



VILLAGE OF DEXTER – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

8140 Main Street • Dexter, Michigan 48130-1092 • (734) 426-8303 • Fax (734) 426-5614

Memorandum

To: Ordinance Committee
From: Michelle Aniol, Community Development Manager
Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendments/Revisions
Date: July 7, 2014

Enclose with this memo you will find the following documents to assist in your discussion regarding sign regulations goals:

- Goals and objection for review of Sign Regulations, dated 8/8/13;
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 8/5/13, with notations;
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 8/1/13;
- Sign Sub-Committee meeting minutes, dated 7-1-13;
- Minutes from the 7-2-13 Planning Commission meeting;
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 7-22-13;
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 6-22-13;
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 3-26-13; and
- Community Development Managers Memo, dated 2-28-13

DRAFT (8/8/13)

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR REVIEW OF SIGN REGULATIONS

(Article 7 and Article 15B)

- Type of signs – character of community not articulated well in ordinance. Need to add more graphic and/or photos of preferred signage. Preferred materials/character such as routed aluminum.
- Adding Sign Master Plans or provisions for the Planning Commission to approve signage during site plan review. Will reduce the need for variance requests due to developers making signage an after thought.
- Ground Signs – Size allowances and height per district. Building sizes or number of buildings a sign is intended to serve. ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large enough ground and multi-tenant signs for large “center”, multi-tenant buildings or multi-building campuses. Maximum allowable is 42 square feet, not proportional to large or multi-tenant buildings.
- Building Signs – Size allowances and height per district. Building sizes or multi-tenant buildings, who and where signage is permitted (consider sign band). ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large enough signs for large buildings. Signage size allowances are tied to building frontage and max out at 42 square feet. Proportions are not suitable for a multi-tenant or larger building. Need to consider sign band/maximum height (less needed downtown, more needed on higher speed and vehicle centered roads).
- Combining the Sign Regulations in the ARC District, Article 15(B) and Article 7. Having 2 sets of standards for sign regulations does not promote consistency. If the regulations in Article 15(B) are preferred they should be migrated into Article 7 for one consistent sign ordinance.
- Clarifying Temporary Signage, including, but not limited to: window signs, banners, garage sales, sandwich board signs, street banners, institutional signage.



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
 Donna Dettling, Village Manager
 From: Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
 Re: 2013 Ordinance Revisions -- Sign Regulations
 Date: August 5, 2013

The Ordinance Subcommittee established at the May 6, 2013 Planning Commission meeting was tasked with reviewing Article 3, General Provisions, specifically Exterior Lighting, Article 6, Landscaping Standards and Article 7, Sign Regulations for potential revisions. Potential revisions were discussed as part of the CIP review, observations and Planning Commission comments/concerns.

The Subcommittee met for the first time on July 1, 2013 prior to the Planning Commission meeting and discussed Sign Regulations, Article 7. Given the complexity of the Sign Regulations and the history, staff recommended that the subcommittee start with review of Article 7 only.

The subcommittee was tasked with creating a list of goals and objectives for potential revisions to Article 7, Sign Regulations and possibly Article 15(B), Ann Arbor Road Corridor (section on Signs). Prior to moving forward with proposed revisions the list of goals and objectives would be shared with the Planning Commission and Village Council for "buy in". Upon presentation of the goals and objectives if there is not consensus on the goals and objectives or need, the subcommittee will not proceed further with evaluation of the sign regulations. If there is consensus on the goals and objectives or need, the subcommittee will proceed with providing recommended revisions for consideration by the Planning Commission and then the Village Council.

**DRAFT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR REVIEW OF SIGN REGULATIONS
 (Article 7 and Article 15B)**

- ⊙ Type of signs – character of community not articulated well in ordinance. Need to add more graphic and/or photos of preferred signage. *rated aluminum*
- X Sign lighting – add guidance on preferred internal or external illuminated for both building and ground signs. Routed aluminum signs preferred for ground signage.
- ⊙ Adding Sign Master Plans or provisions for the Planning Commission to approve signage during site plan review. *will reduce need for variances due to afterthought*
- ⊙ Ground Signs – Size allowances and height per district and building sizes or number of buildings a sign is intended to serve. ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large enough signs for large "center" and multi-tenant buildings or multi-building campuses, maximum allowable 42 square feet, not proportional to large buildings or multi-tenant.
- ⊙ Building Signs – Size allowances and height per district and building sizes or multi-tenant buildings. ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large enough signs for large

*
 revisit
 limit
 proportion
 old examples
 better
 guidance for
 signers, architects
 * signs back to PC for site plan review

*
 proportion

or prepare better guidance by
 example to do less policing.

buildings, size allowances are tied to building frontage and max out at 42, which is not suitable for a multi-tenant buildings or large buildings.

