

1 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING: City of Pontiac Zoning
2 Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes on Tuesday, April, 18,
3 2017; Pontiac City Hall, 47450 Woodward Avenue, Pontiac,
4 Michigan 48342

5 COMMISSIONERS: Chair Ahmad Taylor
6 Lucy Payne
7 Sam Anderson
8 Carlos Bueno
9 Laurie Bishop
10 Joseph Sinclair
11 Elcine Kirkendolph

12 FROM THE CITY: C. James Sabo, City Planner

13 CHAIRMAN TAYLOR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:01 P.M.

14 ROLL CALL:

15 PRESENT: Chair Taylor, Comm. Payne, Comm. Anderson,
16 Comm. Bueno, Comm. Bishop

17 ARRIVED LATE: Joseph Sinclair

18 ABSENT: Elcine Kirkendolph

19 Mr. Sabo reported a quorum present.

20 COMMUNICATIONS:
21 None

22 MINUTES FOR REVIEW: 3-21-17

23 COMM. BUENO MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES

24 COMM. PAYNE SECONDED

25 VOTE: AYES: Bueno, Payne, Anderson, Taylor, Bishop

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

Vote 5-0-0 motion carries.

OLD BUSINESS: NONE.

1 NEW BUSINESS:

2 PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:

3 ZBA-17-06

4 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 45399 Woodward Ave.

5 ZONE: MUD, Mixed Use District

6 LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-33-351-014

7 APPLICANT: Brad Oleshansky

8 Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.

9 Mr. Brad Oleshansky, M-1 Concourse, explained that one of
10 their major problems for their events was the parking,
11 therefore they've spent a great amount of time, money and
effort in designing their new lot with new LED lighting on
poles half the size of the old ones.

12 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

13 COMM. PAYNE VOICED CONCERN OVER THE LIGHTING REFLECTING BACK
ON TRAFFIC.

14
15 Mr. Oleshansky told Comm. Payne that he does not anticipate
16 and that the lighting designer assured him that there will
be no visual impairment for drivers and that the lighting is
of a better quality.

17 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED AS TO THE NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED SPACES
AVAILABLE.

18
19 Mr. Oleshansky answered that instead of having them spaced
20 out, that they have a significant number of them all grouped
together.

21 COMM. PAYNE INDICATED SHE REMEMBERS PEOPLE, INCLUDING THE
22 HANDICAPPED, HAVING TROUBLE WITH PARKING AT THEIR FIRST
EVENT.

23 Mr. Oleshansky indicated that they will shuttle people in
with golf carts.

24 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF, ON THEIR LIGHTING RESULTS AND
STUDY, THE BLUE MEANS NO ILLUMINATION INTO THE STREET.

25

1 Mr. Oleshansky answered that the blue means a slight amount.

2 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF THEIR LIGHTS WERE GOING TO BE
OVERTOWERING THE REGULAR LIGHTS ON SOUTH BOULEVARD.

3
4 Mr. Oleshansky responded negatively and indicated that on
that side they would be single lights only facing in and not
out.

5
6 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF ANYTHING WAS GOING TO GO OUT INTO
THE NEIGHBORHOOD ON THE OTHER SIDE OF SOUTH BOULEVARD.

7 Mr. Oleshansky answered negatively and indicated that they
have replaced slabs of concrete on the sidewalk.

8
9 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED OF MR. SABO IF THIS NEEDS TO GO IN
FRONT OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A PARKING LOT.

10 Mr. Sabo indicated that it was approved over two years ago.

11 COMM. SINCLAIR INQUIRED OF THE APPLICANT IF THEY DON'T GET
THE REQUIRED HEIGHT, HOW MANY ADDITIONAL POLES WOULD HAVE TO
12 BE ADDED.

13 Mr. Oleshansky indicated he thinks 30.

14 COMM. SINCLAIR INQUIRED OF THE APPLICANT IF THEY WERE
PUTTING POLES UP IN THE LOT ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF SOUTH
15 BOULEVARD.

16 Mr. Oleshansky answered in the negative and said that there
are currently 80-foot poles in that area that they are
17 trying to investigate if they can be re-wired, as he would
like to illuminate that lot as well.

18
19 COMM. SINCLAIR INQUIRED IF THERE IS AN ADEQUATE NUMBER OF
PARKING SPACES.

20 Mr. Oleshansky answered that there is, with the exception of
larger events with 40,000 people.

21
22 COMM. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE REQUESTED FOR
PARKING LOT LIGHT POLE HEIGHT FOR SECTION 4.503(A) STANDARDS
BY TYPE OF FIXTURE TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM LIGHT POLE HEIGHT
23 FROM 25 FEET TO 40 FEET AND 25 FEET TO 30 FEET IN MUD
DISTRICT. TWO HEIGHT VARIANCES ARE GRANTED; A 5.0 FEET
24 VARIANCE AND A 15.0 FEET VARIANCE FOR LIGHT POLES.

