The Chairman, Ted Dziurman, called a regular meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals to order at 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, July 5, 2000.

PRESENT:	Ted Dziurman	ALSO PRESENT:	Mark Stimac
	William Need		Pam Pasternak
	Tom Smith		
	Dave Roberts		
	Rick Kessler		

ITEM #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 7, 2000 MEETING

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2000 meeting as written.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES CARRIED

ITEM #2 - VARIANCE REQUESTED. MR. SCOTT GARDNER, GARDNER SIGNS, REPRESENTING STANDARD FEDERAL BANK, 940 E. LONG LAKE for relief of Chapter 78.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 78 for the requirements on a second ground sign at an existing location. The petitioners have been granted a permit to install a primary ground sign along Rochester Road. The proposed site plan indicates a secondary ground sign 50 square feet, 15' high and setback 4' from the right-of-way on East Long Lake Road. Section 9.02.04 of the Sign Ordinance limits the size of a secondary sign to 36 square feet and Section 9.02, Table B requires a setback of 20' from the ultimate right-of-way.

Mr. David Sheere of Standard Federal Bank was present and stated that with the widening of Long Lake road they lost their sign when the right of way was moved. If they were to put the second sign a full 20' from the right of way, it would end up in either their parking lot or would have to move it even farther back to put it in the greenbelt area. Mr. Sheere also stated that although the size of the sign is important to them, he feels that the placement of the sign is much more critical.

Mr. Scott Gardner of Gardner Signs was also present and stated that the reason they felt the size of this size should be 50 square feet is due to the fact that the size of the lettering would be more easily readable for traffic traveling east on Long Lake Road.

Bill Need asked if the sign could be placed on the corner. Mr. Sheere stated that this location was possible, however, he feels that it would be much harder to see and would

ITEM #2
much rather have the sign on the side rather than on the corner due to the fact that if you are traveling eastbound, you would pass the entrance to the bank before you saw the identification sign. Mr. Sheere also stated that total size of both of these signs would be smaller than the original sign, which was 105 square feet. Mr. Sheere and Mr. Gardner passed out pictures of the old sign and also a view of the property as it now exists.

Mr. Smith asked if the sign could be placed to the north of the building and Mr. Sheere stated that it would then be in the greenbelt area and they would still need a variance for the setback.

Mr. Dziurman asked if there were any further plans to widen Long Lake Road and Mr. Stimac replied that as far as he knows, there are no future plans to do any further construction to this portion of Long Lake Road.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. No one wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

There are no written complaints or objections on file.

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Mr. Scott Gardner of Gardner Signs, representing Standard Federal Bank, 940 E. Long Lake relief of Chapter 78 regarding the setback requirement to construct a second ground sign.

- Size of the secondary sign will be limited to 36 square feet.
- Setback will be 4' from the right-of-way.
- Variance is not contrary to public interest.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE REGARDING SETBACK REQUIREMENT CARRIED

ITEM #3 - VARIANCE REQUESTED. MR. STAN CISCO, 1350 KEY WEST, for relief of Chapter 83.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 83, to erect a 4' high non-obscuring fence in the setback along Kenyon. This property, at the southwest corner of Key West and Kenyon, is a double front corner lot. Chapter 83 limits the height of fences to 30" in that portion of the property in front of the building setback line.

Mr. Cisco was present and stated that he and his wife are in the process of adopting children and would like the fence to help them in providing a safe environment for both

ITEM #3
the children and a dog. He does not feel that the 30" size requirement is enough for him to accomplish this.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the Board is concerned because a higher fence would obscure the vision of people backing out of the driveway and perhaps endangers other children. Mr. Need asked if the corner of the fence could be placed at an angle and Mr. Dziurman suggested that it would be angled beginning at 10' each way.

There are two written approvals on file.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. No one wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

Motion by Need
Supported by Smith

MOVED, to grant Mr. Stan Cisco, 1350 Key West relief of Chapter 83 to erect a 4' high non-obscuring fence in the setback along Kenyon.

- Fence would be moved back to form a 10' x 10' triangle at the driveway.

Yeas: All –5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE AS STIPULATED CARRIED

ITEM #4 - VARIANCE REQUESTED. MR. WALTER SMITH, 990 MUER STREET, for relief of Chapter 83.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 83, to erect a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback along Crooks. This property, located at the northeast corner of Muer and Crooks, is a double front corner lot. Chapter 83 limits the height of fences to 30" in that portion of the property in front of the building setback line.

Mrs. Walter Smith was present and stated that they have a two-year old child living with them and are concerned regarding his safety, due to the fact that their property sides up to Crooks Road. Mrs. Smith also pointed out that most of the houses on Crooks Road already have privacy fences erected. She also stated that she and her husband decided not to place the fence in the 12' easement at the rear of the property. Terry Gladstone, of Action Fence was also present and stated that his Company understands the restrictions regarding fencing and have planned to angle the fence 20' off the driveway of the neighbor to the north. He also brought along a letter of approval from the neighbor living behind Mr. and Mrs. Smith.

ITEM #4
Mr. Need asked if the greenbelt law applied to this fence and Mr. Stimac stated that this subdivision was in place prior to the common provision of the greenbelt easements. Mrs. Smith stated that they are aware that they are responsible for maintenance of the easement at the rear of the property.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. No one wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Need stated that he was concerned about the appearance of the fences along Crooks Road and would like to see some space between the right of way line and the fence line. Mr. Dziurman asked if the fence could be moved back about 5 or 10' and Mrs. Smith stated that if they were to do that, they would run into the evergreen trees that are planted there.

There are no written approvals or objections on file.

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Mr. Walter Smith, 990 Muer Street, relief of Chapter 83 to erect a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback along Crooks Road.

- Fence is to be erected at least 5' from the right of way line.
- Variance is not contrary to public interest.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE WITH STIPULATION THAT FENCE IS TO BE PLACED 5' FROM THE RIGHT OF WAY LINE CARRIED

The Building Code Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 9:00 A.M.

MS/pp