

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS AGENDA

City of Birmingham
Commission Room of the Municipal Building
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan
Tuesday, March 14, 2017
7:30 PM

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY
3. APPEALS

	Address	Petitioner	Appeal	Type/Reason
1.	35975 WOODWARD	AUGUST, LLC	17-06	DIMENSIONAL

4. CORRESPONDENCE
5. GENERAL BUSINESS
6. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA
7. ADJOURNMENT

Title VI

Persons with disabilities that may require assistance for effective participation in this public meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office at the number (248) 530-1880, or (248) 644-5115 (for the hearing impaired) at least one day before the meeting to request help in mobility, visual, hearing, or other assistance.

Las personas con incapacidad que requieren algún tipo de ayuda para la participación en esta sesión pública deben ponerse en contacto con la oficina del escribano de la ciudad en el número (248) 530-1800 o al (248) 644-5115 (para las personas con incapacidad auditiva) por lo menos un día antes de la reunión para solicitar ayuda a la movilidad, visual, auditiva, o de otras asistencias. (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964).

The public entrance during non-business hours is through the police department at the Pierce Street entrance only. Individuals requiring assistance entering the building should request aid via the intercom system at the parking lot entrance gate on Henrietta Street.

La entrada pública durante horas no hábiles es a través del Departamento de policía en la entrada de la calle Pierce solamente. Las personas que requieren asistencia entrando al edificio debe solicitar ayudan a través del sistema de intercomunicación en la puerta de entrada de estacionamiento en la calle de Henrietta.

**BIRMINGHAM BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2017
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan**

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA") held on Tuesday, February 14, 2017. Vice-Chairman Randolph Judd convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. He introduced the newest member of the BZA who was in the audience, Kristen Bairdi. Vice-Chairman Judd appointed Peter Lyon as Temporary Chairman for this evening.

Present: Temporary Chairman Peter Lyon; Board Members Kevin Hart, Jeffery Jones, Randolph Judd, John Miller, Erik Morganroth; Alternate Board Member Jason Canvasser

Absent: Chairman Charles Lillie

Administration: Matthew Baka, Sr. Planner
Bruce Johnson, Building Official
Mario Mendoza, Recording Secretary
Scott Worthington, Assistant Building Official

The temporary chairman welcomed everyone and explained the BZA procedure to the audience. Additionally, he noted that the members of the Zoning Board are appointed by the City Commission and are volunteers. They sit at the pleasure of the City Commission to hear appeals from petitioners who are seeking variances from the City's Zoning Ordinance. Under Michigan law, a dimensional variance requires four affirmative votes from this board, and the petitioner must show a practical difficulty. A land use variance requires five affirmative votes and the petitioner has to show a hardship. There are no land use variances called for this evening. Also, appeals are heard by the board as far as interpretations or rulings. Four affirmative votes are required to reverse an interpretation or ruling. There are no interpretations on this evening's agenda.

T# 02-08-17

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BZA MEETING OF JANUARY 10, 2017

Motion by Mr. Jones

Seconded by Mr. Morganroth to approve the Minutes of the BZA meeting of January 10, 2017 as amended.

Mr. Judd made the following correction:

Page 1 - Vice-Chairman Randolph Judd convened the meeting.
Move the second paragraph above the first paragraph and then the new second paragraph should read: "The Temporary Chairman welcomed. . ."

Mr. Jones corrected the following:

Page 6 - Last paragraph, last sentence should say "Mr. Jones moves to deny . . ."

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Morganroth, Jones, Canvasser, Hart, Judd, Lyon, Miller

Nays: None

Absent: Lillie

T# 02-09-17

**2100 E. MAPLE RD.
(Appeal 17-01)**

The owners of the property known as 2100 E. Maple Rd. are requesting the following variances to allow four (4) signs at the Whole Foods Market:

- A. **Chapter 86, Article 01, section 1.04 B General Sign Standards** states that for all buildings, including multi-tenant office or retail buildings, the combined area of all types of signs shall not exceed 1 sq. ft. (1.5 sq. ft. for addresses on Woodward Ave.) for each linear foot of principal building frontage. The principal building frontage for this building is 265.5 ft. allowing 265.5 sq. ft. of signage. The applicant is proposing 791.8 sq. ft. of signage; therefore, a variance of 526.3 sq. ft. is requested. **The applicant has revised the sign plan to propose a total of 422.99 sq. ft. of signage. Therefore a variance of 157.416 sq. ft. is requested.**
- B. **Chapter 86, Article 01 Table B, Name Letter Signs** states that for buildings with more than 100 linear feet of building frontage, the total area of all signs placed on walls other than the principal frontage shall not exceed 100 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing 556.29 sq. ft. of signage on secondary elevations; therefore, a variance of 456.29 sq. ft. is requested. **The applicant has revised the sign plan to propose a total of 231.09 sq. ft. of signage on secondary elevations. Therefore a variance of 131.09 sq. ft. is requested.**
- C. **Chapter 86, Article 01 Table B, Name Letter Signs** states that the maximum height of name letter signs is limited to 24 in. The applicant is proposing two signs at 13 ft. 1 in. and two signs at 6 ft. 5 in.; therefore, variances of 11 ft. 1 in. and 4 ft. 5 in. respectively are requested. **The applicant has revised the sign plan to propose two signs at 8 ft. 3 in. in height and one sign at 4 ft. 5 1/2 in. in height. Therefore a variance of 6 ft.**

3 in. in height for the two signs and 2 ft. 5 1/2 in. in height for the smaller sign respectively are requested.

