

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission
Minutes of Regular Meeting
June 2, 2016**

I. Chairman Cotter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Cotter, Dailey, Driessnack, Friedrich, Hoenig, Horgan, Irwin

Absent: Kostrzewa, Liesch

Staff: Kain, Murphy

II. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Dailey, support by Friedrich, to approve the agenda.

Motion approved unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes

A. May 5, 2016 Regular Meeting:

Motion by Dailey, support by Irwin, to approve the minutes from the May 2, 2016 regular meeting as submitted.

Motion approved unanimously.

B. May 16, 2016 Special Meeting:

Motion by Dailey, support by Hoenig, to approve the minutes from the May 16, 2016 special meeting as submitted.

Motion approved unanimously.

IV. Zoning Board of Appeals Report for May:

Commissioner Friedrich reported that the ZBA did not meet in May.

V. Communications:

Kain reported that one communication was received from Planning Commissioner Liesch regarding Item X. A., which was placed on the dais for the Board. In addition, Kain noted that he had received a communication from the applicant regarding Case SUP-16-07/SPR-16-10, which will be included in the packets for the next meeting.

VI. Public Hearings:

Chairman Cotter noted that Case SUP-16-07 has been postponed until the next meeting.

VII. Public Comments:

Chairman Cotter opened the floor for public comments. There being no one who wished to speak, public comments was closed.

VIII. Site Plan Reviews:

Chairman Cotter noted that case SPR-16-10 has been postponed until the next meeting.

IX. Unfinished Business:

None

X. New Business:

A. Recommend a consultant for the Zoning Ordinance project:

Motion by Horgan, support by Friedrich, to recommend that the City Commission engage TPUDC (Town Planning & Urban Design Collaborative, LLC) for the purpose of creating a new zoning ordinance.

Board Discussion:

Commissioner Dailey asked Commissioner Horgan to share her reasons for recommending TPUDC.

Commissioner Horgan indicated she had reviewed some of the company's projects and feels they have more passion for the direction we want to go with the form based code. She noted that there seemed to be a lot of enthusiasm from the communities that they had worked with, and felt that those communities are more similar to Mt. Pleasant - the fit was better. Commissioner Horgan also noted that she feels that as a community we need to look different and getting an out of state perspective could be a positive thing.

Commissioner Friedrich commented that he too was impressed with TPUDC, and felt they conveyed the importance of getting significant active community involvement. He noted that even though they are not a local company, he didn't feel that would be a major obstacle.

Commissioner Dailey commented that he likes to hear that we are looking for something different. He noted that he felt their presentation was a bit tired; however, their document was good. He added that he feels they will do a great job; however, noted that he feels that the Commission needs to take some active responsibility to get public involvement as well as have a lot of give and take with the consultant.

Commissioner Horgan noted that she had to separate the presentation from what we are asking them to do. Commissioner Horgan also noted that she had reached out to some of the young people to hear what they want in our community, noting we need to make the area attractive to the younger generation. She further commented that TPUDC stressed the need to talk to all of the stakeholders as well.

Motion approved unanimously.

B. Discuss and consider setting a public hearing on a proposed rezoning of properties located in University Park from RCD (Research Center District) to U (University).

Kain noted that the Commission will be asked to consider three items for a public hearing. The first item is a rezoning request for properties at the south end of Mt. Pleasant that are currently zoned RCD

(Research Center District) to U University District. Kain noted that the majority of the property is owned by CMU. This area was designated in the 1980s to function as an area designated for research facilities.

Kain reminded the Commission that in 2013 the main campus was rezoned to U University District. CMU staff has been in contact with the city and wishes to pursue the rezoning of the RCD properties to also reflect the U University zoning. Kain noted that this rezoning would not be a radical change, just a formalization of the status quo. He noted that a Memorandum of Understanding with CMU will be considered by the City Commission in the near future that would provide the city the ability to review and provide feedback on development of these properties. As with the current U district language, under the proposed rezoning these properties would not be subject to the City's Site Plan Review process. Kain noted that there are restrictive covenants in place for University Park which create some assurance as to the use and form of future development in the park.

Kain noted that there are three parcels within the area that are not owned by CMU and which are not included in this rezoning request. In addition, Kain noted that if CMU sells any of the property to an outside party, the properties would be treated as though they are zoned RCD until the City Commission took action to formally rezone them.

Commissioner Irwin asked if the University could build another hotel. Kain noted that was a possibility now and under the proposed rezoning as certain non-research accessory uses are permitted.

Motion by Driessnack, support by Hoenig, that the Planning Commission set a public hearing to consider rezoning of properties in University Park owned by Central Michigan University from RCD to U at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, June 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

Motion approved unanimously.