Types of Building Signs – Expansion of available types and sizes/regulations.

Combining the Sign Regulations in the ARC District, Article 15(B) and Article 7. Having 2 locations for sign regulations does not promote consistent standards. If the regulations in Article 15(B) are preferred they should be migrated into Article 7 for one consistent sign ordinance.

- Clarifying Temporary Signage, including, but not limited to: window signs, banners, garage sales, sandwich board signs, street banners, institutional signage.

• Adding graphics and photos to represent preferred signage.
**add to first - prepare photo file of preferred alternatives*

The goals listed above are DRAFT only and will be discussed by the Subcommittee prior to the August 5 meeting. If the Subcommittee supports the goals (or as modified) a recommendation from the Subcommittee will be presented for the Planning Commission's consideration. The Planning Commission will then be asked to discuss the goals and make a formal recommendation to the Village Council for consideration. If the Planning Commission or Subcommittee is not prepared to make a recommendation the item should be postponed for discussion at the September meeting.

Following the Planning Commission and Village Council's "buy in" on the goals the Subcommittee will begin a more formal revisions process and request the participation from the Dexter Chamber and DDA. Following the Subcommittee's revision process the proposed amendments would be required to go through formal ordinance amendment proceedings, including newspaper posting and a public hearing.

Please feel free to contact me with further questions.

Thank you.

*sign bands/max. height
downtown less
outside more*



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
Donna Dettling, Village Manager
From: Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Article 7 – Sign Regulations
Date: August 1, 2012

On July 2, 2012 the Planning Commission discussed and recommended that the Village Council approve funding in an amount not to exceed \$10,000 to work with Carlisle Wortman on development of revised sign regulations (proposal included). On July 9, 2012 the Village Council discussed the proposal and recommendation and did not authorize funding for the proposal. The Village Council felt as though a combination of staff, Planning Commissioners, Village Council persons, and other interested individuals or groups could collaborate to come up with recommended revisions in lieu of spending additional funding. Several Council members commented that they believe that the Village's ordinance is drafted with all the necessary information and requirements, but that some minor amendments may be necessary.

Staff intends to develop a plan for moving forward. The plan will then be reviewed by the Planning Commission and subcommittee volunteers will be requested.

No Action is requested at this time. The item is on the agenda as discussion only. Please provide feedback on staff's plan.

Please feel free to contact me prior to the meeting if you have any questions.

Thank you.

DEXTER VILLAGE
SIGN ORDINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES

July 1, 2013
6:30-7:30 pm
Dexter Senior Center

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Phillips, Schmid, Fisher, Hansen, Carson and Bishop

1. Introductions

2. Review of Article 7, Signs Regulations

Staff gave a brief overview of what was included in the meeting packet information, including the revisions that were being proposed and reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2012. Article 7, Sign Regulations was on the agenda starting in March 2012 and remained on the agenda until September 2012. The Planning Commission postponed action on further discussion pending staff's return from leave.

3. Article 7, Sign Regulations -- A draft of the proposed ordinance revisions was included in the packet. The following

Commission comments (June):

Changes are good but don't address all concerns; An ordinance of this complexity is a big deal, we should not expect variances; Regulating garage sale signs without a permit you cannot enforce; If we get a lot of variances, something could be wrong with the ordinance; Many things are clarified; You don't want flashing or neon signs; We don't want probably not adequate; This makes planning process simpler; Maybe we need a sign consultant opinion; to over-regulate; Every community deals with signs and sign enforcement; Maybe we need a sign consultant opinion; Problems come from limiting businesses to 42 square feet; Busch's sign will not be visible when the trees out on Dexter-Ann Arbor grow larger; The sign ordinance is too much; it is supposed to protect the Village from worst case scenario; We don't like pole signs or 2nd story signs; Ground sign restrictions to much, limited based on size, distance from building and road; We can talk more about signs at July meeting; We like the Busch's sign, but we need some controls in place; Birmingham has a good sign ordinance; Village Council likes clear standards; We're trying to legislate design and the ordinance is a guideline not a prescription; We will be expecting a request from Dexter Crossing for a ground sign

Commission comments (July):

