

1 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING: City of Pontiac Zoning
2 Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes on Tuesday, May 16, 2017;
3 Pontiac City Hall, 47450 Woodward Avenue, Pontiac, Michigan
4 48342

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN TAYLOR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 6:57 P.M

14 ROLL CALL:

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

17 ARRIVED LATE: Comm. Bueno, Comm. Sinclair

18 Mr. Sabo reported a quorum present.

19 MINUTES FOR REVIEW: April 18, 2017

20 COMM. ANDERSON MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES

21 COMM. PAYNE SECONDED

22 VOTE: AYES: Payne, Anderson, Taylor, Bishop

23 NAYS: None.

24 ABSTAIN: Kirkendolph.

25 Vote 4-0-1 motion carries.

OLD BUSINESS: NONE.

NEW BUSINESS:

26
27

1 PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:

2 ZBA-17-11

3 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 424 Ferry Street

4 ZONE: R-1, One-Family Dwelling

5 LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-33-477-045

6 APPLICANT: Dean Grulke

7 Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.

8 Mr. Grulke stated that he owned the property for 20 years
and gave the following brief summary for those who weren't
9 here two years ago:

10 He stated that a requirement of Zoning was for him
to get a business license, had to have an inspection from
the Building Dept., pull permits, erect an 8-foot fence
11 around the property, which required him to have a plot plan,
which required another inspection, all of which cost lots of
12 money. He stated that that is the reason the fence is in
its current location.

13

CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

14

COMM. ANDERSON ASKED STAFF WHAT THE PROBLEM WAS.

15

16 Mr. Sabo answered that this is not a permitted use in the
R-1 Zone District, so he had a use variance back in 2015 for
use of this portion of the site. He then used the overhead
17 to display where he had outdoor storage and vehicles and
equipment parked, then indicated that he got a notice from
18 Pontiac's Code Enforcement Division. He then pointed to an
area that he did come in and apply for a use variance for.
19 He then pointed to another area that he has since expanded.
Mr. Sabo then said it would be probably best to ask
20 Mr. Grulke the rationale behind that but that he needs a use
variance to use these parcels for that outdoor storage as
21 well.

22 Mr. Grulke indicated that he needed more areas of room.

23 COMM. ANDERSON INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE IF HE IS ALSO GOING TO
FENCE IN AN AREA.

24

25 Mr. Grulke advised the Board that they should have pictures
of his fancy, \$20,000 fence he's already erected.

1 Mr. Sabo indicated to the Board that, if they grant the use
2 variance, one of the stipulations would be a screening fence
3 and he's actually already started to install it and has it
4 partway up and that, if they grant the use variance, he
5 would need to complete that installation and maintain that
6 fence screening.

7
8 COMM. ANDERSON INQUIRED OF MR. SABO IF ALL HE IS DOING IS
9 EXPANDING.

10 Mr. Sabo affirmed.

11 COMM. BUENO ENTERED THE MEETING AT 7:00 P.M.

12 COMM BISHOP INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE WHAT THE NATURE IS OF THE
13 BUSINESS.

14
15 Mr. Grulke indicated that he sometimes stores equipment
16 there and that he needs a place to park his trailers and
17 truck.

18
19 COMM. BISHOP INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE IF IT IS HIS EQUIPMENT
20 OR IF HE IS RENTING SPACE.

21 Mr. Grulke indicated that it is his equipment.

22 COMM. BISHOP INQUIRED IF IT IS FOR A TRUCKING BUSINESS.

23 Mr. Grulke affirmed.

24 COMM. BISHOP INQUIRED IF HE COULD CHANGE THE ZONING FROM
25 RESIDENTIAL TO A COMMERCIAL LOT.

26
27 Mr. Sabo indicated that it is possible but a little more
28 entailed than that and stated that, if it were to be
29 rezoned, then anything that was allowed in that particular
30 zone district could be used into the future. He reminded
31 the Board that it predates zoning ordinance and that the
32 Federal Government, in 1928, created a zoning ordinance and
33 he thinks this site dates back to '26 or '27. He stated
34 that once we, as a country, figured out not to put
35 industrial use in neighborhoods, some of them already
36 existed in neighborhoods. He also stated that, when GM
37 located in town, not everybody had the cars so people who
38 worked in the factories lived in the neighborhoods adjacent
39 to the factories and walked to work. He advised the Board
40 that the best way to handle these types of situations is to
41 allow that particular use at that site and then any other
42 use that were to happen in the future that didn't meet the
43 zoning ordinance, they would be subject to a code violation.

