The Chairman, Ted Dziurman, called the meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals to order at 8:30 A.M., on Wednesday, November 7, 2007 in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

PRESENT: Ted Dziurman
Rick Kessler
Bill Nelson
Tim Richnak
Frank Zuazo

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Evans, Housing & Zoning Inspector Supervisor
Pamela Pasternak, Recording Secretary

ITEM #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MEETING OF OCTOBER 24, 2007

Motion by Kessler
Supported by Richnak

MOVED, to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 24, 2007 as written.

Yeas: All - 5

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES AS WRITTEN CARRIED

ITEM #2 – VARIANCE REQUEST. SIGNGRAPHIX, 900 TOWER, for relief of Chapter 85 to erect two (2) wall signs.

Mr. Evans stated that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 85 to erect two (2) wall signs. Chapter 85.02.05 allows one wall sign for each building, not to exceed a maximum of 200 square feet in area. The plans submitted indicate a total of two (2) wall signs, each measuring 324 square feet in area.

This item last appeared before this Board at a Special Meeting of October 24, 2007 and was postponed to allow the petitioners the opportunity to present the Board members with the data from the University of Pennsylvania study; and, to allow the Building Department to recalculate the area of the signs as presented by Signgraphix.

Mr. Evans explained that Building Department staff had recalculated the area of signs as presented and determined that each sign would be 209 square feet. The two existing signs on this building are calculated as 130 square feet each.

Mr. Dziurman asked about the results of the University of Pennsylvania study, which was mentioned by the petitioner at the last meeting.

Mr. Keith Murray was present and gave each Board member a handout, which included excerpts from this study. Mr. Murray stated that they had broken it down in easier terms

J-1b

ITEM #2 – con't.

so it would be understood by the Board members. Mr. Murray further stated that this study is based on speed and reaction time, and said this study is very subjective. Mr. Murray had taken pictures of the existing signage showing the approximate distance from I-75.

Mr. Kessler stated that in the picture presented to Board members, the building itself was quite fuzzy. Mr. Kessler also stated that he does not have a problem identifying this building with the existing signs. Furthermore, according to the documents submitted to the Board, visibility was based on vehicles traveling 75 miles per hour and the speed limit on I-75 is actually 70 miles per hour.

Mr. Murray said that although he understood that, the study by the University of Pennsylvania was done based on a speed of 75 miles per hour. Mr. Murray also stated that based on the position of the building, the first time you would see the sign was when you were trying to get off the expressway. Mr. Murray said that he had driven the expressway in both directions a number of times and took the picture at the best location for visibility of the existing sign. The study indicates the speed traveled and the distance required allowing a person to make a decision to exit the expressway.

Mr. Kessler asked if a person would be able to read the sign from the location the photo was taken.

Mr. Murray stated that as you get closer you can make out the word "Bank", but it is difficult to see from a distance.

Mr. Kessler stated that although he wears glasses, he did not believe it was difficult to see the existing sign. Mr. Kessler also stated that he does not believe the proposed height of the signs is necessary.

Mr. Dziurman stated that he believes the proposed signs would be more in keeping with advertising rather than directional signs. Mr. Dziurman also stated that there a lot of buildings in the area that do not have signs that are this size and agrees with Mr. Kessler that the proposed size of these signs is too large.

Mr. Kessler asked what the height was of the existing signs.

Mr. Evans stated that they are 50" in height and the "Bank" sign extends 2' below the name sign. The logo measures 74 ½" from top to bottom.

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.

ITEM #2 – con't.

Motion by Kessler
Supported by Richnak

MOVED, to approve the request of Signgraphix, 900 Tower, for relief of Chapter 85 to erect two (2) wall signs where Chapter 85.02.05 allows one wall sign for each building not to exceed 200 square feet in area.

- Height of the signs will not exceed 5'.
- Additional height of the proposed sign will increase visibility based on vehicle speed and line of sight.
- Variance would not be contrary to public interest.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

ITEM #3 – VARIANCE REQUEST. RON FLOYD, VALEO, INC., 150 STEPHENSON, relief of Chapter 85 to erect four (4) wall signs totaling 396.4 square feet.

Mr. Evans explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 85 to erect four (4) wall signs totaling 396.4 square feet. Chapter 85.02.05 limits the number of signs to one wall sign for each building, a maximum of 200 square feet in area.

Mr. Evans stated that the Building Department had recalculated the wall signage as presented by Johnson Sign Company and the north and south signs would be 66 square feet each, and the signs on the east and west elevations would be 88.17 square feet each.

Mr. Larry Lyng, Manager of Valeo was present and stated that they are asking for these signs in order to increase visibility of this building. The building has frontage along Stephenson, Fourteen Mile and I-75. They are proposing relatively small signs and believe they will aid customers, suppliers and other visitors in locating the building. Mr. Lyng went on to say that they do not want to put up any signs that would be considered gaudy. This is a large company and the signage would be in keeping with the signs utilized by both Behr America and Delphi.

Mr. Dziurman asked if these signs would be illuminated.