We need help with this, maybe a focus group; Tried to get a business owner involved before
A consultant would help pull it all together; We need to be careful not to become a lobbying group
City of Birmingham has a good sign ordinance; Need examples of sign issues, it needs to be more organized
If we are going to do this we need to go to business owner and talk to them about the sign ordinance.
Show them the ordinance and ask for their input; Planning Commission not able to spend time necessary to get the ordinance to desired outcome; Ability to afford to hire someone; We need to figure out where to get the money, we need to go to Village Council and be specific; In the business community people feel powerless
Several business owners don't care but others do; We've been doing this for years, and we need a professional to help with the process; A six member committee is not enough people as detailed in the Carlisle Wortman proposal; The majority of council will say they don't see anything wrong with it they will tell Allison to do enforcement; Don't put a time limit on it, don't rush it, but do it within this fiscal year

4. Review of ZBA Cases -- included in the packet was agendas from the last several years of ZBA Sign Cases. The following is list:

- Case 2005-08 -- Dexter Plaza -- Signs in the ARC District - Size and location of ground signage
- Case 2005-09 -- Busch's -- Signs in the ARC District - Size of Building Signage
- Case 2007-04 -- Dairy Queen -- Size of Building Signage
- Case 2010-01 -- Fink Law -- Location of Ground Signage
- Case 2011-01 -- Total Smiles Dental -- Second Floor Signage
- Case 2012-01 -- LaFontaine Chevrolet -- Signs in the ARC District -- Size of Building and Ground Signs
- Case 2012-03 -- Dexter Town Center -- Ground Sign Size and Number of Ground Signs
- Case 2013-01 -- Dexter Pharmacy -- Size of Building Signs, Projecting Signs
- Case 2013-02 -- Dexter Wellness Center -- Use and length of Temporary Signage

5. Discussion of Goals

Aesthetic -- Who? What? Does it matter?

Detailed architectural design guidance is helpful to applicants, helps avoid monotony in signs, Photo Journal signs – will help with evaluation of likes/dislikes; size and aesthetics – Homework for committee is to take photos of signage likes and dislikes to discuss with the group. Once we have defined what we like we need to stick with it.

Procedural Problems – Does staff have issues? The ordinance is not intended to be an easy read. Staff is available for assistance in explaining, consultants guide their clients.

Reformatting – Is there value in time spent reformatting the ordinance? Birmingham's ordinance was circulated.

Temporary Signage use is unclear and difficult to enforce.

Combining Article 15(B) ARC and Article 7 Sign regulations for consistency

Value to ordinance to regulate – need to consider larger ground signs in districts outside downtown, multi-tenant buildings, multi-building campuses (association with access management).

Planning Commission latitude – Incorporate latitude in the ordinance to permit the Planning Commission to approve signage outside the ordinance allowance "if" done during site plan review. This approach will make developers/applicants think about signage ahead of time.



Committee proposes to work on content, then format.




6. Discussion of Michigan Sign Guidebook – A copy of the guidebook was provided to each committee member to aid in the review and discussion.
7. Next Steps – Photo Journal for discussion at August 5 6:00 or 6:30 meeting; begin list of goals for review and presentation to Planning Commission and Council.




Adjourned at 7:30 pm.




Respectfully submitted,





Allison Bishop, AICP
Community Development Manager


































DEXTER KARATE ACADEMY



DEXTER VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, July 2, 2012
Regular Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chair Kowalski at the Dexter Senior Center, 7720 Ann Arbor Street.

Present: Kowalski, Bell, Stewart, Phillips, Schmid, Wilcox, Wade, Kimmel, Carson.

Absent:

Approval of Minutes

-Moved Wade, support Phillips to approve the Regular Meeting minutes for June 4, 2012.
Voice vote: Unanimous Motion Carried

Approval of Agenda

-Moved Schmid, support Kimmel to approve the agenda as presented.
Voice vote: Unanimous Motion Carried

Public Hearings

- A. Special Land Use Request for Northern United Brewing Company, 2319 Bishop Circle East Tasting/Sampling Room per Planning Commission determination of compatibility per Section 3.07 of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. Opening of the hearing at 7:34 pm
2. Presentation by Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
3. Opening of the hearing to the floor: none
4. Consideration of the matter by the Commission: Special Land Use Request for Northern United Brewing Company
5. The hearing was closed at 7:54 pm

-Moved Wade, support Phillips based on the information provided by the applicant at the July 2, 2012 Planning Commission meeting and pursuant to Section 8.03, Special Land Use review standards, the Planning Commission moves to Postpone the Special Land Use request submitted by Northern United Brewing Company, for a tasting/sampling room until August 6, 2012, to allow the applicant more time to address the following:

1. Applicant needs to attend the next Planning Commission meeting to address questions by the Commission regarding the tasting/sampling room.

