

- a. Staff Comments: It is not believed that these proposed signs will result in visual blight. The signs being proposed are consistent with similar signs of this business nature.

Regular Planning Commission meeting minutes of 2/21/22, pg. 2

Discussion/Action continued

3. The modifications will not be a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare.
 - a. Staff Comments: It is not believed that these proposed signs will be a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.
 - b.

J & H Oil is requesting one (1) highway pole sign, 75' in height with 415 square feet of sign face area and one (1) entrance pole sign, 28' 4.4" in height, and 136.4 square feet in sign face area. Both signs will have LED illumination.

All Commissioners agreed that the proposed signs would not result in traffic or safety hazards, visual blight, and would not be a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare.

Motion by Commissioner Degeus with second by Commissioner Brown to recommend the J & H Oil Gas Station PUD Site Signage Plan to the City Council for final approval with the following conditions: *Motion carried unanimously.*

1. Any new proposed sign must meet the requirements of Chapter 1282 or must be approved as an amendment to the PUD Site Signage Plan.
2. The proposed approval is only for the current business owner, J & H Oil. If the business is sold the new owner will be required to submit new signage plans to the Planning Commission.
- 3.

Discussion-Sign Ordinance Amendments

Discussion was held on what amendments should be made to the sign ordinance for the sizes of signs within one hundred (100) feet of I-96. Staff believes that the current maximum square footage requirement along I-96 is too small. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission give enough feedback for them to prepare a draft ordinance with amendment language for the next meeting in March.

Commissioner Conran stated that he was not sure what exactly needs to be changed.

City Clerk/Zoning Administrator Kimberly Borgman stated that maybe signage plans should be reviewed and approved at the time of site plan reviews and approvals since all businesses and their locations will be different and may be in different zoning districts.

After much discussion the Commission requested that the Staff research further into what other communities do and further discussion will be held at the March meeting.

Discussion-Accessory Structure Amendments – Shipping Containers

At the February 14, 2022, City Council meeting, the City Council requested that the Planning Commission review the city's zoning ordinance on accessory structures. This request was brought up since a few commercial properties in town have been sent violation letters because they are using shipping containers for accessory storage on their property. These property owners brought the issue up to the City Council requesting that these shipping containers be allowed for accessory storage. The City Council has requested that the Planning Commission review the zoning ordinance on accessory structures in relation to shipping container storage units and recommend amendment language to the City Council for approval. If the Planning Commission does not wish to change the ordinance, then no new language needs to be brought to the City Council.

It seems to be that shipping containers are becoming more and more popular for the use of accessory storage and in some places even dwelling units. Currently, our accessory structure ordinance does not allow accessory structures in

the rear of commercially zoned properties, and where accessory structures can be located, they must match the principal structure in aesthetic appearance and must contain a 4:12 pitched roof.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss their thoughts on shipping container storage units and give staff enough feedback to bring draft amendment language to the next meeting.

Regular Planning Commission meeting minutes of 2/21/22, pg. 3

Discussion-Accessory Structure Amendments – Shipping Containers continued

Commissioner Conran stated that allowing shipping containers do nothing to enhance the city.

Commissioner Brown stated that maybe the shipping containers could possibly be allowed for short-term use only in the commercial and industrial zoning districts.

Commissioner Weise stated that they could possibly be used in the residential zoning districts for temporary/short term uses such as for someone moving in or out, or remodeling purposes.

Jody Szotko, Commercial Property Owner and Resident presented the Commission Members with some information on what is being done with some shipping containers in other surrounding communities that allow them, as well as a copy of the petition that she has circulated to have shipping containers up to forty (40) feet long added to the Accessory Building Ordinance as an allowed accessory structure use.

Resident, Bob LaCross spoke in favor of the use of shipping containers as an allowable accessory building structure in all zoning districts.

Business Owner of Adema Alternator & Starter Service stated that he currently has two (2) shipping containers on his property that he is using for storage, and he was in favor of allowing the containers for business owners. He stated that they could be painted to enhance their appearance if need be.

The Commission recommended that Staff further research what other communities are doing as far allowing these containers as accessory structures within their Accessory Building Ordinances. Further review and discussion will take place at the March Planning Commission meeting.

Planning Commission Information

Monthly Permits Issued for December 2021 & January 2022

January 10, 2022, City Council Meeting Minutes

January 11, 2022, DDA Meeting Minutes

January 11th & January 20, 2022, Coopersville/Polkton Area Fire Protection Authority Meeting Minutes

Planning Director Comments

Planning Director/Deputy City Manager Alek Mizikar highly recommended that the Commissioners take advantage of the MSU Extension Programs for Planning.

Adjourn

Being no further discussion, Co-Chairman Conran adjourned the meeting at 6:55 P.M.

