

OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD JANUARY 22, 2009

---

**Agenda**

**QUAIL MEADOWS PUD - ECCU WALL SIGN - 1551 SOUTH 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET - (PARCEL NOS. 3905-23-455-033 AND 3905-23-455-025)**

**WORK ITEM: MASTER LAND USE PLAN OPINION SURVEY - DRAFT #2**

---

A meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, January 22, 2009, commencing at approximately 7:00 p.m. at the Oshtemo Charter Township Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Schley, Chairman  
Deborah Everett  
Fred Gould  
Bob Anderson  
Kitty Gelling  
Carl Benson  
Richard Skalski

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

Also present were Jodi Stefforia, Planning Director; Mary Lynn Bugge, Senior Planner; James Porter, Township Attorney, and approximately five interested persons.

**Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. The "Pledge of Allegiance" was recited by the Commissioners.

The Chairman asked to deviate concerning the order of the Agenda and proceed with Item No. 7, "Certificate of Appreciation for Lee Larson." The Chairman informed those present that Mr. Larson had just completed two full terms on the Planning Commission. He said that Lee had performed a service to his community, marked by good people wanting to do good for their community. He thanked Mr. Larson for his service and then read a Certificate of Appreciation signed by all the Planning Commission members. At the conclusion of the reading of the Certificate, accolades for Mr. Larson's service were made by Mr. Skalski, Mr. Gould and Mr. Benson.

## **Elect Officers and Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison**

The next item of business on the Agenda was to elect the officers and the Zoning Board of Appeals liaison. With that nominations were requested. Ms. Everett made a motion to have Mr. Schley continue as Chairman of the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gould. The Chairman asked if there were any additional nominations. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman indicated that the next position to fill would be the Vice Chair. Mr. Benson made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Everett, to appoint Mr. Anderson as the Vice Chair. The Chairman asked if there were any further nominations. Mr. Anderson asked if he could still serve on the ZBA. Attorney Porter said that he could. The Chairman asked for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman asked for nominations for approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals liaison. Ms. Everett moved, and Ms. Gelling seconded, to appoint Mr. Anderson as the ZBA liaison. There were no other nominations. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman said that the only remaining position to fill was the Secretary of the Planning Commission. Mr. Gould then made a motion, and Ms. Everett seconded it, to appoint Ms. Gelling as the Secretary for the Planning Commission. The Chairman noted that there were no additional nominations and called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Agenda**

The Chairman asked if there were any amendments to the Agenda. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Agenda. Ms. Gelling made a motion to approve the Agenda as submitted, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

The Chairman asked if there was any public comment on non-agenda items. Hearing nothing, the Chairman closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

## **Minutes**

The Chairman asked the Planning Commission members if they had reviewed the minutes of December 11, 2008, and asked if there were any corrections. Hearing no corrections, the Chairman called for a motion. Ms. Gelling made a motion to approve the minutes, as submitted. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

**QUAIL MEADOWS PUD - ECCU WALL SIGN - 1551 SOUTH 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET - (PARCEL NOS. 3905-23-455-033 AND 3905-23-455-025)**

The Chairman noted that the next item on the Agenda was a request by Quail Meadows PUD Educational Community Credit Union (ECCU) concerning its wall sign at 1551 South 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Parcel Nos. 3905-23-455-033 and 3905-23-455-025. He said that the request was made pursuant to Section 60.430E to allow a wall sign which exceeded the 20-foot height limit. The Chairman asked for a report from the Planning Department. Ms. Bugge submitted her report, and the same is incorporated herein by reference.

The Chairman opened with a request for clarification regarding the vinyl logo which would be placed above the sign. Mr. Anderson also asked if that logo would constitute a sign. Ms. Bugge said Staff was considering it an incidental sign as it was anticipated it would not be visible from the street; therefore, it would not constitute a wall sign.

Ms. Gelling asked if the wall sign was larger than what was anticipated. Ms. Bugge said it was not because the size of the sign was not discussed when the site plan was reviewed, and it did comply with Ordinance criteria.

The Chairman asked for clarification. He asked if the request was being made pursuant to the PUD provisions. Ms. Bugge indicated that was correct; the modification was being sought pursuant to Section 60.430E of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

Hearing no further questions, the Chairman asked to hear from the applicant. Mr. Steve VanderSloot, on behalf of SignArt Inc. introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He said that he was there on behalf of ECCU Credit Union and was accompanied by the CEO and Marketing Director of the organization. Mr. VanderSloot proceeded to explain the channel lettering proposed as part of the ECCU wall sign. He also explained that the vinyl applique would be applied to the inside of the glass. He said that the logo would be very muted. He said the logo, or branding, was created after the building was designed and the PUD was originally approved. He said that was done in response to a marketing study on behalf of ECCU.