Commission comments:

Over all brief positive comments about the building and grounds

Concerns on sampling of beer and time a person can stay and drink

What is the difference between a tasting room and a tavern

What's the definition of a tavern

Commissioners agree that the applicant should be present to answer questions.

Ayes: Kowalski, Bell, Stewart, Phillips, Schmid, Wilcox, Wade, Kimmel, Carson

Nays: none

Motion Carried

- B. Ordinance Amendment-Article 5, Parking and Loading

1. Opening of the hearing at 7:56 pm
2. Presentation by Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
3. Opening of the hearing to the floor: none
4. Consideration of the matter by the Commission: Article 5, Parking and Loading
5. The hearing was closed at 7:58 pm

-Moved Bell, support Phillips per Section 23.06 Criteria for Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Text and the Public Hearing held by the Planning Commission on July 2, 2012, the Planning Commission recommends that the Village Council amend Article 5, Parking and Loading in order to clarify conflicts in implementation of specific standards and regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and to promote the implementation of the goals and objectives of the Village Master Plan.

Ayes: Carson, Kimmel, Wade, Wilcox, Schmid, Phillips, Stewart, Bell, Kowalski

Nays: none

Motion Carried

Pre-Arranged Citizen Participation-none

Reports of Officers-

- A. Chairman Report Kowalski-Welcome to Scott Stewart, new Planning Commissioner.
- B. Planning Commissioners Reports-none
 - 1. Council Ex-Officio Reports:
Ex Officio - CAPT/DART
Access Plan Included in packet, plan prepared by EMU Interns and WATS. At some point will ask Village Council to adopt plan as a planning document. Staff to complete comments to provide to Commissioner Carson with comments by 8/20/12. Put on the agenda in August as a discussion item.
Commissioner Wilcox briefly commented on Notice of Decision by Zoning Board of Appeals for LaFontaine and provided explanation of rationale and reasoning behind decision. Encouraged Planning Commission to consider permitting more signage for larger scale buildings when reviewing the sign ordinance.
- C. Community Development Office Report-report is in packet containing items below:
 - 1. Park development update, there will be a ribbon cutting at Dexter Daze August 11th after parade and an informal opening.
 - 2. Village Council adopted the Master Plan on June 25, 2012.
 - 3. 8099 Main Street has been purchased for a new pizza restaurant.
 - 4. Wellness Center is moving forward.

Citizens Wishing to Address the Commission-none

Old Business

- A. Discussion of: Article 7, Signs Regulations-Amendments to the Village Sign Ordinance
-Moved Bell, support Kimmel to recommend that the Village Council approve the proposal from Carlisle Wortman to assist with amendments to Article 7, Signs Regulations in accordance with the proposal in the packet in an amount not to exceed \$10,000.
Commission comments:
We need help with this, maybe a focus group.
Tried to get a business owner involved before
A consultant would help pull it all together
We need to be careful not to become a lobbying group
City of Birmingham has a good sign ordinance
Need examples of sign issues, it needs to be more organized
If we are going to do this we need to go to business owner and talk to them about the sign ordinance.
Show them the ordinance and ask for their input.
Planning Commission not able to spend time necessary to get the ordinance to desired outcome
Ability to afford to hire someone
We need to figure out where to get the money, we need to go to Village Council and be specific
In the business community people feel powerless
Several business owners don't care but others do
We've been doing this for years, and we need a professional to help with the process
A six member committee is not enough people as detailed in the Carlisle Wortman proposal
The majority of council will say they don't see anything wrong with it they will tell Allison to do enforcement
Don't put a time limit on it, don't rush it, but do it within this fiscal year
Ayes: Phillips, Schmid, Wilcox, Kowalski, Bell, Stewart, Wade, Kimmel, Carson
Nays: none
Motion Carried

New Business

- A. Consideration of: Annual Bylaw Review- No Action; no changes proposed
- A. Consideration of: Election of Planning Commission Officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary)
-Moved Carson, support Kimmel to nominate current slate for Chair Kowalski and Vice Chair Bell;
For Secretary, nominate Commissioner Wade to replace Commissioner Clugston
Ayes: Wade, Kimmel, Carson, Kowalski, Bell, Stewart, Phillips, Schmid, Wilcox
Nays: none
Motion Carried

Proposed Business for Next Agenda

- A. Park Development Updates
- B. Article 7, Sign Regulations-Update on consultant
- C. Downtown Historic Character Guidebook (TBD)
- D. Access Plan CAPT/DART
- E. Northern United Brewing-Special Land Use Request

Citizens Wishing To Address the Commission-nono

Adjournment

-Move Kimmel support Wade to adjourn at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Tuscano
Recording Secretary

Filing Approved _____, 12



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
Donna Dettling, Village Manager
From: Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Article 7 – Sign Regulations
Date: June 22, 2012

For several months the Planning Commission has been reviewing Article 7, Sign Regulations.

