

The Chairman, Ted Dziurman, called the meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals to order at 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, December 3, 2008 in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Stimac, Director of Building & Zoning
Paul Evans, Inspector Supervisor
Pam Pasternak, Recording Secretary

ITEM #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MEETING OF NOVEMBER 5, 2008

Motion by Richnak
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 5, 2008 as written.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES CARRIED

ITEM #2 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. CITY OF TROY, REPRESENTING TROMBLEY INVESTMENT COMPANY, 3495-3503 ROCHESTER, for relief of Chapter 85 to install a 12'-5" tall, 38 square foot ground sign near the intersection of Trombley and Rochester.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 85 to install a new ground sign. This ground sign is proposed to be 12'-5" tall and 38 square feet in area. The proposed sign is to be placed 3' from the front property line along both Trombley and Rochester Road. Section 85.01.05 (B) prohibits signs over 30" tall in the corner clearance area of the intersection of two streets; further Table 85.02.05 requires ground signs measuring over 10' in height to be setback at least 20' from the front property line.

Mr. Stimac further explained that the City is proposing to widen Rochester Road. Based on the purchase of additional Rochester Road right of way at this location the existing sign needs to be relocated. The ultimate configuration of Rochester Road is proposed to be a boulevard and will result in one-way traffic in this area. People exiting on Trombley will be looking north. The proposed sign is to be 6'-6" from ground to the bottom of the sign to allow the vision of pedestrians and the top of the sign is proposed to be 12'-5" in height.

Mr. Dziurman confirmed that the City is involved because of the purchase of some of this property for a right of way acquisition. Mr. Dziurman also asked what the size of the current sign was.

ITEM #2 – con't.

Mr. Stimac stated that the existing sign is 4' wide and 7' tall and located 2' from the front property line.

Mr. Richnak asked what the distance of the leading edge was to the sidewalk.

Mr. Stimac stated that he thought it was 2'.

Pat Petitto, representing the City of Troy and James Jablonski one of the managing partners of Trombley Investment Company were present. Mr. Jablonski stated that he thought the edge of the sign was 2' from the sidewalk.

Mr. Stimac stated that based upon the plans submitted the proposed sign would be located 2' from the property line and 3' from the sidewalk.

Mr. Kessler asked if the sign was going to extend over the property line and Mr. Stimac stated that it did not.

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

There are two (2) written objections in file. There are no written approvals in file.

Mr. Kessler stated that the proposed sign is going into a dedicated parking space and asked if the petitioner was planning to put landscaping around it.

Mr. Jablonski stated that there will be parking curbs and gravel around the base of the sign. They do not want to impact visibility for motorists or pedestrians.

Mr. Kessler stated that if there is more than a 4" projection from the base it would lead to a hazardous projection. A person could walk into that object and he would like to see some type of landscaping to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Jablonski said that there would be an island all the way around the base of the sign.

Mr. Richnak asked if there was an issue on the current conditions.

Mr. Stimac stated that with the current configuration of the roads the curb is 30' from where the sign is proposed to be located. The sidewalk at Rochester is at the curb line and the sidewalk at Trombley is 10' to 12' back from the traveled portion of the road. Right now traffic exiting Trombley stops 20' west of the proposed sign location. Once Rochester Road is developed traffic will be only one way.

Motion by Kessler
Supported by Richnak

ITEM #2 – con't.

MOVED, to grant the City of Troy, representing Trombley Investment Company, 3495-3503 Rochester relief of Chapter 85 to install a 12'-5" tall, 38 square foot ground sign 3' from the front property line along both Trombley and Rochester Road.

- Edge detail or curb be provided around the perimeter of the sign.
- Variance is necessary due to the acquisition of right of way property.
- Future one way traffic pattern does not create a vision obstruction.
- Variance will not have an adverse effect on surrounding property.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

ITEM #3 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. BEAUMONT SERVICES CO., INC., 44201 DEQUINDRE, for relief of the requirements of Section 1107.2 of the 2006 Michigan Plumbing Code.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioners are requesting relief of the requirement that the secondary roof drainage system required by Section 1107.1 of the Michigan Plumbing Code be provided as a separate system discharging above grade as required by Section 1107.2 of the Michigan Plumbing Code. Section 1611.3 of the Michigan Building Code requires that a secondary drainage system be provided to limit the ponding of water on a roof should the primary drainage system become blocked. Section 1107.2 of the Plumbing Code requires that this secondary system be a totally separate system and that the point of discharge be at an above grade location where it can normally be observed by the building occupants.

Mr. Dziurman asked if this request was similar to other requests from Beaumont Hospital.

Mr. Stimac stated that it is basically the same configuration that has come before this Board in the past.

Mr. Dziurman asked if there had been any problems with these systems.

Mr. Kevin Doyle and Mr. Chet Schroeder of Beaumont Services were present. Mr. Doyle stated that the water flow sensors go off even when there is snow melt.

Mr. Richnak asked if this alarm was at a 24-hour manned station.

Mr. Doyle stated that an alarm goes off when there is standing water that rings through to the Security Department, who in turn notifies building maintenance.

Mr. Zuazo asked what would happen if there was a power outage.

Mr. Doyle said that although not 100% sure he does believe that there is a backup power system available.

ITEM #3 – con't.

Mr. Kessler asked why they want to go with this system rather than what is required by the Plumbing Code.

Mr. Doyle said that if they were to comply with the Plumbing Code the discharge system would be located in an area where there is a high amount of pedestrian traffic as there is a public walkway located in this area. This has the chance to create a lot of problems. Ideally they would try to locate a discharge system over a green space.

Motion by Richnak
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Beaumont Services Co., Inc. 44201 Dequindre, relief of the requirements of Section 1107.2 of the 2006 Michigan Plumbing Code.

Motion by Zuazo
Supported by Kessler

Moved, to amend the motion to include a requirement that an emergency system be provided in case there is a loss of power.

Vote on Amendment.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO AMEND MOTION CARRIED

MOVED, to grant Beaumont Services Co., Inc. 44201 Dequindre, relief of the requirements of Section 1107.2 of the 2006 Michigan Plumbing Code.

- An emergency power system will be provided in case of a power failure.
- The system proposed provides an equivalent level of safety to that required by the code.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

The Building Code Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:55 A.M.

Ted Dziurman, Chairman

Pamela Pasternak, Recording Secretary