

A regular meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals was held Thursday, July 7, 1977 at the Troy City Offices. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Eugene Scheff at 1:40 p.m.

PRESENT: Eugene Scheff  
Chairman

Gerald VandenBussche  
Don Spurr  
Thomas Marcucci  
Rick Sinclair

Item #1. Approval of June 2, 1977 minutes

Motion by Marcucci  
Support by Sinclair

MOVED, to approve the June 2, 1977 minutes as written

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM #2. Variance Requested, McColley Brothers, 1057 East Long Lake, for relief of Chapter 85.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to erect a sign on a business building. Chapter 85 permits only one wall sign for each business establishment in a shopping center. The subject tenant has an existing wall sign on the front of their building and are proposing a second wall sign that will be 4' x 20'. Their location is at the corner of the shopping center and they have their frontage facing the interior of the shopping center to the east and the second wall sign is proposed to the south, facing Long Lake.

Mr. Paul Bucemmi and Mr. Vince Bucemmi were present and presented a larger print of the sign that they propose to erect. They felt that the corner location of the store was ideal for exposure. However, without a sign facing Long Lake they can not take advantage of this double exposure which causes a hardship.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No comments from the audience.

The Chairman closed the public hearing

Two letters of objection on file from Mrs. Redmer, 1144 Mayberry and Donn A. Fasbender of 4061 Babbitt Drive.

Motion by Spurr  
Support by VandenBussche

MOVED, to deny the request at 1057 East Long Lake for the following reasons:

1. No hardship was demonstrated.
2. There can be adequate exposure obtained by using the south side of the building only.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO DENY CARRIED

D1

ITEM #3. Variance Requested, Frank Palazzolo, 3310 Harmony, Lot #153, Raintree Village, for relief of Chapter 83.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to erect a 6' wood fence with brick pillars that will encroach into the front setback of Lakewood. This house is located at the corner of Harmony and Lakewood and requires a front setback from both streets. The fence will be located 19' from the Lakewood property line. At this point, it is required by ordinance to be 25'. The fence ordinance does not permit fences higher than 30" to be located in front yard setbacks.

Mr. Frank Palazzolo was present and explained that the original house was permitted to encroach into the setback by 6' with a wing wall by the Zoning Board of Appeals. This is the same wing wall that the fence will be homologous with. He indicated that he was under the impression that the approval of the Zoning Board allowed the fence also.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. James E. Bishop of 1553 Lakewood feels that the fence is a very beautiful fence and does not affect his driveway in any manner. He has no objection to the fence being erected.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Four letters of approval on file from Wesley Shelton of 1527 East Big Beaver, Dick & Beth Price of 1544 Lakewood; James Oliver, 3323 Harmony; and Samuel Thompson of 3378 Harmony Drive,

One letter of objection on file from Mrs. Secreto of 1554 Crestline.

Motion by VandenBussche  
Support by Sinclair

MOVED, to approve the request at 3310 Harmony for a 6' fence in the required front yard for the following reasons:

1. The encroachment is minor and does not present a vision hazard to adjacent property.
2. The majority of the neighbors are in favor of the fence.
3. The security of the petitioner's back yard is obtained in good taste.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED.

ITEM #4. Variance Requested, Donald Green, 6720 Rochester Road, for relief of Chapter 85.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to erect an 8' x 4' roof sign on his bar-restaurant (Alibi Inn). The petitioner indicates that they will be removing a ground sign and replacing it with this roof sign. Due to the buildings' location in relation with the right-of-way of Rochester Road, he would not be able to obtain the exposure from Rochester Road that he presently has with the existing sign. Chapter 85 prohibits roof signs of any type. This roof sign is on a lower area of the building and there is a roof higher than the roof that the sign is being placed on.

Mr. Donald Green was present and indicated that the existing sign is deteriorating and is in need of repair. He felt that the cost of repair would be as great as a new sign. He would like to get away from the regular bar type clientele that his present sign draws and establish a family dining restaurant.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No comments from the audience.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

July 7, 1977

No letters on file.

Motion by Spurr  
Support by Sinclair

MOVED, to approve the variance to allow a roof sign at 6720 Rochester Road for the following reasons:

1. The proposed sign is more tasteful and less objectionable than the present sign.
2. The sign will be on a lower portion of the roof.
3. The sign will be within the size limitation
4. The petitioner has indicated that he will not put lights in the top of the sign.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED

ITEM #5. Variance Requested, Floyd Graves, 2021 Stirling, for relief of Chapter 85.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to erect a 4' chain link fence along the west property line which is considered a required front setback from John R. The fence ordinance does not permit fences higher than 30" in a required front yard setback.