1 COMM. BISHOP INDICATED THAT SHE WAS WONDERING IF THAT WAS A
2 POSSIBILITY BECAUSE IT WOULD MAKE HIS PROPERTY WORTH MORE
3 AND PROVIDE MORE TAX MONEY FOR THE CITY, SO IT WOULD BE
4 MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL.

5 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE IF HE HAD CONSULTED WITH
6 THE NEIGHBORS.

7 Mr. Grulke affirmed.

8 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE WHAT HIS NEIGHBORS'
9 RESPONSES WERE.

10 Mr. Grulke replied that he had three or four neighbors stop
11 by the week prior to coming here and some of them said they
12 were going to come for this meeting and that he basically
13 takes care of the whole road in the wintertime, plowing it
14 and salting it the same day and that he knows the City's
15 backed up with snowplowing. He indicated that he has a very
16 good relationship with the neighbors, helps them pull their
17 cars out of snow banks and start their cars in the
18 wintertime and is there to help quite a bit. In closing, he
19 was hoping that maybe some of them would come tonight.

20 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE IF HE OWNED A HOUSE IN
21 THE PICTURES.

22 Mr. Grulke indicated that he does not but that he has asked
23 the owner numerous times if he wanted to sell it and that it
24 is in pretty bad shape and falling down.

25 COMM. PAYNE INDICATED THAT IT LOOKS LIKE THE FENCE GOES ALL
THE WAY UP TO THAT HOME.

Mr. Grulke stated that he stayed away from the property line
around five feet and didn't want to go any further because
he didn't want to block the house's view. He further stated
that, if the Board looks at the Commerce Building on the
north side of Ferry, their fence goes right up to the corner
and it's a traffic hazard. He further stated that he sees a
lot of cars buzzing through there without being seen and
that that's why he brought his back around 30 feet.

COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. SABO WHAT HE SAID ABOUT IT NOT
COMPLYING WITH THE ORDINANCE.

Mr. Sabo answered that he technically cannot store outdoor
equipment on some parcels he was displaying and also
displayed an area where he can. He reminded the Board that
they granted him a use variance in a certain area which

1 required him to put a fence up, so he started to put part of
2 that fence up. He stated that it's a fair question to ask
3 Mr. Grulke why he expanded. He further stated that the
4 reason he's here is because he expanded onto certain sites
5 and the Code Enforcement Division sent him a letter.

6 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THE FENCE GOES ALL THE WAY AROUND.

7 Mr. Grulke affirmed.

8 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. SABO IF THIS WOULD BE
9 GRANDFATHERED.

10 Mr. Sabo indicated that all the uses previous to his use on
11 the property, there were several variances granted over time
12 at this location, which includes a 1970 use variance granted
13 by the ZBA to expand the existing nonconforming truck repair
14 and service, to add metal panel fabrication and
15 manufacturing use, and they got a use variance to add that
16 metal panel fabrication and that, in 1972, a use variance
17 was granted by the ZBA to expand the existing metal
18 fabrication, to add wood modeling and installation of
19 refractory materials and pollution control devices. He
20 stated that there were some code enforcement issues through
21 the late '60s and '70s, that there were issues with the site
22 through the '70s and '80s and perhaps even the early '90s.
23 He then inquired of Mr. Grulke if '98 is when he bought the
24 property.

25 Mr. Grulke affirmed.

26 Mr. Sabo stated that Mr. Grulke inherited Code Violation 366
27 and there's been some issues related to the property but, in
28 2015, he got another use variance for what's happening now
29 and then displayed where he's seeking a variance for and
30 displayed the parcels where he is expanding the precise same
31 variance he got for other parcels and the portion of the
32 other two parcels.