- D. **Chapter 86, Article 01 section 1.05 (K) 6, Permanent Business Sign and Broadcast Media Device Standards** states that no wall signs shall project more than 9 in. measured from the wall to which it is attached to the outer surface. **The applicant is proposing two signs that will project 11 in.; therefore a variance of 2 in. is requested.**
- E. **Chapter 86, Article 01 section 1.05 (K) 6, Permanent Business Sign and Broadcast Media Device Standards** states that no electrical raceway shall have a thickness greater than 4 in. **The applicant is proposing electrical raceways that are 6 in. thick therefore a variance of 2 in. is requested.**

This property is zoned B-2 General Business.

Mr. Baka recalled that on January 10, 2017 the applicant appeared before the BZA. At that time the BZA requested that the applicant appear in front of the Design Review Board ("DRB") in order to obtain their input on the proposed signage. The DRB recognized that this location was unique and suggested that the applicant revise the sign plan in accordance with the sign regulations that govern properties on Woodward Ave. The signage standards along Woodward Ave. allow 1.5 sq. ft. for each foot of linear width of the building. Also, signs along Woodward Ave. are allowed to be 3 ft. tall. The applicant is now returning to the BZA with a revised plan. However, the overall height of the new proposal still would not comply with the height limitations on Woodward Ave.

It was noted that the Woodward Ave. standards apply to variance requests A and C. Further, neither Papa Joe's nor Kroger's (competitors of Whole Foods) was granted variances for their signage. Mr. Baka explained that the applicant has eliminated the sign on the west side of the building and instead a two-sided ground sign is proposed. The ground sign meets all of the Ordinance requirements except for the fact they are exceeding their cumulative square footage.

Vice-Chairman Judd suggested the applicant could benefit by reducing or eliminating the sign at the rear of the building that faces the parking lot. He finds it to be unnecessary. Mr. Baka stated that Staff does its best to be honest and realistic with potential applicants, but also makes them aware that it is their right to apply for variances.

Mr. John Streetz with Doyle Signs, Inc. appeared for this request on behalf of Whole Foods. Mr. Streetz passed out four attachments illustrating the sequence of events of Doyle Signs' communications with the City and how they came to revise their drawings and bring their signage closer to the recommendations of the DRB. Tonight they hope

to get approval from the BZA for what they feel is appropriate identification of the property. He went on to describe why the property is unique and noted they have accommodated many of the recommendations of the DRB. Further, he summarized changes they have made since their last submittal and asked the BZA to apply the Woodward Ave. guidelines to this location. The appearance of the proposed signs is consistent with Whole Foods Market's world-wide branding in regard to font and style, but is still in keeping with the fundamental architectural character of the building. Granting the variances will result in substantial justice being done and the rights of other property owners will not be impaired. If the variances are not granted, serious hardships will be suffered.

Mr. Streetz advised Vice-Chairman Judd that the sign in the back facing the parking lot is intended for the main entrance as well as to allow visibility from the railroad tracks. Mr. Judd noted that if the word "Market" was eliminated it would help their situation. Mr. Streetz replied that "Market" is an important aspect of their branding and Whole Foods did not want to remove it. Vice-Chairman Judd concluded the sign at the rear and the word "Market" are unnecessary and urged Whole Foods to reconsider their position.

Mr. Miller commented that the materials the applicant has provided do not allow him to make a logical determination.

Mr. Canvasser asked why at a minimum the Woodward Ave. zoning requirements cannot be complied with. Mr. Streetz answered if they complied with every aspect of that Code they would not be able to accommodate the architecture of the building with signs, or achieve proper identification for the property.

Mr. Jones observed it is good that the applicant tried to comply with the Ordinance, but they are still asking for relatively substantial variances.

Mr. Morganroth wanted to see how the DRB recommendations would impact the overall look of the signage and he could not see that from the materials provided.

No one from the audience wished to comment on this matter.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Judd

And seconded in regard to Appeal 17-01, 2100 E. Maple Rd., Whole Foods. The petitioner seeks a dimensional variance pursuant to the Sign Ordinance, Article 02 (a) (1-4). The petitioner has appeared before numerous boards: the Planning Board, the Board of Zoning Appeals twice, and upon the BZA's request appeared before the Design Review Board ("DRB"). As a result of the appearance before the DRB their Minutes reflect specific recommendations including the shrinkage of the signs, also the elimination of certain symbols, such as a leaf; but more specifically, the elimination of the term "Market," so that "Whole Foods Market" would become "Whole Foods."

