



Minutes

THOMAS TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Thomas Township Public Safety Building, 8215 Shields Drive, Saginaw, MI 48609
July 19, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

Rod Iamurri called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present in addition to Mr. Iamurri were: Dave Sommers, Ruth McDonald, Steve Yockey, Pat Lynch and Doug Bird. Also present was Dan Sika, Director of Community Development, Connie Watt, Planning Assistant/Code Enforcement Officer and two interested parties.

Absent: Jennifer Curry

1. *Call to Order and Roll Call*

2. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

3. *Approval of Agenda:*

It was moved by Sommers, seconded by Bird to approve the Agenda for the July 19, 2017 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

4. *Approval of Minutes:*

It was moved by Sommers, seconded by McDonald to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2017 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

5. *Communications – Petitions – Citizens Comments – None.*

6. *Presentations-None*

7. *Sign Board of Appeals*

A. *Dollar Tree (CORV, LLC) of 7160 Gratiot Road.*

Iamurri opened the public hearing at 7:02 p.m. CORV, LLC owner of the Dollar Tree which will be opening a store in Thomas Township at 7160 Gratiot Road (the former Dollar Daze) is seeking a variance for wall signage of 81.45 square feet. The building sits back over 400' from Gratiot Road and does not have its own pole sign along Gratiot but merely a section of an existing monument sign at the entrance of the Gratiot Road plaza. The owners feel that this

creates a visibility issue for the business so they wish to utilize larger wall signage on the building in order to help eliminate this problem. A few years ago, a similar variance was granted to the Home Depot store because of the distance it is setback from Gratiot Road to deter visibility issues. Sika explained that in 2007, Dollar Daze was granted a variance for a pole sign to be placed along Gratiot Road but after not being able to reach an agreement with the property owner the sign was placed right near the store. Dollar Daze had never sought larger wall signage for the building itself. Iamurri asked for any public comment. There was none. Sommers read the Sign Board of Appeals check list items aloud for voting purposes.

SIGN BOARD OF APPEALS CHECKLIST

AFFIRMATIVE FINDINGS

The Sign Board of Appeals must determine an affirmative finding of fact in each of the following categories in order to consider a variance request. If any of the findings of fact are answered with a "no," further discussion of the variance request may not take place and the variance must be denied. Every finding of fact shall be supported in record of proceedings of the Board.

- 1. The alleged hardships or practical difficulties or both;**
 a. Exceptional and peculiar to the property or the person requesting the variance, and
 b. Result from conditions that do not generally exist throughout the Township.

YES 6 NO 0 (Absent: Curry)

- 2. The alleged hardships or practical difficulties or both; will result from a failure to grant the variance include;**
 a. Substantially more than inconvenience, or an
 b. Inability to attain a higher financial return.

YES 6 NO 0 (Absent: Curry)

- 3. By not allowing the variance, it will result in a substantial injustice being one, considering the following;**
 a. The public benefits intended to be secured by the code.
 b. The individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Sign Board of Appeals to grant a variance, and
 c. The rights of others whose property would be affected by allowing the variance, and will not be contrary to the public purpose of this Chapter.

YES 6 NO 0 (Absent: Curry)

DISCUSSION GUIDE

The Sign Board of Appeals shall use the following criteria in the discussion when determining any request before them related to this Ordinance.

1. Relates only to the property under control of the applicant?
2. Does not produce a nuisance condition to occupants on nearby premises?
3. Does not cause a substantially adverse effect on the adjacent properties?
4. Due to a hardship that is unique and not shared by other properties in the same Zoning District?
5. Does not otherwise impair public health, safety, and comfort, or general welfare of the public?

7/19/17

Question #1:

Yes: Bird, Lynch, Iamurri, Sommers, McDonald, Yockey

No: None

Absent: Curry

Question #2:

Yes: Bird, Lynch, Iamurri, Sommers, McDonald, Yockey

No: None

Absent: Curry

Question #3:

Yes: Bird, Lynch, Iamurri, Sommers, McDonald, Yockey

No: None

Absent: Curry

Motion was made by McDonald, seconded by Yockey to grant a variance of 81.45 square feet for wall signage to CORV, LLC (Dollar Tree) making a total for the wall signage to be displayed of 131.45 square feet. Motion passed unanimously.

08. *New Business-None*

9. *Old Business*

A. Amendment to Mini Storage Ordinance.

Sika noted that previously the Planning Commission had been discussing a possible text amendment to Section 3.14 of the Ordinance which regulates Mini Storage facilities. He stated that the Township Attorney was reviewing the text and the desired changes regarding the fencing requirements for such facilities. He anticipates that within the next month to two months the text

amendment will be completed and ready to come before the Planning Commission for Public Hearing.

B. Medical Marijuana Information.

A recent article concerning the Bureau of Licensing meeting for the first time regarding medical marijuana was presented to the Planning Commission for informational/educational purposes.

10. *Hearings-None*

11. *Receive and File All Correspondence-Planning & Zoning News May 2017*

12. *Adjournment*

Motion by McDonald, seconded Sommers by to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Motion carried unanimously. ***The next regular meeting date is August 16, 2017.***

Respectfully submitted by Connie Watt, Planning Assistant/Code Enforcement Officer