33 COMM. PAYNE INDICATED THAT SHE IS SORRY FOR HER MEMORY IN
34 2015, AND INQUIRED IF THE BOARD DENIED AT THAT TIME.

35 Mr. Grulke answered that the Board approved at that time.

36 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED OF MR. GRULKE IF HE AGREED TO COMPLY
37 WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

38 Mr. Grulke affirmed.

39

1 MR. BUENO INQUIRED WHAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE.

2 Mr. Sabo answered that he made one for approval and one for
3 denial and that he tries to leave it to the discretion of
4 the ZBA.

4 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS LOOKING
5 AT THIS AND IF MR. GRULKE IS EXPANDING THE SITE AND WHAT IS
6 HE DOING WITH THE PARKING AND PAVING AND OTHER THINGS.

6 MR. SABO ANSWERED THAT IT DID NOT GO TO THE PLANNING
7 COMMISSION.

7 COMM. BUENO ASKED IF THEY SHOULD BE GOING TO THE PLANNING
8 COMMISSION.

9 Mr. Sabo answered that it is possible but that he wanted to
10 come here first.

10 COMM. BISHOP MOVED TO CONSIDER UNDER WHICH CIRCUMSTANCES A
11 USE VARIANCE WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR ZBA-17-11, SIDWELL
12 #14-33-477-045, DEAN GULKE, OUTDOOR STORAGE YARD (MAJOR), AS
13 THE PROPOSED USE VARIANCE REQUEST MAY MEET SECTION 6.408(C)
14 USE VARIANCE UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP STANDARDS NUMBERS 1, 2,
15 AND 6; AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

14 1. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE OCCUPANCY
15 REQUIREMENTS AND PONTIAC BUSINESS LICENSING REQUIREMENTS AND
16 THAT THEY ERECT A FENCE AROUND THE AREA.

15 COMM. ANDERSON SECONDED.

16 VOTE: AYES: Payne, Kirkendolph, Anderson, Taylor, Bishop

17 NAYS: Bueno.

18 ABSTAIN: None.

19 Vote 5-1-0 motion carries.

20 PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:

21 ZBA-17-08

22 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1531 E. Highwood

23 ZONE: I-P1, Industrial Park District

24 LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-09-301-031

25 APPLICANT: AKA Architects, Inc.,; BMC Properties

1 Rep: Stephen Auger and Roger Essenmacher

2 Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.

3 Mr. Auger, from AKA Architects, 214 S Broadway St #220,
4 Lake Orion, MI 48362, introduced Roger Essenmacher who is
5 with him.

5 Mr. Essenmacher, from Advent Home Healthcare, 291 Collier,
6 Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326 indicated that Advent
7 incorporated in 2004 and that they're a respiratory therapy
8 company that provides services for catastrophically injured
9 patients and premature babies who are unable to breathe on
10 their own, keeping them in their home setting. He indicated
11 they have four locations with 40 employees, 25 of which are
12 in Auburn Hills, the rest of the employees are located in
13 Grand Rapids, Petoskey and Lansing. He indicated that
14 they've only been in Auburn Hills four years but have
15 tripled their employees and continue to grow. He indicated
16 that the owner is out of the country tonight but was born
17 and raised in Pontiac and is very supportive in community
18 programs.

19 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

20 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THEY WERE CLOSING DOWN AUBURN HILLS
21 AND MOVING ALL THEIR EMPLOYEES TO PONTIAC.

22 Mr. Essenmacher affirmed.

23 COMM. PAYNE ASKED FOR THE REASON THEY ARE CLOSING AUBURN
24 HILLS.

25 Mr. Essenmacher indicated that they have outgrown the space.

COMM. PAYNE ASKED HOW MUCH SPACE IS AT AUBURN HILLS.

Mr. Essenmacher indicated about 6-, 8,000 square feet.

COMM. PAYNE ASKED HOW MUCH SPACE IS AT THE PONTIAC LOCATION.

Mr. Essenmacher indicated around 12,000 and they're looking
to add another 10,000 square feet.

COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED ABOUT THE TYPE OF POSITIONS THEY
EMPLOY.