The petitioner has responded with his presentation tonight accepting some of the recommendations of the DRB, but specifically declining to change the branding portion of the signs that include "Market" and also refusing to shrink sign A-2 even though he has expressed the belief that sign is somewhat superfluous and does not require that much square footage since it faces a parking lot.

The Signage Ordinance dealing with variances requires that there are four elements. Vice-Chairman Judd does not feel in this case the petitioner has proven the alleged practical difficulties which are peculiar to this piece of property. He can understand certain aspects dealing with this location near Maple Rd., but he does not feel that meets the requirements of this Section.

Vice-Chairman Judd does not think denying this would be materially detrimental to the adjacent property owners dealing with the increase in signage. Further he thinks that the granting of the variance would be contrary to the general objectives of this Chapter in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. Additionally he thinks that denying this variance would result in substantial justice being done considering the public benefits intended by this Chapter.

He also notes in referring back to the variance section dealing with the BZA that direct references are made to mitigation. He does not feel that the petitioner in this case has sufficiently shown any mitigation that would permit him to make a motion to grant the variances. Based on those reasons, Vice-Chairman Judd would move to deny.

Mr. Hart observed that several prior businesses at this location have failed. One of the reasons was the proximity to the railroad tracks which cuts off the entire view from the west side of the site. Heading east on Maple Rd. there are probably three seconds to respond to any kind of signage. Therefore he thinks it is very important to take into consideration the encumbrances on this site and the practical difficulties of trying to run a successful business there. He can't emphasize enough how this site is a totally unique piece of property in the City of Birmingham. Therefore he will not support the motion.

Mr. Miller said it is hard for him to support the applicant's appeal if he really does not know the magnitude of what he is supporting. He will support the motion to deny.

Vice-Chairman Judd noted that if ever there was a destination site it would be Whole Foods. Most people who are going there are doing so quite deliberately.

Mr. Jones said the criteria for this board's actions are to find within the Ordinances the parameters of that which allows them to grant any variance. No one on this board doesn't want that business to succeed, but that is not the board's job. Their job is to

review the Ordinances. So he will reluctantly support the motion because the criteria has not been met for the board to grant the variances.

Acting Chairman Lyon indicated he will support the motion. Removing the south sign at the rear of the property would go a long way to mitigate the size of the variance needed. Because of the aforementioned reasons he supports the motion as presented.

Motion to deny carried, 6-1.

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Judd, Canvasser, Jones, Lyon, Miller, Morganroth

Nays: Hart

Absent: Lillie

There was no support for a lesser variance that the board could potentially give the appellant tonight. Mr. Miller indicated that when the appellant comes back the board would like to graphically see the extent of their hardship.

T# 02-09-17

**630 HENRIETTA
(Appeal 17-02)**

The owners of the property known as 630 Henrietta are requesting the following variances to construct a second-story addition:

A. **Chapter 126, Article 02, section 2.10** allows a maximum of 30% lot coverage. The existing lot coverage is 30.9% (1636 sq. ft.) and the proposed lot coverage is 33.1% (1749 sq. ft.); therefore, a variance of 3.1% (163 sq. ft.) is requested.

B. **Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.74** requires a minimum of 14 ft. between principal structures. The existing and proposed distance to the adjacent house is 10.16 ft.; therefore, a variance of 3.84 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-3.

Mr. Worthington noted the house was constructed in 1987 and a variance of 0.35 ft was obtained for construction of 600 & 630 Henrietta for distance between principal structures.

Mr. Ben Heller, Morgan-Heller Associates, represented Bruce and Lee Sack, the homeowners. Mr. Heller explained the distance between houses where they are asking

for the variance is a pre-existing, non-conforming situation. The Ordinance has changed since the house was built and now requires a greater distance between the buildings.

The recessed space at the entry door is not covered and tends to collect snow and ice. They propose to extend the covered arch space and create coverage at the entry. The neighbor on the right supports the design and feels it will be an enhancement.

Mr. Miller indicated he is searching for the hardship that the applicant has to overcome in order to get an extra 163 sq. ft. of lot coverage. Mr. Heller replied that extending the covered arch space back to the front door counts as lot coverage. The home as it exists is almost 1% over allowable lot coverage. So the request is about 2/3 of that 163 sq. ft. Not allowing the coverage leaves the applicants with a safety hazard. Because the extension sits tightly between the already extended part of the house they really are not hurting anyone.

Mr. Hart pointed out that the open space will not change by covering the already existing concrete. It will not add to the impervious drainage situation. Mr. Heller explained that any coverage short of what they propose would not achieve the desired effect. Mr. Morganroth said if a room was not being added on the second floor and they wanted to extend the roof, there would still be the same concern for lot coverage.

No one in the audience wished to comment.

Motion by Mr. Miller

Seconded by Mr. Hart to approve the variances for 630 Henrietta, Appeal 17-02. The problem of Variance B was not self-created. It is how these unusual homes are set: Siamese twins right next to each other. So, that was a pre-existing circumstance.

