

Jamestown Charter Township
Zoning Board of Appeals
August 6, 2019

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Zomerlei with Brouwer opening with prayer.

Board members present: Zomerlei, Brouwer, VanAanhold, Vanden Heuvel, Byker.

Present other than Board: Zoning Administrator Steve Kushion, list attached.

Motion by Vanden Heuvel to approve the agenda, supported by Brouwer. Carried.

Motion by Vanden Heuvel to approve the minutes of 5/14/19, seconded by Byker. Carried.

Before opening the hearing, Zomerlei read the section of the ordinance pertaining to denial of a request and that it cannot come back to the ZBA for a year if nothing has changed from the first request.

Kushion – I do not know of any change from the first request.

Jon Frego, Pioneer Construction – there is no change in the signage. The reason we are here is that the sign company did not tell us of the meeting in May and we should have been told.

Board had no problem to continue.

No public comments.

Zomerlei read in the request from Royal Technologies for a variance to allow a 296 sq. ft. wall sign where the maximum size permitted by ordinance is 139 sq. ft.

Motion to open the hearing by Brouwer, supported by Vanden Heuvel. Carried.

Dwayne Masselink, Interactive Studio LLC – I apologize for not being here for the first time around. We are asking to show a healthy presence in Jamestown.

Jon showed rendering of map showcasing four buildings. He reviewed the signs of their other buildings in other states.

Jon – lots of semis come in daily. Trucks miss the drive and go into the corporate office drive or further west or even back up. The sign location will grab the attention of the drivers and direct them to the correct building. We know we are not in compliance with the ordinance. We want people to know where we are.

P. 2 ZBA hearing 8-6-19

Jake Schwartz, Royal Tech – This is our ‘campus’ location...a cluster of buildings, not just one. This sign is key on the first building. Our sign company does things right. Visible connection is key.

VanAanhold – I drove by. Q1 and Q2 seem to be the same size. I saw a roadside sign that caught my attention. I didn’t see an address.

Jake – we would like to put an address up. If we put signs on all the buildings, it would be more square footage than just the one.

Vanden Heuvel – the main concern I have...I feel, and you can correct me – our rule is to address the individual request. We have five guidelines to follow. I can feel with the truck issue. Other factors don’t apply. The grade of the road visibility is reduced. The top left corner of the sign, I can see. How will a bigger sign address this?

Jake – an amount of landscaping is required. Grass, bushes, trees grow and will block the sign.

VanAanhold – Q1 building is blocked by trees.

Byker - #1 – unnecessary hardship. I feel applies with the truck issue. Feel a larger sign might help. Qualifies with #1. (Five criteria of ordinance that have to be met)

Jon – a drive is shared between Q1 and Q2.

Jake – Q1 has 160–200 ins and outs a day. Q2 has between 340-400 trucks in and out. The trucks slide by the buildings. Q3 has 340 employees. It’s busy.

Zomerlei – I noticed the temp. signs and the hill next to you – Kent Quality Foods. It’s not mowed and could obstruct view. We have an ordinance that we have to abide by.

Jon – I feel that we meet #1 – hardships of grade building is set – not good visual. #2 meets with the campus concept. A good size address will help. And uniqueness is that the building is taller. #3 meets the grade issue. #4 is unique with topography and campus concept. And #5 - it is only two feet above the ordinance using our method of calculation. We could have a box method, but individual illumination is better.

Vanden Heuvel – box method is in our ordinance.

VanAanhold – have you had any accidents there?

Jake – No.

P. 3 ZBA hearing August 6, 2019

Vanden Heuvel – the sign will look pretty big with closeness to the road. I feel it is not a hardship that requires exception. I am sympatric to your concerns, but we can't take that into consideration.

Zomerlei – I kind of feel the same way. The sign ordinance is based on liner feet. Everyone has the same size. You maybe could meet one or two conditions, but definitely not all.

Vanden Heuvel - #4 not granting special privileges would open up to other requests and how do you turn them down.

Zomerlei – now days with GPS, you know 500 feet before you reach the location that you are getting close.

Vanden Heuvel – by granting this request, it will make this easy to skate around.

VanAanhold – I get the safety issue and landscaping, but it still does not meet the ordinance.

Motion by Byker to approve the 296 sq. ft. wall sign, supported by Zomerlei. Yeas – Brouwer, Byker, VanAanhold. Nays- Zomerlei, Vanden Heuvel. Motion passed. Reasons for approval:

- 1] Meets #1 because of crest of hill
- 2] Meets #2 the hill and campus are unique to property
- 3] Meets #3 because crest of hill was not created by Royal
- 4] Meets #4 because of berm of neighbor - grass
- 5] Square footage of sign very close to ordinance

Motion by Vanden Heuvel to adjourn, seconded by Brouwer. Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Oosterink, Recording Sec.
Zoning Board of Appeals

Minutes approved on _____ by _____
Chairman