24

25

1 Mr. Essenmacher indicated that approximately half are
2 respiratory therapists, like himself, and the others are
3 clerical, administrative, warehouse, delivery, et cetera.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

3 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF THIS WENT TO THE PLANNING
COMMISSION.

Mr. Sabo answered that it did not go to Planning.

COMM. BUENO INQUIRED, WITH THE EXPANSION, IF THERE WERE ANY
REQUIREMENTS THEY NEED TO FULFILL, SUCH AS LANDSCAPING AND
PARKING.

Mr. Sabo indicated that it was administratively denied for a
site plan and sent to the Board for a setback variance.

Mr. Essenmacher indicated that the parking is per ordinance
with the expansion.

COMM. ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE REQUEST FOR A
SIDE YARD SETBACK, FROM 20 FEET AS REQUIRED IN SECTION
2.314(B), DIMENSION AND DESIGN STANDARDS, TO A 10-FOOT
SETBACK FROM THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE FOR THE EXPANSION OF
THE EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN THE IP-1, INDUSTRIAL
PARK DISTRICT. A SIDE YARD VARIANCE OF 10 FEET FOR A
BUILDING ADDITION IS GRANTED AS IT APPEARS TO MEET THE
COMPLIANCE CONDITIONS FROM SECTION 6.407.

COMM. BISHOP SECONDED.

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

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

Vote 6-0-0 motion carries.

PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:

ZBA-17-09

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1125 James K. Boulevard

ZONE: R-1, One-Family Dwelling District

LOCATION: Sidwell # 13-36-256-003

APPLICANT: Deborah Fratrick

- 1 Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.
- 2 Ms. Fratrik, 1125 James K. Blvd., Pontiac, Michigan, stated
3 that her current driveway is very steep and she cannot get
4 her husband around anymore and that they had just purchased
5 a new wheelchair van so they could have a better quality of
6 life. She indicated that it works well on the property next
7 door and that she has sent out letters to the neighbors and
8 that they are supportive.
- 9 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.
- 10 COMM. ANDERSON INDICATED THAT HE THINKS THERE IS A
11 HIGH-PRESSURE GAS MAIN IN THE AREA AND SUGGESTED CONCRETE
12 SINCE THERE IS A LOT OF SAND IN THE AREA.
- 13 COMM. BUENO ASKED IF SHE HAS DECIDED ON A MATERIAL YET.
- 14 Ms. Fratrik indicated that her first step was the Board's
15 approval and that she was going to look into Grasscrete
16 because she wants it to look nice.
- 17 COMM. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE REQUEST, SECTION
18 2.304(B), DIMENSION AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, TO PERMIT A
19 SECOND DRIVEWAY IN THE SIDE YARD OF THE PROPERTY AT
20 1145 JAMES K. BLVD IN THE R-1 DISTRICT, AS THE REQUEST
21 APPEARS TO MEET THE STANDARDS FROM SECTION 6.407 OF THE
22 ORDINANCE AND WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
- 23 1. THE PROPERTY OWNER MUST PROVIDE AN ACCESS
24 EASEMENT OVER THE LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY AT
25 1145 JAMES K. BLVD., ALLOWING THE OWNER OF 1125 JAMES K.
BLVD. ACCESS.
- 26 2. FOR BOTH AESTHETIC PURPOSES, AND TO ANTICIPATE
27 THE POTENTIAL TRANSITION OF THE SECOND DRIVEWAY BACK TO A
28 GRASS STATE IN THE FUTURE, THE APPLICANT SHALL CONSIDER THE
29 USE OF A CELLULAR GRASSED PAVING SYSTEM SUCH AS GRASSCRETE
30 AS A VIABLE SUBSTITUTE TO REGULAR CONCRETE OR ASPHALT AS A
31 DRIVEWAY MATERIAL.
- 32 COMM. PAYNE SECONDED.
- 33 VOTE: AYES: Bueno, Payne, Kirkendolph,
34 Anderson, Taylor, Bishop,
- 35 NAYS: None.
- 36 ABSTAIN: None.
- 37 Vote 6-0-0 motion carries.

