clarify how their sign was out of conformity and what he would need to update it in terms of height and square footage. He stated that the changeable letter sign is seen as favorable by the Commission.

Mr. Bordine asked if he could update his sign without making it smaller and farther from the road.

Chairperson Steckling stated that both Boards would have to approve it.

Mr. Bordine stated that they would like to be grandfathered in and allowed to update the sign, but he does not think it is fair for new people coming in. His recommendation is a larger sign which can be located closer to the road and also taller.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Bordine to define specific numbers. He asked how high their current sign is.

Mr. Bordine responded 16 feet high and the square footage would be about 120 square feet per side.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the Commission was looking at the edge of the road, but they adopted a different standard based on center line and the road in front. He stated that Dixie Highway is a 4 lane road with a passing lane.

Mr. Bordine clarified that it is a 5 lane roadway with a deceleration lane in front of his business. He stated that he does not know the exact distance, maybe 25 feet at the most.

Chairperson Steckling stated that in the proposed sign ordinance, Dixie Highway would be defined as 4 lanes with a center turn lane with 50 mile per hour speed limit. The maximum height would be 10 feet with a maximum of 140 square feet. He questioned Mr. Bordine on the distance of the current sign from the road.

Mr. Bordine clarified that to adopt the current ordinance that would be 10 feet more into the road. He is a resident and he is looking to the future, however, it needs to be an even playing field. He doesn't understand how for sale signs can be in front of the business sign. It is not more important to let people know that something is for sale as opposed to

promoting business. He stated that there is a for sale sign on Dixie Highway that is an arm's length from the curb.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it is probably not supposed to be there. He stated that they are trying to eliminate the violations for the current ordinance, update the ordinance so it is more current. They want to take care of the businesses that are there and attract other businesses.

Mr. Bordine stated that he doesn't know how far his current sign is from the center of the road.

Commissioner Lamont stated that there is a 120 foot right of way in front of Bordines. He stated that they were 12 foot travel lanes and 12 foot center lane so there would be roughly 30 feet from the center lane to the edge of the road and another 12 foot deceleration lane that would be 42 foot. He stated that if the sign was 20 foot off the deceleration lane to the edge of the sign, his sign would be 62 foot from the center lane and would be in compliance. He stated that this is only if all of these numbers are true. Commissioner Lamont asked Mr. Bordine to define the positive things and the negative things that he saw when he was looking at signage. He stated that the commission wants to attract business and wants to be competitive.

Mr. Bordine stated that he likes what the commission is doing now. The sizes allowed in the sign ordinance as it is currently written is too small. He stated that the businesses need to get their message to the customers. He stated that it is harder and harder to get the message out and to be successful, they need to make changes and attract customers on Dixie Highway. He stated that the commission that met 5 years ago had the mind set that they were in the country. He doesn't understand why they would think that Dixie Highway was out in the country. It is a 5 lane road which signifies that you are no longer in the country. He saw nice signs that were large. He liked the artistic signs that looked like they were professionally done. He stated that the building is much more important than the sign; they need to meet architectural design standards. He stated that too much landscaping is a safety hazard. He doesn't like the car dealership special sale items, blow up gorillas and such. He thinks they should be banned, but they do need a method to get their message across. He stated that there should be leniency for decorations that are seasonal. He stated that the commission has the right message right now. He stated that the new Lowe's sign on Rochester Road is huge and he knows that they are relying on people seeing this sign as they drive by.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he is aware that they went to the ZBA for a variance. He stated that they did compromise on the size of the road sign to have an enlarged building sign. He stated that that they made other architectural design standard changes too. He stated that Lowes was required to brick the sign.

Mr. Bordine stated that when a Meijer, Lowes or Home Depot comes to Springfield, they are going to do the exact same thing. He stated that there needs to be a balance.

Commissioner Lamont thanked Mr. Bordine for his input. He stated that they are looking for that standard that achieves the architectural design, tastefulness, but they do not want to get into sign pollution or when one sign blocks another sign. He pointed out a picture in the Planning Commission journal that illustrated this.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Bordine that if he was able to make the current sign electronic, is he happy with the overall size and height of the current sign.

Mr. Bordine stated yes.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Bordine for hard numbers of the existing sign. He stated in his opinion, the sign does not look overwhelming based on the lots and frontage that is involved. He stated that there is no correlation to say that if someone has 2000 foot of frontage, they are allowed to have a slightly larger sign. He stated that this would make sense. He stated that this might alleviate the problems with giving someone a larger sign, and not to everyone else.