Mr. Miller thinks the unusual condition of walking up to the house being under cover; then as you approach the door suddenly you are wide open and the roof is pitching right down over that front door would be a concern for anyone. So he thinks that it is reasonable to have cover over the front door. And in doing so, it causes you to go for this variance.

Even though the houses are rather close together, Mr. Miller thinks that it is not a negative since the houses are that close together further back in the lot. It would just be extending the closeness somewhat. So Mr. Miller would say that it is reasonable substantial justice. Conformity would be burdensome in that it is a difficult situation over the front door.

Just as an aside, when he first read this he penciled in "no." Then he walked past a few times and saw the condition, and it is a surprisingly difficult condition to visualize if you don't actually see what is going on there. Then when he saw what was there he began to change his mind. He didn't even consider the fact that the roof sloped in; but when it was mentioned that also adds to the argument.

Therefore, Mr. Miller would submit to approve the drawings as submitted.

Temporary Chairman Lyon said he is struggling to support this motion. He understands the need to cover the porch for safety; however, he does not understand the need for the all-season room on the second-floor balcony. He supposes that is a different way to do a roof. From the street a lot more front facade has been added. It goes against the size of the building and that is where lot coverage comes into effect. There are issues that need to be rectified but he doesn't think they need to be rectified with the addition of more living space above the area they are trying to cover.

Vice- Chairman Judd advised he will not support the motion for those same reasons. Safety is somewhat enticing in this case, but there are other ways to handle safety. He thinks the variances are being driven by the desire for more living space on the second story.

Mr. Hart thought that part of the design of the house has to give substantial justice to the neighboring properties. By adding the second-story living space, the way the roof and gutters will work and the way they will push the rain water away from the house in a seamless fashion will allow for the house to present itself well to the neighbors. It is important not to come up with some kind of haphazard idea for them. This is an existing non-conforming house and he thinks the request is reasonable. Therefore he supports the motion.

Motion carried, 4-2.

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Miller, Hart, Canvasser, Jones, Morganroth

Nays: Judd, Lyon

Absent: Lillie

T# 02-10-17

**239 SUFFIELD
(Appeal 17-03)**

The owners of the property known as 239 Suffield are requesting the following variance to construct a one-story rear addition:

A. **Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.74** requires a minimum of 30 ft. between principal structures. The existing house is 21.6 ft. from the adjacent house and the proposed addition is 27 ft. from the adjacent house; therefore, a variance of 3 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-1.

Mr. Worthington advised the house was built in 1929. The rear bump-out of the house will be torn down and the new footprint will be further from the adjacent house, thereby improving the existing non-conformity. The new addition will be single-story, similar to what is presently there. The adjacent lot at 215 Suffield is 80 ft. wide and is only required to have 20 ft. between principal structures.

Ms. Glenda Meads, Glenda Meads Architects, was present to represent Mr. and Mrs. K. Albertie, the property owners. She explained that looking down the driveway, the existing addition cannot be seen, and certainly the addition that is proposed to be 5 ft. further back won't be seen. There have been no complaints by the neighbors and as was said, they are asking for something that is less than what exists.

No one from the audience wished to speak on this appeal.

Motion by Mr. Morganroth

Seconded by Mr. Jones regarding Appeal 17-03, 239 Suffield, to approve the request for a variance with respect to Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.74 requiring a minimum of 30 ft. between principal structures. The existing house is 21 ft. from the adjacent house and the proposed addition is 27 ft.; therefore a 3 ft. variance is requested.

The current non-conforming sunroom actually is closer to the adjacent house and so this change is actually decreasing the proximity between the two structures. He is in support of that for the reason that he sees mitigation with this new structure being further from the other house. For that reason he would support the variance and tie the motion to the plans submitted.

Mr. Jones said he supports the motion for the reason that it will do substantial justice to the neighborhood. The difficulty relates to the different size of the lots that are adjoining. The immediate neighbor is required to be 20 ft. from the lot line, whereas the appellant is required to be 30 ft. The requested variance improves the nonconformity. He does not believe this problem is self-created.

Mr. Hart stated that all of the issues have been covered in the presentation and it has been done very well. He will support the motion. Temporary Chairman Lyon said he

also will support the motion. The adjacent 80 ft. and 120 ft. lots require a different distance between buildings and the proposal lessens the condition.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Morganroth, Jones, Canvasser, Hart, Judd, Lyon, Miller

Nays: None

Absent: Lillie

T# 02-11-17

**952 RIDGEDALE
(Appeal 17-04)**

The owners of the property known as 952 Ridgedale are requesting the following variance to construct a rear addition:

A. **Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.03 D.** requires a minimum of 10 ft. between the principal structure and detached garage. The existing house is 11 ft. from the detached garage and the addition will be 9.25 ft. away; therefore, a variance of .75 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-2.

