The Chairman, Ted Dziurman, called the meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals to order at 8:32 A.M. on Wednesday, November 1, 2000.

PRESENT: Ted Dziurman
William Need
Rick Kessler
Ghazanfar Shah
Mark Stimac
Ginny Norvell
Pam Pasternak

ABSENT: William Nelson

ITEM #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 2000

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 4, 2000 as written.

Yeas: 4 – Dziurman, Need, Kessler, Shah
Absent: 1 – Nelson

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES AS WRITTEN CARRIED

ITEM #2 – VARIANCE REQUEST. MR. ANTHONY SEMIFERO, 5520 LIVERNOIS, for relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback.

The Chairman moved this item to the end of the agenda, Item #5, to allow the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

ITEM #3 – VARIANCE REQUEST. ALYSSA WYMAN, PUBLICITY CHAIRMAN OF THE TROY WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION, for relief of Chapter 78 regarding the number of off-site signs allowed to advertise a special event and the length of time allowed to display the signs.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 78 to place 75 off-site signs advertising an event at the Troy High School. Chapter 78, Section 14.03 limits the number of off-site signs to 4. Ms. Wyman also requests that these signs are allowed to be displayed for an eight (8) day period. Chapter 78 limits the time period for special event signs to be displayed to seven (7) days.

Ms. Marilyn Johnson and Ms. Carol Rupkey, representing the Troy Women's Association, were present and stated that in the past they have placed at least seventy (70) signs out announcing this event. Ms. Johnson further stated that she divides the City into "corridors" and one person is responsible for each corridor for both the placement of the signs and the pickup of the signs the day after the event.

ITEM #3
Mr. Dziurman asked how they came up with 75 signs and Ms. Johnson stated that that is how many signs they have purchased.

There is one written approval on file and one written objection on file.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Tom Carroll, 4700 Rambling Court was present and asked how large the signs would be. Ms. Johnson stated that they were approximately the size of political signs and Mr. Stimac stated that they are limited to 6 square feet. Mr. Carroll also asked if "Troy Daze" need a variance to put out signs and Mr. Stimac stated that they did. Mr. Carroll also asked about the "Automations Alley" sign that was placed on the Columbia building and Mr. Stimac explained that that sign was part of a special event that was being held there and that a Special Event permit was required. Mr. Carroll stated that he felt that the restrictions placed on signs by the sign ordinance did not make it very easy for citizens to find businesses in the City of Troy. Mr. Carroll also stated that he did support this petitioner's request.

No one else wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Alyssa Wyman, Publicity Chairman of the Troy Women's Association, relief of Chapter 78 to place 75 off-site signs advertising an event at the Troy High School and relief to allow these signs to be displayed for an eight (8) day period.

- The variance is not contrary to public interest.
- Variance will not have an adverse effect on surrounding property.

Yeas: 4 – Dziurman, Kessler, Need, Shah
Absent: 1 – Nelson

MOTION TO GRANT REQUEST CARRIED

ITEM #4 – VARIANCE REQUEST. SIGNGRAPHIX, INC., ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM BEAUMONT HOSPITAL, for relief of Chapter 78 to add a wall sign.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 78 to add a wall sign that is 71 square feet in size. Section 9.02.02 of the Sign Ordinance permits 2 signs. Previous action by City Council and the Building Code Board of Appeals
ITEM #4
granted variances to allow up to 21 signs. The request for a new wall sign will result in a total of 22 signs on site.

Mr. Bill Lutz of Signgraphix, Inc. was present and stated that the dynamics of health care keeps changing and basically they need this sign for traffic control. He further stated that traffic is a problem and the fact that this health care campus is still evolving creates a greater traffic hazard. Mr. Lutz stated that the discharge area is now located to the north of the main entrance door and if someone is coming to pick up a patient, if they are not in the correct lane they will pass this location and have to backtrack or drive all the way around the circle.

Mr. Dziurman asked how many signs are presently on the site and Mr. Stimac stated that this Board has granted variances in the past to allow up to 21 signs.