25 COMM. ANDERSON SECONDED.

1 VOTE: AYES: Payne, Bueno, Sinclair,
Anderson, Taylor, Bishop
2
NAYS: None.
3
ABSTAIN: None.
4
Vote 6-0-0, motion carries.
5
PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:
6
ZBA-17-07
7
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1617 Giddings Road
8
ZONE: R-1B-Large Lot one-Family Dwelling District
9
LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-10-327-008
10 APPLICANT: Robert Shelton
11
Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.
12
Mr. Robert Shelton, 1617 Giddings Road, Pontiac, Michigan,
stated that he had a temporary building next to his garage
13 for storage but the windstorm removed that and that he
wanted the colors to blend with the existing garage and that
14 his neighbor that would have the best view of it is in
support of this.
15
CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED PUBLIC COMMENT.
16
Ms. Betty Lewis-Rand inquired if there was a reason she
17 didn't get notified about the lighting on the concourse.
18
Mr. Sabo asked Ms. Lewis-Rand where her property is located.
19
Ms. Lewis-Rand indicated Crystal Lake, right off of Franklin
Road.
20
Mr. Sabo indicated that it is mandated that any property
21 within 300 feet should have been notified and he did not
know why she did not and also indicated that he and another
22 employee of the City folded and mailed out 450 letters.
23
CHAIR TAYLOR CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.
24
COMM. SINCLAIR INDICATED THAT HE PULLED IT UP ON GOOGLE MAPS
AND WONDERED IF THERE IS STILL A SMALL BUILDING BESIDE THE
25 GARAGE.

1 Mr. Shelton indicated that the temporary storage shed is
gone.

2
3 COMM. ANDERSON INQUIRED IF THE NEW BUILDING WOULD BE IN THE
FRONT OF THE PROPERTY.

4 Mr. Shelton answered negatively and indicated that it will
be between the existing garage and his neighbor Marilyn's
5 house.

6 COMM. ANDERSON INDICATED THAT THEY ARE DEEP LOTS OVER THERE.

7 Mr. Shelton indicated that he can't put it way in the back
because it is a flood plane and he wouldn't be able to
8 access it in the spring.

9 COMM. ANDERSON INQUIRED IF THE NEIGHBOR WAS ON A LAKE.

10 Mr. Shelton indicated that she has a pond.

11 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED OF MR. SABO IF THE CITY STILL HAS THE
ACCESSORY BUILDINGS MATCH THE HOUSE.

12
13 Mr. Shelton indicated that it will match the garage.

14 COMM. ANDERSON INQUIRED IF IT WAS TO BE ATTACHED TO THE
GARAGE.

15 Mr. Shelton answered negatively, stating it will be 3 1/2
feet away.

16
17 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THE GARAGE FACES THE STREET.

18
19 Mr. Shelton answered affirmatively.

20
21 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THE GARAGE IS A ONE-CAR.

22
23 Mr. Shelton answered that it is a two-car.

24 COMM. PAYNE ASKED IF HE WAS ADDING AN ADDITIONAL GARAGE OR
STORAGE BUILDING.

25
26 Mr. Shelton answered it would be a storage building, that he
made sure the neighbor was going to be happy with it and
also that she is the one who saved the temporary building by
calling him and holding onto it until he could get there
after it blew over the top of the fence.

1 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THERE WAS ANY WAY HE COULD ATTACH IT
TO THE GARAGE.

2

Mr. Shelton indicated that he'd like to in the future.

3

4 COMM. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE REQUEST FOR
ALLOWABLE SQUARE FOOTAGE FOR ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, SECTION
2.304(F)(2) ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AREA, TO INCREASE MAXIMUM
5 ALLOWABLE AREA FOR A NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURE FROM 900 SQ
FEET TO 1,130 SQ FEET IN R-1B DISTRICT. THE EXISTING GARAGE
6 IS 644 SQ FEET AND A SECOND GARAGE STRUCTURE IS 486 SQ FEET.
A VARIANCE OF 230 SQ FEET OF ADDITIONAL AREA FOR AN
7 ACCESSORY BUILDING IS GRANTED.

8 COMM. ANDERSON SECONDED.

9 VOTE: AYES: Bueno, Payne, Sinclair,
Anderson, Taylor, Bishop

10

NAYS: None.

11

ABSTAIN: None.

12

Vote 6-0-0 motion carries.

13

CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

14

CHAIR TAYLOR CALLED TO VOTE ADJOURNING.

15

16 VOTE: AYES: Bueno, Payne, Sinclair,
Anderson, Taylor, Bishop

17

NAYS: None.

18

ABSTAIN: None.

19 Vote 6-0-0 motion carries.

20 ADJOURNMENT: 7:43 P.M.

21

22

23

24

25

