

MINUTES
BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, September 21, 2015
City Hall, Room 310
5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Don Carlson – Chair, Thomas Hoy - Vice-Chair, Rob Marx and Greg Babcock

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Neumeyer, Mike Klaus, Ken Davister, Sandra Bartels, Lawrence Hoffman and Bonita Hoffman.

D. Carlson called the meeting to order and asked the Board if anyone needed to abstain from voting. All stated no. He then asked if any members had gone out to the properties. G. Babcock and T. Hoy stated they went to all three properties. He asked if any members had spoken to anyone regarding the variance requests. All stated no.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the August 17, 2015, minutes of the Board of Appeals.

A motion was made by R. Marx and seconded by T. Hoy to approve the August 17, 2015, minutes of the Board of Appeals. Motion carried. (4-0)

The election of officers will be moved to the end of the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. River East 318, LLC, property owner, proposes to remove an existing monument sign and install a new, taller monument sign in the Downtown Two (D2) District, located at 318 South Washington Street. The applicant requests to deviate from the following requirement in Chapter 13, Green Bay Zoning Code, Section 13-2008, Table 20-1, height of a monument sign.

Ken Davister – River East 318, LLC & Mike Klaus – Colortech of Wisconsin, Inc.: The applicant is proposing to remove the existing monument sign and install a new double faced illuminated monument sign. The owner is in the process of renegotiating with the tenants of the building and they are asking for a different sign for visibility and to have it centered in the front of the building. The existing sign, as you head north on Washington Street, is positioned to where you would miss the driveway before you see any signage so it does make sense to have a larger sign. The applicant would like to keep his tenants, as they have been great tenants, and would like to do whatever it takes to keep them there. The reason for the additional height is due to a brick fence that is 36 in. tall and sits in front of the building. They need to clear the fence so the sign is visible in all directions. The lettering on the sign is the only thing that will be illuminated.

D. Carlson asked P. Neumeyer what is the variance they are asking for. P. Neumeyer stated that this is a monument sign and the maximum height is 6 ft.

G. Babcock asked what the height is of the existing sign. The applicants stated it is 10 ft. The applicant also stated that he had applied for a variance for the current sign when the building was being built. This was due to the brick fence in front of the building.

R. Marx asked why they can't accomplish the new sign within the 10 ft. he already has. K. Davister stated this cannot be done as there will not be enough room for the name "Johnson Bank Building". The tenants have the naming rights on the building, and the name has never reflected on the signage. He agreed to put the name on the sign if he can get the variance for the new sign.

D. Carlson asked P. Neumeyer if there were any issues regarding traffic visibility with the new sign dimensions. P. Neumeyer stated he was not aware of any issues.

D. Carlson asked T. Hoy and G. Babcock if they saw anything at the property site that might prohibit the new sign. They both stated no. G. Babcock stated that there is a larger sign, larger than what is being requested, that is farther down the roadway.

D. Carlson verified with P. Neumeyer that the issue for the variance is not the placement of the sign, but the height of the sign. P. Neumeyer stated that was correct.

A conversation then ensued between Board members. They were in agreement of the variance.

A motion was made by R. Marx and seconded by T. Hoy to grant the variance as requested. Motion carried. (4-0)

2. Sandra M. Bartels, property owner, proposes to widen an existing driveway located in a Low Density Residential (R1) District at 1181 Stuart Street. The applicant requests to deviate from the following requirements in Chapter 13, Green Bay Zoning Code, Section 13-1705, residential driveways and Section 13-1709, setback for parking areas.

Sandra Bartels – 1181 Stuart Street: S. Bartels proposes to widen her driveway from 8ft. to 13.6 ft. because the total width from her home/garage to the sidewalk is 14 ft. Her current tenant has a pick-up truck that is wider than the actual driveway. He has gotten parking tickets for parking on the street and has a hard time parking in the garage. This will also help with parking for future renters that may have more than one vehicle.

A short conversation ensued between the applicant and Board members regarding the site plan for the driveway and clarification to where the truck would be parking. D. Carlson asked S. Bartels if she was looking to concrete everything from the sidewalk to the driveway. She stated that was correct. She stated she cannot expand the driveway the other direction due to the property line.