Tom Lowrie, 9539 Dixie Highway, stated that he agreed with Calvin in that is getting harder to market. He stated that he is not on top of the ordinance standards, although he said he should be. He has new tenants and they have a message as well. He stated that the new electronic message boards are much more expensive, but they are much more convenient. He is not certain on the size of the signs. He has 400 foot of frontage; this includes all of the tenants. He stated that he has people come in every year that say, I didn't know you sell mulch. He stated that he does not know the solution, but he is glad the commission is addressing it and that they are getting the business input. He has 3 addresses at his business location and only 2 signs. He clarified that this is one parcel, 3 addresses and a shared driveway.

Commissioner Lamont stated this is also something that the ordinance does not address, shared driveways.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this was like the Kroger plaza.

Commissioner Lamont stated that the township encourages less curb cuts. If you have 3 businesses on 1 parcel, this is a preexisting condition and our sign ordinance does not address this. He stated that the new ordinance does allow for a separate free-standing sign for each business or out lot, but we want to encourage shared driveways. We want to allow a secondary sign.

Chairperson Steckling that there are all separate business entities on the property and you can have ground signs, building signs and individual signs. He stated the temporary signs issue started the discussion a year ago. He stated that the commission didn't like it because of clutter, but knew that the business owner was trying to stay alive. He stated that he doesn't like the individual permitting nature of the temporary sign process that they first looked at because it was cumbersome and time consuming. He stated that they are trying to build language into the current ordinance that will fit both of the needs. He

stated that there is a conflict because the commission wants some semblance of order, but they want to take care of the business needs too. He still believes that if a business is given a total amount of available signage based on the frontage, lot size, etc., the ground sign will have maximums that are built in as well. Then, the business can decide how much it wants to allocate to other signage on the property. He stated that they would like to get away from the temporary signage. They need to come up with some objective numbers for signage. He stated that they are not near to passing this new ordinance. They are working on refining it and getting it to a version that they like. When it is a version that the commission agrees on, they will have a public hearing after which changes can be made, or it can go to the Township Board for approval. He stated that they still have some time, but the commission is getting weary because they have been messing with it for a long time. He stated the biggest items that they need feedback from business owners are ground signs, building signs, temporary signs and where they are located. He stated that they would like to take into consideration the building size, lot size, speed along the road. With the changeable signs, they are hoping to get rid of the temporary signage. He stated that the electronic signs that he has seen are only really 3 lines at the most, but there is a limit as to how much you can absorb traveling by the sign.

Jim White, 8700 Dixie Highway, (Al Deeby Dodge) stated that the commission is on the right track. He stated that they really don't want the temporary signs. They want to grab people's attention. He stated that they have been trying to get a permanent sign addition for the service entrance for a while now. They are trying to meet the standards of the corporation. He would like a proper digital sign. He stated that if they need to invest in a permanent display area for their cars, they would like to do it. He would like to invest in signs that look good. He understands that there has to be limitations in size of the signs. If he had an electronic sign, he could advertise specials.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the permanent display area for the cars would probably fall into the site plan section of the ordinance, green belt usage. He asked Mr. White about the banners on the light poles, those are technically signs. There is a lot of square footage on the light poles and the commission needs to know whether to include it or not.

Mr. White stated that these light pole signs are a staple part of the business.

Chairperson Steckling asked him to provide a total of signage in square feet. He stated that they should include all signs, including window signage. His goal is to have numbers that they can fit into. He asked him to measure the location of the ground sign.

Mr. White stated that he will provide those figures.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the displays do not fit in the category of sign. He stated that he likes the Lowrie display. It actually creates less signage because you can see what is offered. The architectural standards are also important; possibly all new signs would have a review to make sure that they fit architectural standards, so they are not gaudy in color.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he wanted to look at the Dixie Corridor Overlay to see what controls are specified.

Chairperson Steckling stated that adding an electronic component to the Bordines current sign is enough of a change to require a permit. It is grandfathered at this point. He stated that if they are going to exercise architectural control, it is done at the permitting step.

Commissioner Lamont stated that with the passage of a new and updated sign ordinance it would not affect signs that are in non-conformance, unless they were significantly altered.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they would still be non-conforming, but if the business wanted to put up a new sign and change the location, it would need to be brought into conformance.

