

## JAMESTOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP

### Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

December 2, 2025 at 5:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Chris VandenHeuvel called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Janae Byker, Scott Brouwer, Dean Smith, Mike VanAanholt, Chris VandenHeuvel. Board member Brouwer had to leave the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

**INVOCATION:** Board member Brouwer opened with the Invocation.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** A motion was made by VandenHeuvel, supported by Smith, to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** A motion was made by Brouwer, supported by VandenHeuvel, to approve the minutes of the November 26, 2024 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting as written. Motion carried unanimously.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- **Chairperson VandenHeuvel** read the request from Midwest Sign Company for a variance to construct a second multi-tenant monument sign located at 3810 and 3830 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, also known as permanent parcel number 70-18-09-100-021. The property is within the Commercial Planned Development Zoning District in which the Ordinance permits only one ground sign per lot. This variance would provide relief from Section 24.14.B.2 of the Jamestown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance (JCTZO).

**A motion was made** by Brouwer, supported by VanAanholt, to open the Public Hearing at 5:33 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

**Kort Alexander**, representative for the property owners and contractor, provided reasons for the variance request. He stated that they have concerns regarding safety and wayfinding with only one sign, due to the requirement by emergency services and the township water and sewer department to have a unique address for each building, and due to the possibility of having twelve tenant brandings on the sign, which would be difficult to read on a busy road. He stated that it is not common to have two separate commercial buildings on one parcel with separate addresses, and that they are being deprived of a right to reasonably display branding on one sign within the size permitted.

**Dan Gordon**, 3400 Adams St., the owner and developer of the property, stated that the 2.7-acre parcel is unique with its extensive road frontage, and that a sign with potentially twelve businesses on it would be difficult to read on a busy road. His opinion was that while the buildings are on one parcel, they are separate buildings and a sign should be allowed for each building.

**A motion was made** by VandenHeuvel, supported by VanAanholt, to close the Public Hearing at 5:53 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

**Board members** deliberated the appeal. There was discussion regarding the Special Use process, and why the sign issue was not addressed at that time by the Planning Commission. Smith stated that the sign issue was not brought up by the applicant during that process, but the Planning Commission would not have had the authority to allow two signs. The applicant stated that the issue of two addresses arose later. There was also discussion

regarding the possibility of a pole sign, which would allow for larger square footage based on road frontage, and the aesthetics of a pole sign with the surrounding properties.

**A motion was made** by Smith, supported by Byker, to grant the request for a variance based on determining that all the required standards for the granting of a variance have been met, and with the condition that both signs be identical to each other in construction:

1. The strict enforcement of the provisions of this Ordinance would cause an unnecessary hardship and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by all other property owners owning property within the same zoning district, as it would create confusion regarding building identification with potentially twelve tenants and two unique building addresses on one sign.
2. There are conditions and circumstances unique to the property which are not similarly applicable to other properties in the same zoning district as there are no other properties in the same zoning district with two buildings and two unique addresses on one parcel.
3. The conditions and circumstances are unique to the property and were not created by the owner or his predecessor, as the property owner did not request unique addresses for each building. The unique addresses were mandated by emergency services and the township.
4. The requested variance will not grant special privileges that are denied other properties similarly situated and in the same zoning district, as buildings on other properties in the same zoning district have one sign per building.
5. The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of this Zoning Ordinance, as other properties in the same zoning district have one sign per building, and the proposed monument signs will be harmonious with surrounding properties.

**Motion carried**-4 ayes, Board member Brouwer absent.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- **2025 Election of Officers**

**A motion was made** by VandenHeuvel, supported by Smith, to elect Mike VanAanholt as Chairperson and Janae Byker as Vice-Chairperson. **Motion carried**-4 ayes, Board member Brouwer absent.

#### **ADJOURN:**

**A motion was made** by VandenHeuvel, supported by Smith, to adjourn the meeting at 6:21 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by,

Maureen Carmody, Recording Secretary  
Zoning Board of Appeals

Minutes approved on

by \_\_\_\_\_

(chair)