C. Discuss and consider setting a public hearing on proposed text changes to Section 154.087 (U University District) of the zoning ordinance.

Kain noted that this text change relates to the rezoning request discussed in the last agenda item, and will bring the zoning ordinance in sync with the rezoning. Kain commented that if the Planning Commission decides to recommend not rezoning the property, then they likely will not want to recommend the text change either since they go hand in hand.

Kain noted that the proposed text change will reflect that the U District will include properties owned by CMU in the University Park and will also provide for the treatment of properties rezoned to U in University Park in the event that the ownership is conveyed to another party. The property would then be treated as RCD unless otherwise rezoned through City Commission action.

Motion by Horgan, support by Driessnack, that the Planning Commission set a public hearing to consider an amendment to Section 154.087 (U University District) at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, June 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

Motion approved unanimously.

D. Discuss and consider setting a public hearing on proposed text changes to Section 154.135 (Special Definitions); Section 154.144 (Signs in the C-1 District); Section 154.145 (Signs in the C-2 District); and Section 154.147 (Signs in the OS-1 District) of the zoning ordinance; add Section

154.151 (Signs in the CBD-TIFA District) to the zoning ordinance; and to consider endorsing Downtown Signage Design Guidelines to update the regulation of signs in the CBD-TIFA.

Kain introduced TC-16-01, which he noted is a two part request: to adopt the proposed text changes, and to endorse the Downtown Signage Design Guidelines. Kain referred the Commission to the attachments that were included in their packets: The Downtown Signage Design Guidelines; a draft ordinance and the map of the area included in the CBD/TIFA district.

Kain reported that the guidelines were created through a joint effort of the Historic District Commission, the Downtown Development Board and the CBD-TIFA. The intent of the guidelines is to encourage compatibility with a historic district, and to be aesthetically pleasing. The guidelines address such things as size and shape, placement, materials, colors, etc. Kain noted that the document is advisory in nature and it is hoped that it will be consulted when new signage is proposed within this boundary, further noting that the guidelines have been endorsed by all three boards.

Kain reviewed the proposed text changes, noting that changes are being proposed to Section 154.135 (Special Definitions) to remove the definition for marquee signs. As there are currently only two marquee signs in the downtown, both non-conforming, staff didn't feel that there was a need to include this language in the ordinance. In addition, there will be definitions added for awning/canopy signs; building facade; changeable copy sign; illumination, internal; menu sign; multi-tenant sign; and post and arm sign. Language will also be added to the existing definitions of portable and projecting sign to add clarity.

Section 154.151 (Signs in the CBD-TIFA District) will be added to the zoning ordinance.

Language will be added to Sections 154.144 (Signs in the C-1 District); Section 154.145 (Signs in the C-2 District) and Section 154.147 (Signs in the OS-1 District) to distinguish that any signage that is located within these districts but also falls within the CBD-TIFA District will follow the regulations in Section 154.151. Properties within these districts that are not in the CBD-TIFA will follow the regulations for that zoning district.

Kain noted that this will open some new doors for signage downtown and will create some new signage rights rather than take away.

Kain noted that he and Michelle Sponseller, Downtown Development Director spent significant time downtown inventorying current signage to assure that these changes would not create a lot of nonconformities.

Commissioner Driessnack noted concern over creating more non-conformity. Kain commented that non-conformities would certainly be created; however, he noted that any non-conforming signs can be maintained, refaced, etc. without issue. If they were to be replaced then they would need to be brought into conformance or made less non-conforming.

Motion by Friedrich, support by Irwin that the Planning Commission set a public hearing to consider an amendment to Sections 154.135, 154.144, 154.145, and 154.147 of the zoning ordinance; add Section 154.151 to the zoning ordinance; and to consider endorsing Downtown Signage Design Guidelines at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, June 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

Motion approved unanimously.

XI. Other:

A. Staff Report:

1. Administrative Review

Kain reported that since the last meeting, staff has reviewed and approved one site plan administratively. Case SPR-16-09, for 1290 E. Broomfield was approved, which will allow for the addition of three parking spaces and a new retaining wall at the rear of the existing building.

2. July (June 30th) Planning Commission meeting: Kain noted that other than the three public hearing set at tonight's meeting, the case that was postponed will likely be back on the agenda. In addition, he noted that there were a couple of other projects out there that may be ready.

3. Kain noted that the City Commission would receive the Planning Commission's recommendation for a Zoning Ordinance consultant at their June 13th meeting.

XII. Adjournment:

Motion by Hoenig, support by Friedrich, to adjourn.

Motion approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

bam