Commissioner Lamont stated that if they just wanted to repaint it, or change fonts, it would not be a significant enough change as long as they maintained the same framework.

Mr. Oppmann reiterated that they could repaint it, finish it, as long as the sign area itself remains the same, it does not increase or decrease, or they don't increase the height. They could keep the same sign.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he wanted to make sure that the wording in the proposed sign ordinance does not prohibit that.

Chairperson Steckling stated that anything that is nonconforming is going to stay unless it is destroyed or they want to change it. He stated it does not have to be in the proposed sign ordinance.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he is troubled by c. in the compliance section, "a change of use of a business would require a nonconforming sign to be brought into conformance." This is on page 16, letter c. Change of use must be defined. He stated that this is almost like doing an amortization program. It essentially eliminates nonconforming signage.

Commissioner Lamont stated that if the salt business were to change to a different use, selling flowers, then the sign would no longer be in conformance.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they have to define change of use. Is it retail to retail? He stated that salt sale to flower sale would not be, but salt sale to an accounting business would be a change of use. He stated that this needs to be clarified.

Commissioner Lamont stated that the pond business took over the flower shop recently.

Mr. Oppmann stated that it went from retail to vacant. He stated that frequently in sign ordinances, if the business has been nonexistent for a certain amount of time; the sign needs to be brought into conformance. He stated almost every community has this.

Commissioner Lamont stated that this needs to be clarified. The commission needs to come to a decision on what they want and then have the ordinance reflect.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the goal of the sign ordinance is to eventually eliminate nonconformity and an amortization program is effective, but there could be issues. If you have signage that is still in good shape and the new business wants to move in and use it.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he doesn't understand retail to retail, however possibly retail to business should be looked at. He stated he would like to hear the answers back from the businesses that they asked tonight and go back and do a little more homework. This would create a good final product instead of something that you have to keep amending.

Commissioner Baker thanked the business owners for being here. He stated that they are interested in knowing the current status on properties along Dixie Highway. He wondered if there would be an opportunity for the ordinance officer to play a role in this. He stated that having someone out there who can recognize what is out there and data that was consistently collected. He stated that he would like to know exactly how many square feet are being used now including: banners, ground signs, building signs. The distance from the road way should also be included. He stated that since the Township is looking for this information, and we should help gather the data. He stated that he would rather not waste another month getting the accurate figures. He stated that we could use this information for ground zero data as to what is at each site. He stated that they have had some discussion about the fact that the use of the right of way is not the township's jurisdiction. He asked about page #6, the discussion about ground signs, item #1. This is proposing a secondary sign at a secondary entrance. He stated that in looking at the Kroger complex they have one ground sign at the southern entrance/exit, he asked if they would be allowed to have a second sign at the northerly entrance. He wondered if this meant that the cleaners could have a ground sign, the Highland House could have a ground sign, etc. He asked if this is the intent.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he interpreted it differently. Individual buildings would have their own ground signs. It says, "each individual building", not each individual tenant. He stated that when he applied this to Lowrie's with the single drive, single zoning lot with 3 tenants. He stated there are 3 buildings there. He should be able to have 1 additional ground sign at a secondary entrance which he doesn't qualify for. He stated that each individual building may have their own ground sign as determined during site plan review. He stated this is designed for new development. If you look at ME CAD Boulevard, they have 2 signs on Dixie Highway, this would allow for some signage down ME CAD Boulevard as well. This signage would be based on building, not on tenant.

Mr. Oppmann concurred with Commissioner Lamont.

Commissioner Baker stated that on page 12, item #10, about the CEVMS signs. It says, “no CEVMS shall be located within 1000 feet of another CEVMS on the same side of the roadway.” He wondered if Bordines elected to use this type of sign and so did Al Deeby, with this 1000 feet limitation, whoever got there first would get the sign. They both would not be permitted. He wondered if the 1000 feet was based on road study information. He stated that this should be examined.

Commissioner Lamont concurred.

Commissioner Baker stated that if they put stipulations on the luminescence of the sign.

Mr. Oppmann stated that if you travel about 6 miles down Dixie south, you can see where there is no regulation of any type.