Mr. Worthington explained the house was built in 1922 and the detached garage was built prior to 1983. The applicants propose to expand the back of the house. They will conform with all of the setbacks on their property and will not adversely affect any of the neighboring properties.

Ms. Glenda Meads, Glenda Meads Architects, represented Bruce and Martha Jeshurun, the homeowners. The proposed very modest addition flushes out the back of the house to have the east match with the west. They are cantilevering the addition to afford as much space as possible. They looked at other options to knock a piece off the corner of the garage but none of them would work without compromising the size of the garage door. None of the neighbors have any complaints. She submitted three letters in support.

It was discussed the addition would not cause a problem with the Fire Code. Mr. Hart explained the whole intention of the 10 ft. restriction is to keep people from putting garages in that don't function. Mr. Johnson advised that fire ratings are addressed now with fire protection on the interior garage walls and garages can be attached.

Members of the audience were invited to speak to this matter.

Mr. Curt Stagner, 932 Ridgedale, the property closest to the garage and the addition, voiced his support the requested variance.

Motion by Mr. Canvasser

Seconded by Mr. Jones in regard to 952 Ridgedale, Appeal 17-04, request for a variance pursuant to Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.03 D. The requested variance is for 1.75 ft. He would move to grant the variance. He thinks that this is not a self-created issue. It is due to the unique circumstances of the property. This is, in terms of requested variances, as minimal as they come. It would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to the property owners in the area. Also he thinks strict compliance in this case would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome. Therefore he moves to approve the variance, tied to the plans submitted.

Mr. Miller expressed his support of the motion. It is the location of the existing garage far forward on the lot that is causing the hardship. The need for a variance is based on the pre-existing condition of the garage location.

Motion carried,

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Canvasser, Jones, Judd, Hart, Lyon, Miller, Morganroth

Nays: None

Absent: Lillie

T# 02-12-17

**1331 W. MAPLE RD.
(Appeal 17-05)**

The owners of the property known as 1331 W. Maple Rd. are requesting the following variance to construct a 6 ft. high fence in the front yard:

A. Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.11 limits the fence height to 3 ft. in the required front yard. The existing 6 ft. fence will be replaced with a 6 ft. fence in the same location; therefore a variance of 3 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-1.

Mr. Worthington advised the 6 ft. high fence along the side lot lines is allowed per the exception 4.11 A. 2. b. The fence that is parallel to the front lot line will be replaced in the same location with the same height. The City has very few instances where a single lot is located between two corner lots. The interior lot is getting squeezed.

Mr. Stuart Moutrie, the applicant, spoke on behalf of his appeal. They want to replace the existing fence that has been up for close to thirty years and is coming apart. The proposed replacement which is wood grained and taupe in color looks very nice. Their current 6 ft. high fence on Maple Rd. is flanked by a 6 ft. fence on both the east and west side of their property, and there are both brick and vinyl 6 ft. fences directly across Maple Rd. to the north. He has letters in support from his adjacent neighbors who have 6 ft. fences. Living near a main road, the privacy and security of a 6 ft. fence is paramount.

Mr. Hart pointed out that Maple Rd. is actually the applicant's side yard.

The Temporary Chairman asked for comments from the audience.

Mr. Lou Baukman, 117 Arlington, said he is familiar with the fence because he helped to install it in 1983. This property is unusual because both the front and back end are against backyards. The main reason the fence was constructed was to block the headlights on Maple Rd. The other reason for the fence is to match the height of the adjacent fences rather than going down 3 ft. as the Ordinance states.

Motion by Mr. Miller

Seconded by Mr. Morganroth regarding 1331 W. Maple Rd., Appeal 17-05. This situation certainly wasn't self-created; it is a very unique circumstance of a side yard being designated as a front yard. But it is actually the side yard of the house; it is along Maple Rd. and very unique in that regard.

The variance would certainly do substantial justice to the property as well as to the adjacent properties which have 6 ft. high fences to the east and to the west. Strict compliance with the Ordinance would cause the existing 6 ft. high fence to be re-built at a 3 ft. height. For that area along Maple Rd., Mr. Miller believes that would be relatively unreasonable for the property owner.

So for those reasons, Mr. Miller would move to approve this appeal, based on the drawings as submitted.

Mr. Jones believed that keeping the fence at that height will do substantial justice to the neighborhood from the standpoint of the uniqueness of the property and to carry the line between the two streets. This unique circumstance justifies the variance.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Miller, Morganroth, Canvasser, Hart, Jones, Judd, Lyon

Nays: None

Absent: Lillie

CORRESPONDENCE (none)

T# 02-13-17

GENERAL BUSINESS (none)

T# 02-14-17

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA (no one spoke)

T# 02-15-17

ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, the board members passed a motion to adjourn at 10 p.m.