Mr. Need stated that he felt that with 21 signs presently on the site, he would like to see one sign eliminated and this sign put up in place of that sign. Mr. Need also feels that the number of signs is excessive and is concerned that with the changes being made at this location that the number of signs will continue to grow.

Mr. Lutz stated that they have looked at other options but there is nowhere to remove a sign from the ground and add this sign. He also said that there would be only two wall signs on the front of the building and did not believe that the addition of this second sign would be detrimental. Mr. Lutz again stated that their main concern is traffic control. He feels that it is very important to get traffic in the correct lane for the convenience of the patients. Mr. Dziurman stated that he feels that Mr. Need is concerned with the number of signs at this location rather than the placement of these signs. Mr. Lutz stated that a health care campus is very problematic and they are trying to comply with the ordinance but as the campus evolves there are still going to be additional changes.

Dr. Shah of Oakland County stated that he believes that the “Discharge” sign is important and does support the addition of this sign.

Mr. Kessler asked if the hospital had received complaints from patients due to the fact that they were unable to get to the proper location to pick up a patient. Mr. Kessler further stated that recently he had been a patient at this facility and the person who was picking him up did not have a problem finding the correct location. He does not feel a sign used to identify a door is a necessity. Mr. Stimac asked if the discharge door was separate from the main entrance and Mr. Lutz stated that it is located slightly north of the main entrance with a definite set of doors. Mr. Stimac asked if the corridor was connected and was told it was. Mr. Stimac then asked why patients were not discharged from the main entrance and Mr. Lutz told him that they are trying to keep congestion down at this location.

ITEM #4

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

There are no written approvals or objections on file.

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to deny the request of Signgraphix, Inc., on behalf of William Beaumont Hospital, 44201 Dequindre, relief of Chapter 78 to add a wall sign, which would bring the total number of signs to 22.

- This request would result in an excessive number of signs.
- This variance would be contrary to public interest.

Yeas: 2 – Need, Kessler
Nays: 2 – Dziruman, Shah
Absent: 1 – Nelson

MOTION TO DENY REQUEST FAILS

Motion by Need
Supported by Shah

MOVED, to grant the request of Signgraphix, Inc., on behalf of William Beaumont Hospital, 44201 Dequindre, relief of Chapter 78 with the following stipulation.

- One existing sign, that is part of the original variance granted, is to be removed.
- The number of signs will be maintained at 21.

Yeas: 3 – Shah, Dziurman, Need
Nays: 1 – Kessler
Absent: 1 – Nelson

MOTION TO GRANT REQUEST WITH ABOVE STIPULATIONS CARRIED

ITEM #5 (ITEM #2) – VARIANCE REQUEST. MR. ANTHONY SEMIFERO, 5520 LIVERNOIS, for relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback.

The Chairman moved this item to the end of the agenda, Item #5, to allow the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Because of the configuration of this parcel and its relationship to the adjacent properties, there is a front yard required on Livernois as well as along Nottingham Court. Petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in the required setback along Nottingham Court. Chapter 83 limits the height of fences to 30" in that portion of the property in front of the required building setback line.

This item originally appeared before the Board at the September 6, 2000 meeting. This item was tabled to this meeting, to allow the petitioner to approach his neighbors and work out a solution, and/or to allow the petitioner to bring back a different request to the board. It was again tabled at the meeting of October 4, 2000 to allow the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Mr. Stimac explained that we have notified the petitioner of each of the preceding meetings and have not had a response from him.

Motion by Kessler
Supported by Need

MOVED, to deny the request of Mr. Anthony Semifero, 5520 Livernois, for relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback.

- Petitioner has failed to present new plans.
- Lack of interest by petitioner

Yeas: 4 – Kessler, Need, Shah, Dziurman
Absent: 1 – Nelson

MOTION TO DENY REQUEST CARRIED

The Chairman adjourned the Building Code Board of Appeals meeting at 8:58 A.M.

MS/pp