Mr. Lyng stated that they had not decided at this point whether they would use a spotlight or some other type of illumination.

Mr. Kessler asked why the petitioner needed four (4) signs.

ITEM #3 – con't.

Mr. Lyng stated that it was because of the direction of the building. This building straddles thoroughfares and if traveling north on I-75 it is not visible until you are just about on top of it. This same condition also applies to vehicles traveling on Stephenson.

Mr. Kessler asked if the ground sign would have the name of the company on it.

Mr. Lyng stated it is very small and only has the address on it.

Mr. Zuazo asked if there were other occupants in the building.

Mr. Lyng stated that their company is the only occupant in the building.

Mr. Jay Johnson of Johnson Sign Company was present and stated that they are proposing to put up small readable signs on the building. The petitioner could put up a 10' x 20' sign on the corner of the building, but the signs they are proposing would be smaller. They are hoping to get away from putting up a large ground sign.

Mr. Kessler asked what type of sign the petitioner was planning to put near the entranceway of the building.

Mr. Johnson stated that according to the Ordinance as long as they put up a sign, that was less than 36 square feet, and not visible from any adjacent right of way, a permit was not required.

Mr. Evans confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Kessler asked if the signs would be considered one sign if they were wrapped around the building.

Mr. Evans stated that if they butt up next to each other they would be considered one sign.

Mr. Kessler asked if the checkmark was part of the sign.

Mr. Evans confirmed that it was.

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.

Mr. Nelson asked what would happen if another tenant moved into this location.

ITEM #3 – con't.

Mr. Evans stated that for each building one ground sign is allowed and an additional ground sign is allowed as long as it does not exceed 36 square feet.

Motion by Nelson
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Ron Floyd, Valeo, Inc., 150 Stephenson, relief of Chapter 85 to erect four (4) wall signs totaling 396.4 square feet where Chapter 85.02.05 limits the number of signs to one wall sign per building, with a maximum of 200 square feet in area.

- These signs will take the place of any other monument sign.
- Any ground sign that would normally require a sign permit would not be allowed.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

ITEM #4 – VARIANCE REQUEST. SIGNS & MORE, 4415 LANCASHIRE, for relief of Chapter 85 to erect a ground sign for a subdivision entrance.

Mr. Evans explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 85 to erect a ground sign for a subdivision entrance at the property at the northeast corner of the intersection of Cumberland and John R. Table 85.02.05 requires a minimum setback of 10' from the street right of way lines. The site plan submitted indicates a 2.5' setback from the John R. Road right of way and a 4.33' setback from the Cumberland right of way. At a 30" height the sign does comply with the corner clearance requirements of Section 7.01.02.

Mr. Dziurman indicated that he would not be voting on this request as he is a resident of Mt. Vernon estates Subdivision.

Ms. Molly Smith of Signs & More was present. Ms. Smith stated that this is a very old subdivision and has approximately 400 homes in it. The original sign was put in before the Ordinance was established. There are four (4) entrances to this subdivision, and three (3) sign permits have been reviewed by the Building Department and now will go before City Council for approval. This item is before this Board as the proposed setback does not meet the required 10' setback. If they conformed to the 10' setback, the sign would be in the homeowner's fence line. Visibility would also be questionable. The existing brick pillars will be taken down, the landscaping re-planted and the proposed sign would be 30" in height.

Mr. Zuazo asked how far the existing sign was from the right of way.

ITEM #4 – con't.

Mr. Charles Folkerts, 4290 Washington Crescent was present and he stated that in his opinion it was probably at the right of way line. There is approximately 1' between the existing sign and sidewalk and the proposed sign would be moved an additional 1 ½' back.

Mr. Richnak asked how high a fence would be allowed in this area.

Mr. Evans stated that this sign would not be any taller than what is allowed for a fence located in a front setback.

Mr. Zuazo asked what was behind the fence.

Mr. Folkerts stated that it is a private yard and this sign will be put on property owned by the homeowner. The existing landscaping will be replanted.

Ms. Smith stated that the sign will parallel the street to increase visibility.

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

Mr. Richnak asked if the homeowner was in favor of this request.

Mr. Roland Eagle, the homeowner at 4415 Lancashire, was present and stated that he agrees with this proposal 100%.

Motion by Richnak
Supported by Nelson

MOVED, to grant Signs & More, 4415 Lancashire, relief of Chapter 85 to erect a ground sign for a subdivision entrance that the located 2.5' from the John R. Road right of way and 4.33' setback from the Cumberland right of way, where Table 85.02.05 requires a minimum setback of 10' from the street right of way lines.

- Variance is not contrary to public interest.
- Variance will not have an adverse effect to surrounding property.
- The existing brick pillars will be removed as stated by the applicant.

Yeas: 4 – Kessler, Nelson, Richnak, Zuazo
Abstain: 1 – Dziurman

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

Mr. Richnak stated that he thought the new sign will be an improvement to this area.

The Building Code Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 9:10 A.M.

Ted Dziurman, Chairman

Pamela Pasternak, Recording Secretary