Bruce R. Johnson, Building Official

CASE DESCRIPTION

35975 Woodward 17-06

Hearing date: March 14, 2017

The owners of the property known as 35975 Woodward are requesting the following variance to construct a two-story commercial building:

- A. Chapter 126, Article 03, Section 3.04 B (4) requires a minimum of 10 foot rear yard setback shall be provided from the midpoint of the alley, except that the Planning Board may allow this setback to be reduced or eliminated. In the absence of an alley, the rear setback shall be equal to that of an adjacent, preexisting building. As no alley is present, the nearest adjacent building has a rear setback of 13'. The applicant is proposing a 47' rear setback; therefore, a variance of 34' is requested.

Staff Notes: The building is proposed to front on Woodward. There are no adjacent buildings that also front on Woodward; therefore, the nearest preexisting building, Douglas Cleaners, is used to determine the rear setback. That building is located at 900 N. Old Woodward.

This property is zoned B2B, General Business.

Matthew Baka

Matthew Baka
Senior Planner

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2017
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan**

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on January 25, 2017. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams; Alternate Board Member Daniel Share

Absent: Board Member Gillian Lazar; Alternate Board Member Lisa Prasad

Administration: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

01-12-17

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OF JANUARY 11, 2017**

Motion by Mr. Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Williams to approve the Planning Board Minutes of January 11, 2017 as presented.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Boyle, Williams, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Abstain: Share

Absent: Lazar

01-13-17

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS (none)

3. Verify that the northwest most space in the angled parking area is 180 sq. ft. in order to be counted as an off-street parking space.
4. Install trees along the frontage of the subject parcel or obtain a waiver from the Staff Arborist;
5. Obtain a permit from M-DOT for changes in the right-of-way along Woodward Avenue;
6. Screen all roof-top units;
7. Add a bike rack with administrative approval;
8. Review with the Police Dept. or appropriate body the possibility of a no left turn from the alley onto Davis; and
9. This board is supportive of the Woodward Ave. Action Plan for future implementation that the applicant is aware of.

There were no public comments at 8:26 p.m.

Mr. Koseck announced he would not support the motion because of the choice of brick.

Motion carried, 6-1.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Whipple-Boyce, Williams, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Share

Nays: Koseck

Absent: Lazar

01-16-17

2. 100 - 450 Woodland Villa Ct. (existing Woodland Villa Condos)
Request for Final Site Plan Review for addition of gate across Woodland Villa Ct.
(postponed from November 9, 2016)

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce to receive and file the e-mail from Richard Rattner dated Tuesday, January 24, 2017 requesting withdrawal.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share

Nays: None

Absent: Lazar

01-17-17

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

1. 35975 Woodward Ave. (currently vacant, former gas station)
Preliminary Site Plan Review for new two-story office/retail building (postponed from January 11, 2017)

Ms. Ecker advised that the parcel located at 35975 Woodward Ave., the former site of a gasoline service station, is currently vacant. In 2005, the gas station closed its operations and the remaining structure was later demolished in 2013. Construction of the existing parking lot was completed without site plan approval roughly one year ago. The applicant is proposing to demolish a portion of the surface lot to construct a new two-story building with on-site parking and various other site improvements.

The site has a total land area of .538 acres and is located at the southwest corner of Woodward Ave. and Oak. The parcel is zoned B-2B General Commercial and also D-2 in the Downtown Overlay District. It is proposed that the first floor of the building will contain a lobby, commercial space, and a two-car private parking garage. The second floor will be primarily office space. Since the site is located outside of the Downtown Parking Assessment District, on-site parking has been proposed in the rear for the ground floor and the second floor. The applicant is now proposing a 5,500 sq. ft. floor plate for each of the two stories above grade, plus the basement, for a total of 16,500 sq. ft. of gross space.

In accordance with Article 3, section 3.04 (B) (4) of the Zoning Ordinance, in the absence of an alley, the rear setback shall be equal to that of the adjacent, pre-existing building. The adjacent building, Douglas Cleaners, appears to have a 14 ft. rear setback. ***The applicant must verify the rear setback on the Douglas Cleaners building and match that, or obtain a variance through the BZA.***

In accordance with Article 04, section 4.20 LA-01 (G), the applicant is required to provide 11 street trees or obtain a variance from the BZA. The Staff Arborist may waive the full street tree requirement upon a determination that there is inadequate green space to support such trees. The applicant has had discussions with the Staff Arborist.

Design Review

At this time the applicant has provided elevation drawings, but specific details or specification sheets on the materials have not yet been provided. The plans submitted indicate that the applicant is proposing to utilize the following materials:

- Slate roof;
- Cut stone cornice;
- Aluminum clad windows;
- Stone (panels below windows);
- Brick soldier course above first floor windows;
- Brick (exterior walls), and
- Steel and glass (entrance canopy).

In response to Mr. Share, Ms. Ecker affirmed that the cobra light fixture near the driveway could be removed if it is on the applicant's property. Ms. Whipple-Boyce hoped to have a crosswalk at Woodward Ave. and Oak. Mr. Williams thought a speed limit of 35 mph should be in force along Woodward Ave. Mr. Boyle said that as a City, Birmingham is beholden to improving pedestrian safety on that junction. Mr. Koseck pointed out two parking spaces that could be rotated clockwise 90 degrees in order to simplify backing out.