The Chairman asked how the Planning Commission could be assured, other than based upon Mr. VanderSloot's judgment, that the logo would not be visible from the street, especially at night. The Chairman said that the Commission wanted to be

consistent, and that if this was part of the sign, it would be in violation of the Township Ordinances. Ms. Bugge clarified that, if it was a sign, it would still be within the wall sign area allowed for financial institutions due to the length of the wall to which it was attached; however, the height would then become an issue.

Mr. VanderSloot again assured the Planning Commission that he understood its concerns and that there would not be any direct back lighting which would project the logo image in such a fashion as to constitute a sign, under the Township Ordinances.

A question arose as to the distance of the sign from the road right-of-way. After a brief discussion, it was the consensus that the location of the sign on the crossbeam would be approximately 86 feet from 9<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Benson asked about the lighting within the channel letters. Mr. VanderSloot said there would be direct lighting contained within the channel lettering themselves, but that there would be no direct lighting for the logo.

The Chairman asked if there was any comment from the public. Ms. Pam Larson introduced herself to the Planning Commission. She said she lived on 8<sup>th</sup> Street and said her major concern was how bright the lighting would be and whether it would extend off site. Mr. VanderSloot said, compared to other signs, channel lighting is much more subdued and that those lights would not be on overnight.

The Chairman said he thought that the proposal for the wall sign was attractive, and he appreciated that ECCU wanted to be sensitive to the Township's desire not to set a bad precedent. He said he was willing to trust the applicant's representations regarding the logo, given the oversight to be provided by the Planning Department. Ms. Everett concurred.

Mr. Benson said, when he viewed the property, he thought the roadway was five or six feet higher than the building elevation of the structure. Therefore, the height of the sign was not inappropriate. He said he also thought the sign needed to be displayed in such a way as to allow the motoring public to locate the facility.

The Chairman said he would like it reflected in the record that the building was lower than the grade of the street, but he did not want that issue to be the sole basis for the Planning Commission's decision, as that might set an adverse precedent.

Ms. Gelling said that she thought there were additional reasons which had been previously mentioned, such as the location of the sign on one of the crossbeams which would make it aesthetically pleasing, as indicated by the Chairman.

Mr. Gould noted that the grade was an issue, but he thought that the location of the sign was also the right place on the subject building and could be authorized under the PUD provisions.

Mr. Skalski said, while height might be important, he thought that the location on the building itself was equally important and was in favor of granting the deviation to the normal height requirements.

With that, the Chairman asked if there was further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a motion. Ms. Gelling made a motion to approve the wall sign at a height of 23 feet, based upon the fact that it was the most appropriate location on the subject building, as well as the fact that the road is higher than the grade of the subject building. Mr. Gould seconded the motion. The Chairman asked if there were any concerns about the vinyl applique. Ms. Everett pointed out that the issue was not part of the request. Ms. Bugge again stated that Staff believed it was an incidental sign and would not be visible from off-site, and if it was, the Planning Department would bring the matter back to the Commission. The Chairman then closed the discussed and called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Work Item: Master Land Use Plan Opinion Survey - Draft #2**

The Chairman said the next item on the Agenda was a work item, being Draft #2 of the Opinion Survey. The Chairman introduced Greg Milliken on behalf of McKenna Associates Inc. and asked for feedback from the Planning Commission on Draft #2 of the Opinion Survey.

There was a lengthy, thorough discussion of the proposed Opinion Survey. Several recommendations for modification or refinement to the proposed Opinion Survey were made. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chairman asked if the Planning Commission was comfortable with letting the Planning Department and Mr. Milliken's firm move ahead without further review. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that, barring any radical changes in the Opinion Survey, when reviewed by the Township Board, it should proceed without further review by the Planning Commission.

### **Any Other Business**

The Chairman asked if there was any other business. Hearing none, he moved on to Planning Commissioner comments.

### **Planning Commissioner Comments**

The Chairman asked if there were any Planning Commissioner comments. Hearing none, he stated that he would like to see revisions to the PUD provisions in the Township Zoning Ordinance addressed in 2009.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further matters to be considered by the Planning Commission, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Minutes Prepared:  
January 30, 2009

Minutes Approved:  
March 12, 2009