D. Carlson asked P. Neumeyer what the specific variance is for this request. P. Neumeyer stated there are two components for this request. The first is the taper needed for the drive to create the parking spot and the second is parking within the front setback.

D. Carlson asked S. Bartels if she was changing the curb cut and driveway apron. S. Bartels stated everything will remain the same. D. Carlson then clarified with S. Bartels that it is not so much the widening of the driveway, but additional space to park. She stated that was correct. S. Bartels also stated that in order to park a regular sized vehicle in the driveway, they have to pull so far forward that the vehicle almost hits the garage door in order to stay completely off the sidewalk.

P. Neumeyer asked S. Bartels if there was a second garage on the property. She stated that there was and that is the garage she uses. P. Neumeyer suggested the apron be wider to avoid ruts in the grass from vehicles. D. Carlson stated they could require the applicant to put in a wider driveway. P. Neumeyer stated the widening of the driveway could be an issue due to the trees, as the trees are City owned trees. A conversation then took place regarding additional parking solutions from widening the driveway on either side to widening the apron and curb cut.

R. Marx stated that it is difficult as there are no dimensions listed for the driveway. T. Hoy asked if that information should be collected and brought back next month. D. Carlson stated he would not be in favor for that as they know what she wants to have done. He then informed the applicant that they can give her a variance and have her decide herself if she wished to use it or not, without putting the burden on of actually having to do it. He does not want to condition the variance to have her do extra work that she doesn't want to have done.

A motion was made by R. Marx and seconded by T. Hoy to approve the variance as requested with no further restrictions. Motion carried. (4-0)

3. Lawrence Hoffman, property owner, proposes to rebuild a detached garage/screen porch in a Low Density Residential (R1) District at 524 Northern Avenue. The applicant requests to deviate from the following requirements in Chapter 13, Green Bay Zoning Code, Section 13-615, Table 6-4, side and rear yard setbacks, Section 13-615(c)(1) maximum area within a rear yard and Section 13-609, impervious surface.

Lawrence Hoffman – 524 Northern Ave: L. Hoffman stated that he would like to rebuild his garage. He stated that the garage is sitting on the south and east side property lines of his property. In building the new garage he would like to keep the zero setbacks on the back and side.

R. Marx asked L. Hoffman if he was adding on to the garage. L. Hoffman stated that he is hoping to make the garage 4 ft. deeper than the original 20 ft. He is looking to have extra room at the front of the garage for storage. R. Marx asked if the screened porch will be the same size that the garage will be extended 4 ft. toward the street. L. Hoffman stated that was correct.

D. Carlson stated the variances that are needed are impervious surface, rear and side yard setback, and maximum area in the rear yard. If the garage was placed according to the ordinance, there wouldn't be much room for a garage. He stated that since he has a small lot, there are not many alternatives for the garage.

A conversation then ensued between Board members. There were no issues in granting the variance.

A motion was made by R. Marx and seconded by G. Babcock to grant the variance as requested. Motion carried. (4-0)

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Discussion and action on the annual election of officers, per the City of Green Bay Board of Appeals, Rules of Procedure - Chair, Vice-Chair

P. Neumeyer asked for nominations for Chair for Board of Appeals. T. Hoy nominated D. Carlson as Chair for the Board of Appeals. D. Carlson accepted the nomination.

A motion was made by G. Babcock and seconded by R. Marx to elect D. Carlson as Chair of the City of Green Bay Board of Appeals. Motion carried. (3-0)

D. Carlson nominated T. Hoy as Vice-Chair for Board of Appeals. T. Hoy declined the nomination. D. Carlson then nominated G. Babcock as Vice-Chair for Board of Appeals. G. Babcock accepted the nomination.

A motion was made by T. Hoy and seconded by R. Marx to elect G. Babcock as Vice-Chair for the City of Green Bay Board of Appeals. Motion carried. (3-0)

A motion was made by R. Marx and seconded by G. Babcock to adjourn the meeting at 6:02 pm. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.