

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.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Grulke affirmed.

25

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.  
6 Mr. Essenmacher, from Advent Home Healthcare, 291 Collier,  
7 Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326 indicated that Advent  
8 incorporated in 2004 and that they're a respiratory therapy  
9 company that provides services for catastrophically injured  
10 patients and premature babies who are unable to breathe on  
11 their own, keeping them in their home setting. He indicated  
12 they have four locations with 40 employees, 25 of which are  
13 in Auburn Hills, the rest of the employees are located in  
14 Grand Rapids, Petoskey and Lansing. He indicated that  
15 they've only been in Auburn Hills four years but have  
16 tripled their employees and continue to grow. He indicated  
17 that the owner is out of the country tonight but was born  
18 and raised in Pontiac and is very supportive in community  
19 programs.  
20 CHAIR TAYLOR OPENED AND CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT.  
21 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED IF THEY WERE CLOSING DOWN AUBURN HILLS  
22 AND MOVING ALL THEIR EMPLOYEES TO PONTIAC.  
23 Mr. Essenmacher affirmed.  
24 COMM. PAYNE ASKED FOR THE REASON THEY ARE CLOSING AUBURN  
25 HILLS.  
26 Mr. Essenmacher indicated that they have outgrown the space.  
27 COMM. PAYNE ASKED HOW MUCH SPACE IS AT AUBURN HILLS.  
28 Mr. Essenmacher indicated about 6-, 8,000 square feet.  
29 COMM. PAYNE ASKED HOW MUCH SPACE IS AT THE PONTIAC LOCATION.  
30 Mr. Essenmacher indicated around 12,000 and they're looking  
31 to add another 10,000 square feet.  
32 COMM. PAYNE INQUIRED ABOUT THE TYPE OF POSITIONS THEY  
33 EMPLOY.  
34  
35

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.

1 Mr. Gase answered affirmatively.

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

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

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

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

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

9

- 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