Mr. & Mrs. Floyd Graves were present and indicated that they had obtained a permit several weeks prior and hired a fence contractor to install the fence. It was after the fence was installed with the appropriate permit that an inspector informed them that the fence could not be installed. They will not be blocking the vision of John R and need a fence higher than 30" to keep their dog in the yard and to prevent other dogs and children from entering into their yard.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. William Lambros of 2050 Stirling was present and indicated that he had no objection to the fence.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Seven letters of approval on file from Sandra Melbardis, 2056 Chancery; Robert A. Jedlicki, 2074 Chancery; William Conn, 2066 Stirling; Mr. & Mrs. Robert Kathka, 2053 Stirling; Richard Ruharden, 2041 Stirling; Shirley Delauier, 6660 John R; and Joseph Lind of 2071 Stirling.

Motion by Spurr  
Support by Marcucci

MOVED, to approve the variance requested at 2021 Stirling for the following reasons:

1. The fence is not an obstruction in any manner.
2. The surrounding neighbors approve of the fence.
3. It is not harmful.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED.

July 7, 1977

ITEM #6. Variance Requested, Sidney Krandall, 755 West Big Beaver,  
for relief of Chapter 85.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to erect two wall signs, 12 square feet in area for each. The signs will be located on the entrance canopy relating to their tenant area in this office complex. Chapter 85 does not permit separate identification signs for individual tenants in an office complex. The petitioner appeared before this board previously and was granted relief of the ordinance to erect one wall sign not exceeding 20 square feet for his individual identification. The petitioner has indicated that the previously approved sign will not be constructed if he can obtain the two smaller signs on his canopy.

Mr. Hugh Crandall and Mr. Gains were present. They indicated that this type of sign will be their logo for the jewelrystore and will be the only identification that they will have on the Big Beaver Office complex. They feel that a lack of exposure will result in a loss of business. The only exposure will be to people in the parking lot as the signs will not be visible to the Big Beaver traffic. Mr. Crandall indicated that the sign will be a softly lit one.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No comments from the audience.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

No letters on file.

Motion by VandenBussche  
Support by Sinclair

MOVED, to approve the request for relief of Chapter 85 at 755 West Big Beaver for the following reasons:

1. The proposed signs are in good taste.
2. The signs are not overly large.
3. The signs are primarily for direction to tenant space once the customer enters the complex.
4. This particular type of business does need some type of directional identification.

ayes: 3  
nays: 2 - Scheff, Marcucci  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED.

Variance Requested, Beacon Sign Company, 35001 Dequindre, for relief  
of Chapter 85.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting to maintain wall signs on the east and south side of their building (gas station). These signs will total, in area, 300 square feet. Chapter 83 permits a wall sign not to exceed approximately 20 square feet based on the square foot area of the front of their structure. The petitioner has created a condition that makes the entire face of the structure a sign on both the east and south side.

Sam Adam and Mark Aulie of Beacon Sign Company were present. They indicated that Sunoco has taken over the operation of the gas station and have eliminated the mechanical portion of the operation. They have cleaned up the whole area in general.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No comments from the audience.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

No letters on file.

Motion by Marcucci  
Support by Spurr

MOVED, that the request for a variance at 35001 Dequindre for relief of Chapter 85 be denied for the following reasons:

1. The gas-only sign is not essential to survival of the business.
2. More energy should be directed into price signs.
3. There are already two ground signs and two signs on the face of the building that give more than adequate signage.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO DENY CARRIED

ITEM #8. Variance Requested, Jerome V. Romanski, 1879 Pelican Court, for relief of Chapter 79, Section 9.14 of the Troy City Code.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to place an air conditioning condenser unit in the required side yard of this residential district. The refrigeration code does not permit condensing units to be located within 10' of a property line or in a required side yard. The required side yard of this district is 10' and the unit will be located approximately 7' from the side property line.

Mr. Jerome Romanski was present and stated that his patio extends the entire length of the rear of his house which makes it impossible to place the condensing unit at the rear of the house. He stated that the houses are jogged rather than in a straight line therefore the unit will not be directly adjacent to the neighbors house. Mr. Romanski indicated that he will plant shrubbery around the unit to conceal it from the vision of the street.

Motion by Sinclair  
Support by Marcucci

MOVED, to approve the variance requested to permit an air conditioning unit to be placed in the required side yard at 1879 Pelican Court for the following reasons:

1. The next door neighbor that would be affected, has no qualms.
2. It will be concealed with shrubbery.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED

July 7, 1977

Adjournment

---

Motion by VandenBussche  
Support by Marcucci

MOVED, to adjourn the Building Board of Appeals at 3:10 p.m.

ayes: 5  
nays: 0  
absent: 0

MOTION TO ADJOURN CARRIED

21