Mr. Victor Saroki, Architect for the proposed development, was present along with Ms. Yvonne Yaldoo, Project Architect, Mr. Michael Dul, Landscape Architect, and Ms. Jamie Rae Turnbull, Owner's Representative. Civil Engineer for the project is PEA and SME is their Environmental and Technical Consultant.

Mr. Saroki advised that the building is two stories in the D-2 Zoning District. The basement will be primarily for mechanicals and storage. The finished ceiling there is below 7 ft. 6 in., so it is not habitable and will not count toward their parking requirement. There are serious environmental issues on the site, and it has had a tremendous amount of fill added over the years. The third challenge is the cross-access easements with Douglas Cleaners that are recorded and in place.

Mr. Saroki pointed out they have reduced the width of all vehicular and pedestrian access openings in the screenwall to no more than 25 ft. in width. They are eliminating two curb cuts and adhering to all of the streetscape requirements. The parking requirement for the 9,800 sq. ft. usable area of the building excluding the basement and garage space is 33 spaces and they have 34 on-site.

The idea of a uniform rear yard line is quite difficult on this site. They would not be able to meet the parking requirement if they moved their building back to match the rear yard setback at Douglas Cleaners; therefore they plan to seek a variance. Mr. Saroki went on to highlight the high quality materials and where they will be used on the building.

He advised the Staff Arborist has agreed to waive the full street tree requirement because it may obstruct some of the views. They are more than happy to extend their sidewalk over to the potential crosswalk at Woodward Ave. and Oak when the location is determined. If they had to remove all of the contaminated soils on-site for underground parking, just the removal of the soils would be over \$3 million. Therefore, it became cost prohibitive. Soils for the basement will be removed and liners installed.

Mr. Saroki was good with turning the two parking spaces as Mr. Koseck suggested. If the cobra light is on their property they will remove it.

Chairman Clein asked him to coordinate with the owner of Douglas Cleaners to reshape the geometry of the approach coming around the corner.

Mr. Boyle asked about the use of the building. Mr. Saroki answered the second floor will be office and house a private foundation for the owner, Mr. Art Van Elslander, who recently sold his business. He explained how the curb cut on Woodward Ave. functions very well for the site (right in and right out only). If they were to do an L-shaped building in order to hide the parking, he is sure the parking requirements could not be met. Also, it would mean that the building would have to be very narrow and long, which is not very functional.

Chairman Clein thought this is a beautiful building and a beautiful design. Further discussion concluded if the zoning were changed and they could go up another story and fill up the site more, parking would have to go underground and there could be other issues.

Ms. Jamie Rae Turnbull explained that currently Douglas Cleaners does not have the ability to exit onto Woodward Ave. The previous owner of the subject site padlocked it.

Mr. Boyle observed the presence of a garage on the west elevation makes for a somewhat unusual condition. Mr. Saroki explained their owner requested the garage as a function for the building. They worked it into the elevation and it seems to work with the window fenestration and pattern.

The chairman called for comments from members of the public at 9:43 p.m.

Mr. Dave Underdown, the owner of the Douglas Cleaners property, described the history of his building and expressed his support of the proposed site plan.

Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce

Seconded by Mr. Boyle based on a review of the site plans submitted the Planning Board recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Plan Review for 35975 Woodward Ave. with the following conditions:

- 1. Verify the rear setback of the adjacent property and match that with the subject development or obtain a variance. The Planning Board supports the variance;**
- 2. Submit specification sheets for all mechanical equipment and a roof plan;**
- 3. Obtain a waiver from the Staff Arborist of two street trees;**
- 4. Planning Board approves the use of in-grade upward illuminating fixtures;**
- 5. Applicant comply with improvements to the sidewalk and ramp when the light controlled pedestrian crossing is added to the intersection of Oak and Woodward Ave.; and**
- 6. Comply with the requirements of all City departments.**

No one in the audience wished to comment at 9:50 p.m.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share, Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Lazar

01-18-17

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (no public was left)

01-19-17

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND COMMUNICATIONS

a. Communications

- The Long-Range Planning Session will be held on Saturday, January 28th.

Application Date: 2-10-17Hearing Date: 3-14-17Received By: BMAppeal # 17-06

Board of Zoning Appeals Application

Type of Variance: Interpretation _____ Dimensional X Land use _____ Sign _____ Admin review _____

Property Information:

Street address: 35975 WOODWARD AVE		Sidwell Number: 19-25-179-001
Owners name: AUGUST, LLC (C/O DAVID P. LARSEN)		Phone # : (313) 393-7575
Owners address: 1901 ST. ANTOINE STREET		Email: DLARSEN@BODMANLAW.COM
City: State: DETROIT, MI		Zip code: 48226
Contact person: DAVID P. LARSEN, BODMAN PLC		Phone #: (313) 393-7575

Petitioner Information:

Petitioner name: SAROKI ARCHITECTURE		Phone #: (248) 258-5707
Petitioner address: 430 N. OLD WOODWARD		Email: VSAROKI@SAROKIARCHITECTURE.COM
City: BIRMINGHAM	State: MI	Zip Code: 48009

Required Attachments:

- Original Certified Survey ☒ Original BZA application ☒ Letter of hardship or practical difficulty
- ☒ 10 folded copies of the site plan and building plans (existing and proposed floor plans and elevations)
- ☒ Set of plans and survey mounted on foam board
- ☐ If appealing a board decision, a written transcript from the meeting is required along with 10 copies of minutes from any previous Planning, HDC or DRB board.