1 PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:
2 ZBA-17-10
3 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 957 N. Perry Street
4 ZONE: R-3, Multiple-Family Dwelling District
5 LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-21-226-002
6 APPLICANT: Patrick Wainbunchner
Rep: Tera Saala
7 Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.
8 Ms. Saala, General Manager for Pinewood Townhomes,
9 957 N. Perry, Pontiac, Michigan, stated that she's been
10 there five months and that they really want to control the
traffic and keep the community safer for the tenants and
11 indicated that she brought some pictures of what the fence
will look like.
12 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.
13 COMM. PAYNE ASKED MS. SAALA THE REASON THEY WANT TO CHANGE
FROM A SIX-FOOT FENCE TO AN EIGHT-FOOT.
14 Ms. Saala indicated that the reason is a lot of people are
jumping the fence.
15 COMM. PAYNE ASKED MS. SAALA IF SHE'S SPOKEN TO THE
16 NEIGHBORS.
17 Ms. Saala responded negatively.
18 Mr. Sabo indicated that the decorative wrought iron fencing
19 in the photos is for the front and in the back is eight-foot
chain link.
20 MR. BUENO ASKED IF THERE WAS ANY CHANCE ON GETTING THE BACK
FENCE PAINTED BLACK.
21 Ms. Saala affirmed.
22 COMM. SINCLAIR ENTERED THE MEETING AT 7:44 P.M.
23 COMM. ANDERSON ALSO SUGGESTED PAINTING THE BACK FENCE BLACK.
24 COMM. SINCLAIR VOICED CONCERNS OVER THE APPLICANT
25 MAINTAINING AROUND THE FENCE AREA.

1 Ms. Saala indicated that, since she's been there, that's
2 been a high priority for her.

3 COMM. ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE (WITH THE CONDITION OF
4 PAINTING THE BACK FENCE ALONG MADISON STREET BLACK) THE
5 VARIANCE REQUESTED FOR FENCES IN THE FRONT YARD AND REAR AND
6 INTERIOR SIDE YARDS FOR SECTION 4.103(A) (1), FENCE HEIGHT TO
7 INCREASE THE MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT IN THE FRONT YARD FROM 4
8 FEET TO 6 FEET AND TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT IN
9 THE REAR AND INTERIOR SIDE YARDS FROM 6 FEET TO 8 FEET IN
10 THE R-3 DISTRICT. TWO HEIGHT VARIANCES ARE GRANTED; A
11 2.0-FOOT VARIANCE FOR A WROUGHT IRON FENCE IN THE FRONT YARD
12 AND A 2.0-FOOT VARIANCE FOR 8-FOOT CHAIN LINK FENCES IN THE
13 SIDE AND REAR YARDS AS THE REQUEST APPEARS TO MEET THE
14 STANDARDS FROM SECTION 6.407 OF THE ORDINANCE.

15 COMM. KIRKENDOLPH SECONDED.

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

18 NAYS: None.

19 ABSTAIN: None.

20 Vote 7-0-0 motion carries.

21 PUBLIC HEARING AND VARIANCE REQUEST:

22 ZBA-17-12

23 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 44 Illinois Avenue

24 ZONE: R-1, One-Family Dwelling District

25 LOCATION: Sidwell # 14-31-176-029

APPLICANT: Gerald Gase

Presentation of facts given by Mr. Sabo.

Mr. Gase, 44 Illinois Ave, Pontiac, Michigan, stated that he
had many problems with the contractor he hired to build the
building, from him saying things were done according to
ordinance when they were not, to running away with the money
and that DTE thinks he built the footings over power lines.
He indicated that the building is necessary for storage of
tools that his father worked with for many years and that he
worked with him on.

1 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED PUBLIC COMMENT.

2 Ms. Megan Lowery, 50 Illinois, Pontiac, Michigan indicated
3 that she lives next door and that, due to the situation he's
4 suffered with his contractor, it has been an eyesore. She
5 also indicated that there are other neighbors here tonight
6 as well and that their concern is how big it was going to be
7 and what it was going to be used for and she personally was
8 concerned if it would impede her ability to build a fence in
9 the future and what it would do to her property value.

