





ZA Durkin stated that a public hearing is required prior to a lot division. We simply need to schedule that hearing for the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Motion by Kinczkowski, supported by Wagner

To schedule a public hearing for July 1, 2024 for consideration of a lot division at 306 Mill Street

VOTE: Ayes: 7          Nays: 0          Absent: 0          MOTION CARRIED

### 3. Annual Report to Council

ZA Durkin stated that according to the bylaws, the Commission shall provide an annual report to Council. Included in the packet is a re-cap of the past year's activities of the Planning Commission. She is looking for any changes, additions or deletions prior to sending it to Council.

It was stated that the report shows that a lot has been accomplished this past year. Member Hartman noted that his term of office should reflect term ending 2027.

Motion by Hartman, supported by Grischke

To approve the Annual Report to Council with the change to reflect Member Hartman's correct term of office and request that it be forwarded to Village Council

VOTE: Ayes: 7          Nays: 0          Absent: 0          MOTION CARRIED

### 4. Request by Council to revisit Temporary Sign Ordinance

ZA Durkin stated that at their last meeting, Council requested that the Planning Commission review the temporary sign ordinance that was adopted last year. This was a result of some controversy, Facebook postings, etc. complaining about the required removal of the temporary signs in front of Pinckney-Chrysler and Pinckney Car Wash. Council has asked that the commission further review the ordinance to see if there is some way to allow those signs. We need to keep in mind that we can only regulate per district, not by content, or by specific properties. She stated that she has provided some points to consider as well as ordinances from various communities in Michigan.

Member Grischke stated that she understands that the business owner was granted permission for a temporary sign for 90 days back in 2007/2008. They chose not to remove the signs after the 90 days and the signs have remained. ZA Durkin stated that the ordinance was not enforced. Grischke stated that they also did not abide by the ordinance and permit.

The question was asked if these could be grandfathered. Durkin stated that there are two issues. They have been in violation of the ordinance since the 90 days expired, and it is a temporary sign, moveable, not attached to the ground, etc. You cannot grandfather something that is temporary in nature. The question was asked if they could make them permanent. Durkin stated that if they were made permanent, then they would have to meet the permanent ground sign conditions. In this case, the Car Wash does not have any ground signage, therefore they could add a permanent ground sign that meets the ordinance. Pinckney-Chrysler has already exceeded their allowable ground signage. They could ask for a variance for the additional square footage if they met the hardship criteria.

Discussion was held on these signs being "temporary" in which case we would need to require a permit, establish the number of days allowed, number of times per year, etc.

Discussion was held on the amount of additional square footage that would be required to accommodate these signs. ZA stated that our ordinance requires a maximum of 50 square feet for permanent ground signs. The signs we are talking about are 56 square feet so if they are allowed, it would be more than double the current allowable ground signage. The other issues with these signs are that they are back-lit, illuminated, etc. which are all prohibited for temporary signs. You also need to keep in mind, that you would have to allow every business within that district to have the same rights.

Member Wagner stated that she is not in favor of violation in perpetuity. We can all agree that the aesthetics in Pinckney needs to be uplifted and these signs may not be the way to do it. Member Smith stated that they have been there a long time. He would like to see some type of variance. Member Kinczkowski stated that they do not meet the criteria for a variance. He further stated that it has been said that we should consider this because they have given a lot to the community. He asked what do we say to the small business owner who wants to do the same who may not be able to give back to the community or haven't been around long enough? What does that say to other businesses? Are we going to say that if you don't donate to the Village, you can't have your way? We are creating rules special for individuals. If we allow more signage, then we allow everyone more signage.

Member Hartman asked if we could develop the Village gateway sign to accommodate miscellaneous messages, etc. as a DDA initiative. Discussion was held on a community billboard with various announcements. Discussion was held on the location for visibility. It was stated that it could be something similar to what is in front of the schools. However, this is a separate issue.

Discussion was held on the Commission's attempt to make the temporary sign ordinance less restrictive. It was stated that previously there were no temporary signs allowed. The ordinance was developed with the intent of what is best for the majority of people, and it makes sense. We cannot play favoritism and say it is okay to break the rules sometimes. The ordinances are designed to be enforced. If not, it diminishes what has been done.

ZA Durkin stated that although this has been good discussion, we do not have a clear direction. We can table this and talk about it again in July, we can suggest changes if we can come up with a determination or you can send it back to Council and indicate that you stand on the ordinance as presented. They have the ability to make changes.

Motion by Hartman, supported by Wagner

To table discussion of the temporary sign ordinance until the next meeting

ROLL CALL VOTE:      Gee – Yes  
                                  Grischke - Yes  
                                  Hartman - Yes  
                                  Kinczkowski - No  
                                  Smith - Yes  
                                  Wagner - Yes  
                                  Oliver – Yes

MOTION CARRIED

**PUBLIC FORUM:**

Chairperson Oliver opened the public forum at 7:31 p.m.

Mr. Frank Collins stated that he finds it hard to believe that these two businesses that have been viable for 25 years cannot build a new sign that complies with the ordinance. He further discussed the difficulty in grandfathering issues. We have an ordinance. Do the right thing and enforce the ordinance. Although he can appreciate some of the comments that have been made, he objects to the ulterior motives to grandfather these signs.

Hearing no further comments. the forum was closed at 7:33 p.m.

**MEMBER DISCUSSION:**

Member Smith asked about the presentations that have been made regarding the gas station and fast-food proposals and asked if there is confidence in the proposal. Durkin stated that the applicant is adamant on moving forward with all three uses on that property, but we do have some concerns.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Hartman, supported by Grischke

To adjourn the regular Planning Commission meeting at 7:34 p.m.

VOTE: Ayes: 6      Nays: 0      Absent: 1      MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

---

Christine Oliver, Chairperson

---

Julie Durkin, Zoning Administrator  
Recording Secretary