At the June 4, 2012 Planning Commission meeting there was discussion that the Planning Commission is still not satisfied with the sign provisions and may want to consider a complete reconstruction of the ordinance to reduce the complexity of the ordinance.

At the last meeting there also appeared to be additional amendment considerations to review regarding sign size allowances for building and ground signs and additional amendments that have not been discussed as part of the discussions over the last few months.

Given the number of times over the last few years that we have attempted to improve the ordinance to meet the needs of staff, the Commission, Council, residents and merchants, and the continued dissatisfaction with the ordinance, staff requested a scope of services to assist with the ordinance. Doug Lewan from Carlisle Wortman, the Village's Planning Consultant, has provided a scope of services to provide the Village with guidance and assistance to recreate Article 7, Sign Regulations. The scope is attached.

Staff would like the Planning Commission's feedback on the scope of services or additional feedback on alternatives for moving forward.

If the Planning Commission would like to continue to move forward with the amendments that we have been working on, please provide additional feedback on the additional revisions requested.

Attached is also the City of Birmingham's Sign Ordinance for reference and for a perspective of other communities sign ordinances.

Please feel free to contact me prior to the meeting if you have any questions.

Thank you.



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
Donna Dettling, Village Manager
From: Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
Re: 2013 Ordinance Revisions
Date: March 26, 2013

At the last Planning Commission meeting there was discussion about potential ordinance revisions that the Planning Commission would like to review in FY13-14. The Planning Commission advised staff to initiate a list of the potential goals and objectives for any revision recommendations. The Planning Commission advised that following creation of a list staff would provide the information to the Village Council for feedback on if and when to proceed.

The following ordinances suggested for review include:

Article 3 – Exterior Lighting
Article 6 – Landscaping Standards
Article 7 – Sign Regulations

Staff will not be present at the April 1 meeting, however please review the list and provide any additional feedback for staff. Please plan to postpone any action until the May meeting at which time the Planning Commission and staff can further refine the goals and objectives and determine how to move forward.

The following is a preliminary list to get the discussion started:

Article 3 – General Provisions – Section 3.19 Exterior Lighting

- Add references to the Engineering Standards for streetscape lighting standards
- Height of lighting – lower height means more light poles

Article 6 – Landscaping Standards

- Consider working with the Tree Board on species selections

Article 7 – Sign Regulations

- Type of signs – character of community not articulated well in ordinance
- Sign lighting – preferred internal or external illuminated for both building and ground signs
- Ground Signs – Size allowances and height per district and building sizes or number of buildings a sign is intended to serve. ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large.

enough signs for large "center" and multi-tenant buildings, maximum allowable 42 square feet, not proportional to large buildings.

- Building Signs -- Size allowances and height per district and building sizes or multi-tenant buildings. ZBA requests show that we are not permitting large enough signs for large buildings, size allowances are tied to building frontage and max out at 42, which is not suitable for a multi-tenant building.

Please feel free to contact me with further questions.

Thank you.



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
Donna Dettling, Village Manager
From: Allison Bishop, AICP, Community Development Manager
Re: 2013 Ordinance Revisions
Date: February 28, 2013

At the last Planning Commission meeting there was discussion about potential ordinance revisions that the Planning Commission would like to review in FY13-14.

Article 3 – Exterior Lighting
Article 6 – Landscaping Standards
Article 7 – Sign Regulations

Staff would like the Planning Commission to discuss how they would vision moving forward with reviewing and amending the ordinances. Options may include:

1. Brainstorm goals and objectives as a Commission
2. Establish a timeline and priority for review
3. Create a subcommittee to review each ordinance
4. Request funding in FY 13-14 to employ a consultant to facilitate an ordinance revision process.
5. Other

Please provide staff with guidance and/or a recommendation on how to proceed.

Please feel free to contact me prior to the meeting if you have any questions.

Thank you.