General Information:

Prior to submitting for a Board of Zoning Appeals review, you must schedule an appointment with the Building Official or a City Planner for a preliminary discussion on your submittal. The deadline is the **15th** of the previous month.

The BZA review fee is **\$310.00** for single family residential; **\$510.00** for all others; and **\$50.00** for the public notice sign.

Location of all requested variances must be highlighted on plans and survey. All dimensions to be taken in feet to the first decimal point.

Variance chart example:	Required 25'	Existing 24'	Proposed 24'	Amount of Variance 1'
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

By signing this application I agree to conform to all applicable laws of the City of Birmingham. All information submitted on this application is accurate to the best of my knowledge. Changes to the plans are not allowed without approval from the Building Official or City Planner.

Signature of Owner: _____

[Signature]

AUGUST, LLC

Date: 2-6-17



February 9, 2017

Board of Zoning Appeals
City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48009

Re: August, LLC
35975 Woodward Ave.

Dear Members of the Board,

The purpose of this letter is to respectfully request a variance from the following Zoning Ordinance requirement:

Article 3, Section 3.04 (B)(4)

A minimum of 10-foot rear yard setback shall be provided from the midpoint of the alley, except that the Planning Board may allow this setback to be reduced or eliminated. In the absence of an alley, the rear setback shall be equal to that of an adjacent, preexisting building.

We respectfully request of variance of 34 feet from the rear setback requirement. The required rear setback is 13 feet and we are proposing 47 feet. Please refer to the BZA Application (enclosed).

The property at 35975 Woodward Avenue is a corner lot with frontage on 3 streets – Woodward Avenue, Oak Street, and N. Old Woodward. It is the last property at the north end of the Downtown Overlay Zoning District. The only adjacent property is Douglas Cleaners, to the southwest. Tim Horton's is across the street on Oak Street. The frontage along N. Old Woodward and a portion of Oak Street is part of an easement that preserves drive access for Douglas Cleaners (900 N. Old Woodward). The existing rear setback for Douglas Cleaners establishes the rear setback requirement for the proposed building. The Douglas Cleaners property is uniquely situated where the storefront and entry is along Oak Street, but it technically fronts on N. Old Woodward, hence the address. The relationship between the two sites (35975 Woodward & 900 N. Old Woodward) is unique due to the shared easement, but also due to the configuration of the sites. The Douglas Cleaners property wraps around the inward property lines, spanning from Woodward to N. Old Woodward.

430 N. OLD WOODWARD, BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

P 248 258 5707 F 248 258 5515

SarokiArchitecture.com

Based on conversations with the Building Official, it has been determined that the rear yard for Douglas Cleaners is along the side of the building that runs parallel to Woodward Avenue. This is approximately 13 feet away from the shared rear property line, thus creating a 13-foot rear building setback requirement for the proposed building.

This creates a practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship in developing this property. The proposed building is required to front along the Woodward Avenue property line, and would have to span across most of the site, leaving insufficient room for drive access, circulation, and on-site parking. Meeting the required setbacks would result in a larger building footprint and require underground parking. There is significant contamination and poor soils on this site, which would make excavation costs for underground parking prohibitive for anyone developing this site. The site is also unique because the outline of the proposed site and adjacent Douglas Cleaners site is atypical of most properties in the Downtown Overlay Zoning District, since most share a common front and common rear. The two buildings do not front on the same street, so to have one determine the alignment of the other creates a hardship. The language of this zoning requirement is such that it is intended for, and applies naturally to a more urban context, where sites may not be required to provide onsite parking, sites are more rectangular, and buildings are generally built directly next to each other. When one combines all of these unique circumstances, they create several practical difficulties to any development on this site.

We recognize that the Zoning Ordinance has its merit. Our plan is in conformance with all other zoning and building requirements, except for this rear yard. The unique characteristics of this site create significant hardships for the property owner which are not self-created. Strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance would be burdensome to the property owner, and a lesser variance would not provide substantial relief. The restrictions of this site would be burdensome to any proposed development.

The proposed improvements would substantially enhance the appearance and function of the property, and neighboring properties. For these reasons, the petitioner respectfully requests that the Board of Zoning Appeals grant the variance requested. We hope that the owner's attempts to enhance the site will be looked upon favorably by the board.

Sincerely,



Victor Saroki, FAIA
Saroki Architecture