Commissioner Baker stated that he does not think it is the Commission’s goal to give the sign to who gets there first. He appreciated the positive comments from the business owners on how this is going. He would hope that they could gather some data that would allow them to say how the proposals that they are considering would impact businesses today.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it would be beneficial to have Greg Kazmierski tell them what the violations have been. Therefore, they could tell what the businesses have tried to do that they could not do. He would suggest that the commissioners travel the roadway and determine what the boundaries are and what they are comfortable with. He stated that he agrees with the road right of way issue and he would disagree with the signage having to be outside of the right of way, but getting a permit from the road commission would be close to impossible. He stated that he believes that some township signage is in the right of way now, and he agrees with Calvin Bordine that as long as it is not a safety hazard and obstructs vision. He stated that the road right of way is large along Dixie Highway. He would say that this is not the township’s responsibility to enforce the right of way. He stated that if they have a problem with it, they will talk to the merchant and tell them that they have to take it down. He would rather the commission take the stance that if they can get away with it, but determine the permissible standards. He concurred with Commissioner Baker about the 1000 foot separation issue.

Supervisor Trout stated that the reason they were looking at the distance from the center line is that it gave us consistency. It would be hard for the township if someone was able to get a permit in the right of way, then everyone would be able to. He thinks that the right of way changes enough, i.e. from 100 feet to 120 feet. If everyone put their sign at the edge of the right of way, some would be at 50 feet, some at 55 feet. He doesn’t think that this is what we are trying to accomplish, he thought that designing it based on consistency made more sense. He does think that 60 feet on Dixie would be sufficient. On page 5, there was a note about roof signs and he wondered if the commission had any thoughts on whether they wanted to allow those or not.

Chairperson Steckling stated that it would be helpful if the commission could look at the consent judgment that approved the roof sign at Dixie Davisburg Market.

Supervisor Trout stated that this market has a little bit of everything. They have flagpole banners and are working on getting a changeable sign. He stated that his office will provide this to the commission. On page 6, under signs permitted, e 1, would cover what Mr. White mentioned about changes that we would allow. He stated that there are provisions for that. Under ground signs, general requirements, the commission should look at multiple tenant situations as well, perhaps allowing a square footage increase or allowance for multiple tenants. He would rather see a larger sign than more signs. He may try to put something together that addresses that. He thinks they should agree on the approach that they want to take, either option A or B. He stated within both of these, there is the provision for the additional percentage allowed for speed limit. On ground signs, they should look at building frontage for part of the calculation. On wall signs, the setback should be another consideration. He stated that there should be additions that you could get based on speed limit, setback, or road frontage. These should all be part of the calculation determining square footage requirements. If they could focus on one chart, or the other, it would help.

Commissioner Baker stated that he likes the first option in which they were taking into account what type of road and also the speed limit. This was more relevant to the signage than the zoning district.

Commissioner Lamont stated that they talked about coming up with an ordinance that would be relevant for Dixie Highway and also the Hamlet. He stated that the first case does a better job doing this and is more appropriate.

Chairperson Steckling concurred.

Supervisor Trout stated that we could add additional columns to add frontage and setback consideration.

Commissioner Lamont clarified that they were talking about adding additional square footage to the building sign if the building is set back further from the roadway.

Supervisor Trout stated that on page 11, there was an issue with the road frontage that dipped down quite a bit. He asked if it was more appropriate to look at the roadway surface when determined the sign placement. He stated that the way it is written, it penalizes them and causes the sign to be below the crown of the road. He pointed out the Savoie Insulation businesses and how it related to this property.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the other part of this is his situation in which the road is lower than his property level.

Supervisor Trout stated maybe they should add language if the roadway is lower, calculate from the roadway, otherwise use the setback. Under changeable message signs,

they had talked about the distance from the residential zoning lot. He agrees with the comments about how far they should be from each other. He stated they were going to look at the proximity of the businesses to potential neighborhoods. He stated that there is a sign book that we put together about a year ago that shows every property. We can share this with the commission and this will be a part of moving forward to document all signage that is currently there. He stated that Greg Kazmierski can go out to update the book.

Chairperson Steckling stated that Bordines and Nissan are close to Lavon. He stated that this is a legitimate concern and it does need to be tempered somehow. He stated that lighting and illumination are also key items. He stated that Lowries borders residential behind him.

Supervisor Trout stated that on page 14, other temporary signs, number 1, they talk about signs not affixed to light poles and other types of things, but it seems that it might be more appropriate for a dealership like Randy Hosler to have these types of signs instead of sandwich boards. He stated that the commission also has to evaluate how to address a business who does not want to make any significant structural changes, possibly just to update the sign.

