



SAGINAW CHARTER TOWNSHIP SIGN BOARD OF APPEALS  
SAGINAW CHARTER TOWNSHIP HALL  
AUGUST 10, 2011  
PAGE 2 OF 3

Mr. Faerber stated the applicant has already received a huge variance and inquired why the applicant wanted to increase the size of their signs again. Ms. Smith stated in October of 1993 the Saginaw Township Board of Appeals granted several variances. At East Valley plaza a sign, located off premise on Bay Road totally 200 sq. ft. and 24 feet tall. No additional freestanding signs are permitted within the development. West Valley has a variance for a sign totally 250 sq. ft. located on the east side of the intersection of Fortune and Tittabawassee Road, upon the following conditions: 1) The applicant does not erect any more than two other signs with a maximum frontage of 100 sq. ft. between Fortune and Urbana Park; 2) No sign is permitted within 300 feet to Urbana Park subdivision and no signs will be erected on Fortune Boulevard. Combined, West Valley and East Valley have a total of three, free standing signs. After reviewing the sign regulations of the sign ordinance there is the potential for West Valley and East Valley to erect a total of thirteen (13) more signs. Given the size of the combined properties and their road frontage available for signage, staff finds that the property is unique and the conditions are not found elsewhere in the Township. The only parcel that is similar would be the Fashion Square Mall. Staff does find that limiting clutter and improving the aesthetics of the commercial corridor serves a valid public purpose. Ms. Smith also stated the property owner has the right to retain these signs as is without the variance, or to remove the signs and conditions of the variance, which would permit them to install thirteen (13) total signs on the properties of West Valley and East Valley.

Mr. Gerhardt inquired if the applicant was seeking a variance due to aesthetics. Based on square footage, these proposed signs would be massive and after reviewing pictures of the actual signs in staff's report, I would prefer to never allowing the stacking of signs in that way again. Mr. Brucker stated in terms of traffic flow and safety, it would be to the Township's benefit to have a significantly noticeable sign especially on Bay Road. Mr. Brucker stated he would prefer to see less signs then what is allowed, then allowing all seventeen (17) signs that are allowed by right. Mr. Faerber stated the sign is set back sixty (60') feet but with the larger sign, I think it would be a sight hindrance. If the board of appeals members decides to allow this variance, I would propose no future modifications to be allowed, no flags, no added on bolted signs, adornments, anything external. No foliage above one foot tall but flowers would be allowed. However, modifications to the sign face would be allowed.

Mr. Brucker then asked for public comments regarding this proposed variance.

There being no public comments, the public hearing portion of this proposed variance was closed.

Mr. Brucker stated in order to deny or pass the proposed variance request; the vote must be unanimous when only three members are present. Discussion followed among the Sign Board of Appeals members.

Motion by Mr. Gerhardt, supported by Mr. Faerber, to APPROVE variance request SA-11-01 where all three (3) proposed signs must be architecturally consistent with the conceptual sign submitted, no foliage above one (1') foot tall at the base of the signs on