10 Mr. Gase indicated that her building a fence would be fine
11 with him.

12 Mr. Sabo indicated that, since Mr. Gase was lied to by his
13 contractor, who said he had obtained permits for the
14 footings, it is not his fault and that is why he has an
15 opportunity for an exception on the size.

16 Ms. Lowery asked why there are different size limits in the
17 ordinance in different areas.

18 Mr. Sabo indicated that it depends on the size of the lots.

19 CHAIR TAYLOR CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

20 COMM. BISHOP WANTED TO ADDRESS MS. LOWERY IN SAYING THAT, IN
21 THAT AREA, THERE ARE SOME 800 SQUARE FOOT HOUSES BUT, SINCE
22 THIS IS A LARGER HOME AND A LARGER LOT, THE SIZE OF THE
23 GARAGE WILL NOT BE AN EYESORE AND, ON THE VALUE OF HER
24 PROPERTY, BIGGER IS BETTER, SO IT WOULD INCREASE.

25 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF IT WAS THE APPLICANT'S INTENT TO
LIVE IN THE HOME.

26 Mr. Gase answered affirmatively.

27 COMM. BUENO VOICED CONCERNS ON WHAT IT WOULD LOOK LIKE.

28 Mr. Sabo asked Mr. Gase if he had elevations.

29 Mr. Gase indicated that he does not but that the building
30 will be quite a bit lower than the house.

31 COMM. BUENO ASKED IF THE 960 SQUARE FEET IS THE NEWER PART
32 OR IF IT INCLUDES THE GARAGE.

33 Mr. Sabo indicated that it does not include the garage.

34

- 1 Mr. Gase indicated that, with the size of the lot, he does
not feel it will create a disproportionate effect.
- 2
3 COMM. BUENO INQUIRED IF THE APPLICANT HAD STICKERS FOR
APPROVALS.
- 4 Mr. Sabo answered negatively and indicated that they only
posted stop work orders.
- 5
6 COMM. SINCLAIR ASKED WHAT THE USE WOULD BE.
- 7
8 Mr. Gase indicated for storage and introduced his son.
9 Gerald Gase, Jr. indicated that it was mostly for
woodworking tools that is just a hobby, not for commercial
use, and that the house is built to where you cannot get
anything large in the basement.
- 10 COMM. SINCLAIR ASKED IF THEY REALLY KNOW IF THEY CAN KEEP
THE FOUNDATION.
- 11
12 Mr. Gase indicated that he can and that DTE is talking about
burying another wire to go around the foundation.
- 13 CHAIR TAYLOR ASKED IF THEY WERE STILL DEALING WITH THE
CONTRACTOR.
- 14
15 Mr. Gase, Jr. indicated they were not and he is in jail.
- 16 COMM. KIRKENDOLPH REMINDED THE APPLICANT TO BE MINDFUL OF
THE NEIGHBORS AND MOVED TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE REQUEST FOR
A DIMENSIONAL VARIANCE, SECTION 2.304(F) (1), ACCESSORY
STRUCTURES AREA, TO INCREASE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE FLOOR AREA
FOR A NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURE BY 160 SQ. FT. FROM 800 SQ.
17 FT. TO 960 SQ. FT. IN THE R-1 DISTRICT; AND A DIMENSIONAL
18 VARIANCE, SECTION 2.304(F) (2) TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM
19 ALLOWABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE HEIGHT FROM 15 FEET TO 15
FEET, 4 INCHES, AS THE REQUEST MEETS THE STANDARDS FROM
20 SECTION 6.407 OF THE ORDINANCE.
- 21 COMM. BISHOP SECONDED.
- 22 VOTE: AYES: Kirkendolph, Sykes, Anderson, Taylor, Bishop
- 23 NAYS: Bueno, Sinclair
- 24 ABSTAIN: None.
- 25 Vote 5-2-0 motion carries.

1 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.

2 CHAIR TAYLOR MOVED TO ADJOURN.

3 VOTE: AYES: Kirkendolph, Sykes, Anderson, Taylor,
4 Bishop, Bueno, Sinclair

4

NAYS: None

5

ABSTAIN: None

6

Vote 7-0-0 motion carries.

7

ADJOURNMENT: 8:20 P.M.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

