



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF  
THE SIGN BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – JANUARY 12, 2010**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Acting Chair Gordon Barnett.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: (5) S. Olsen, A. Milshteyn, C. Brummer,  
G. Barnett, Jr., & E. Adenekan  
Members Absent: (2) D. Eyl & 1 Vacancy  
Staff Present: (2) C. Cheng & B. Acquaviva

**A - APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Moved by C. Brummer, Seconded by S. Olsen, **“To Approve the Agenda as Presented.”**

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - *Unanimous***

**B - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**B-1** Draft Minutes of the September 9, 2009 Regular Session.

Moved by C. Brummer, Seconded by E. Adenekan, **“To Approve the Minutes of the Regular Session Minutes as Amended.”**

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - *PASSED - UNANIMOUS***

**C – APPEALS & ACTION**

**C-1 SBA09-008 - 2340 Dexter Avenue**

**Description & Petitioner Presentation**

Mr. Paul Deters of Metro Sign gave the history of this appeal. The original application was for 8 feet in height, but it was rejected. Unbekownst to us due to the property being combined, the type of sign we actually need is an “Off-Premise” sign.

From the staff report and what we submitted, this is a shared ingress. This was supposed to be developed as one property with one sign. The way the off-site signage stipulations were written, that may not be feasible.

**Staff Report**

**Background:** This appeal was originally heard at the August 11, 2009 Sign Board of Appeals meeting for a setback and height variance. The setback variance was granted; per Code, it has to be 15 feet back, and they were approved for a setback of five feet. When they came back in for the height, it wasn’t mentioned that in April of 2009, this lot was split. It was originally one parcel, but has since been split. This is technically two parcels. This site was designed and approved as one parcel through the Planning Commission and City Council as a Planned Project. It does function as one site, but it is technically two parcels.

52 They do share the parking, the drives, ingress, egress, etc., but because this sign is proposed  
53 to be located off the Maple Road drive, it is considered an “Off Premise” sign.  
54

55 Now per the “Off-Premise” sign code, it has to have variances from another off premise sign –  
56 the billboard. This one would be within 50 feet of another off-premise sign (the billboard). They  
57 need a 3.5 foot height variance and an a variance for being within 500 feet of a residence.  
58

59 **Recommendation:**  
60

61 Staff supports this variance as it would be approved if this were developed as one site.  
62

63 **Questions of Staff by the Board**  
64

65 C. Brummer (To C. Cheng) – So this creates a non-conforming sign (Yes. Keep in mind that  
66 because of the building that is planned for this site but not yet built, the ground sign would be  
67 within 50 feet, which would also need a variance in the future. Per the “Off-Premise” sign code,  
68 it must not be within 50 feet of any on premise sign). So this would be creating a non-  
69 conforming situation, even though if this sign were not there, the building would not have non-  
70 conforming issues. (Correct).  
71

72 Steve Olsen – The billboard that now shows the Maple Shoppes logo – is that billboard  
73 intended for any other use? (Petitioner – That is just for illustration purposes. That billboard is  
74 actually under a sign lease with Adams sign and there are approximately 16 years left to that  
75 lease, so our hands are tied.) Ok, so it’s a general purpose billboard.  
76

77 **MOTION #1**  
78

79 Moved by S. Olsen, Seconded by E. Adenekan, **“In regard to Appeal Number SBA09-008,  
80 2340 Dexter Avenue, the Board grants a variance from Chapter 61, Section 5:509(3)(4) for  
81 an Off-Premise monument sign to be located at the northwest corner of the site between  
82 the driveway and the proposed building.”**  
83

84 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**  
85 **Variance Granted**  
86

87 **D - OLD BUSINESS**  
88

89 C. Brummer – Have we received an adequate answer from either Wendy Rampson and/or the  
90 Mayor or Roger Fraser as to the state of the existence of this Board? (C. Cheng - Unknown  
91 yet, but is in the amendments of the new draft ordinance).  
92

93 **E - NEW BUSINESS**  
94

95 C. Brummer – Stated that she was sorry that Steve Schweer had stepped down as the Chair of  
96 the Sign Board of Appeals. He was remarkably adept at being informed, consistent and timely,  
97 which makes this Board unique. She stated that she wished for the Board to recognize Steve  
98 Schweer for his service on the SBA.  
99

100 **MOTION #1**  
101

102 Moved by C. Brummer, Seconded by S. Olsen, **“To recognize former Sign Board Chair  
103 Steve Schweer for his many years of service on the Sign Board of Appeals and to the  
104 citizens of Ann Arbor.”**

105 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED - UNANIMOUS**

106 C. Brummer – Recognized David Eyl for his service on the SBA.

107  
108 **MOTION #2**

109 Moved by C. Brummer, Seconded by E. Adenekan, “To recognize former Sign Board member  
110 David Eyl for his service to the Board.

111  
112 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED - UNANIMOUS**

113 **F - REPORTS and COMMUNICATIONS –**

114  
115  
116 S. Olsen – Reported on the *Sign Revision Committee* meeting. I haven’t heard anything since  
117 the last meeting was held. Beyond that meeting, the intent was to present the revised draft of  
118 the Ordinance to the city attorney’s office and then to City Council. I don’t know the status of  
119 that, as I haven’t had any communication from Chandra Gochanauer regarding that.

120  
121 G. Barnett – Asked Mr. Olsen if he would give a brief review of that report.

122  
123 C. Brummer (To C. Cheng) – (You will be getting notices before the end of the week. Chandra,  
124 Wendy Rampson and myself have been working on these press releases. You should be  
125 notified by the end of the week. The dates for the public input will be January 27<sup>th</sup> from 2 to  
126 3:30 p.m. and the 28<sup>th</sup> from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m.). Is it still proposed that this Board will go out of  
127 existence? (Yes.)

128  
129 S. Olsen – Is there a copy of the draft ordinance available? (I’ll make certain all of you are  
130 notified of the meetings and the draft). During the three or four meetings that the Committee  
131 had, nowhere in it was a plan to bring any of this information before this board. My participation  
132 appears to have been de-facto.

133  
134 G. Barnett, Jr. – Stated for the record that he is hardly ‘shocked’ that they won’t be coming  
135 before this board for input.

136  
137 **G - AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – None.**

138  
139 **ADJOURNMENT**

140  
141 Moved by A. Milshteyn, Seconded by S. Olsen “**that the meeting be adjourned.**”  
142 Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m. without objection.”

143  
144 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO ADJOURN – PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

145  
146 ***Submitted by: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V***