Chairperson Steckling clarified that the road frontage should be visible to the public right of way and have this included in the computations for allowable signage. He would get rid of the changeable copy sign in which you could change it once a day. He would put the Randy Hosler oil change sign under pennant. Under page 5, item d, billboards are mentioned. In regards to the Renaissance Festival, the signage would be prohibited as per this section. The commission may want to reevaluate this section.

Supervisor Trout stated that a billboard is a sign that is on a piece of property that has no commercial use at all.

Chairperson Steckling stated the definition of billboard on page 2 reads, “any sign that contains a message unrelated to or not advertising a business transacted, sold or produced on the premises or place where the sign is located.” He stated that the Renaissance Festival sign at the BP gas station fits this definition. He stated whether it is a vacant piece, or a piece that sells something else, it falls in the same category. He stated that you could distinguish it from a vacant piece and a piece in use, this is a possibility.

Supervisor Trout stated that this issue might be able to be addressed by our transient and seasonal sales. He stated that his office and Mr. Oppmann would work on making the changes addressed at tonight’s meeting.

Chairperson Steckling stated that if we want to allow it, we have to put it somewhere. He addressed the business owners at the meeting to ask them to provide signage information.

2. Site plan applications and ordinance requirements – discussion

Chairperson Steckling stated that these are the attempts to streamline the site plan process. The commissioners were provided with the proposed and current applications.

Commissioner Lamont stated that there were a lot of redundancies before in the application process. He stated the elimination of some of the things for concept are good.

Supervisor Trout stated that the applicant signs a statement saying they will comply with the provisions of the ordinance below. They do not have to have all of the information now, but they are aware of it.

Commissioner Lamont stated typically during site plan review, there would be a tendency to over review it.

Commissioner Baker suggested several typographic corrections.

3. Article XI-O-S- Office Service-discussion regarding adding churches as an allowable use

Chairperson Steckling stated that at the last meeting it was discussed whether it was going to be a special use or a permitted use.

Mr. Oppmann stated that it should be a special use with no specific requirements. Typically, O-S is a transitional area.

Chairperson Steckling stated that if it was going to be a 300-400 member church.

Mr. Oppmann stated that you get more discretionary ability for a special land use. This is his recommendation.

Commissioner Baker concurred with this and agreed that it would allow the commission to manage the development more than just a permitted use.

Commissioner Leddy concurred.

Commissioner Lamont concurred. Since, Brian Oppmann mentioned that O-S is transitional from residential to commercial and it frequently borders commercial. He stated that if a church comes into ME Cad later a Buffalo Wild Wings wants to come into the same complex. Now, we have a church within 1000 foot of a liquor license and the liquor license will have to be denied. It is a question of who got there first, just like the signs.

Mr. Oppmann stated this would be a use variance. He questioned if this was specifically in the zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Lamont stated yes. He stated that special use would be recommended not only for the liquor reason, but the possible close proximity to residential. He stated that if

they look at future development and where the office service is, this could pose some problems.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this was an unusual standard. He has never heard of so many feet separation between businesses and other uses with liquor licenses.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he doesn't want the decision of one development to impede upon another development.

Mr. Oppmann stated that if you don't put any use standards attached to it, then really all it has to do is meet the discretionary criteria of special land use. They can be examined on a case by case basis.

Commissioner Leddy asked if they could sign a waiver before the development was approved.

Commissioners concurred that the zoning ordinance would have to be changed.

Commissioner Leddy stated that there is a church interested in a local office building.

Chairperson Steckling stated that Supervisor Trout and Mr. Oppmann would rewrite the section adding churches as a special land use taking into account Commissioner Lamont's concern regarding the liquor license.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List.

Commissioners went over the priority task list and made necessary revisions and corrections.

Commissioner Lamont asked who was working on the connectivity ideas for the safety paths.

Supervisor Trout stated that his office was currently working on this.

Public Comment: Diana Walls, 627 Broadway, Davisburg, asked the Commission how they wanted the information provided to them by the Downtown Davisburg business owners regarding signage.

Supervisor Trout responded that Ms. Walls could provide a statement of the downtown business owners comments and suggestions and send it to him. He would then make this document available to all of the Commissioners.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Baker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 pm. Supported by Commissioner Lamont. Voted yes: Leddy, Steckling, Lamont, Baker. Voted no: None. Absent: Shaver, Willson, Hines. Motion Carried.

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary