APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR June 23, 2010

The Regular Session of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Wednesday, June 23, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 100 N. Fifth Avenue, A2, MI The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairperson Carol Kuhnke

ROLL CALL

Members Present: (7) D. Gregorka, K. Loomis, C. Briere, S. Briere,

D. Tope, C. Kuhnke & W. Carman (arr. @ 6:03 pm.)

Members Absent: (2) J. Carlberg & One Vacancy

Staff Present: (1) M. Kowalski

A – APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was approved as amended – Items under "B" (Draft Minutes) were not available at the time of the meeting.

On a VOICE VOTE - MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED - UNANIMOUSLY

B - **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - Not Available.

C - APPEALS & ACTION

C-1 ZBA10-004 – 2060 W. STADIUM BLVD.

Joseph Gilmour is requesting Permission to Alter a Non-Conforming structure from Chapter 55 (Zoning) Section 5:45 (C2B-Business Service District)

Description and Discussion

The petitioner is requesting Permission to Alter a Non-Conforming Structure in order to permit expansion of an existing non-conforming structure. ** This petition was advertised as a Variance request and Permission to Alter a Non-Conforming Structure; however, after a more detailed analysis it was determined that a variance is not required.

The parcel is zoned C2B (Business Service District) and is currently used as an automobile dealership. The building was constructed in 1963 and has been used as a dealership continuously since that time. The existing building(overhang) is setback 12.9 feet from the front property line and is non-conforming due to an encroachment into the front setback of 27.1 feet; the required front setback is 40 feet. The existing setback to the enclosed interior space is 21.5 feet however; the building overhang extends to 12.9 feet at the closest point from the front property line. Chapter 55 (zoning) only permits a maximum of 2 foot building overhang into the required open space.

The petitioner is requesting to fill in most of the area underneath the overhang with useable floor area. A portion of the overhang will be removed for a proposed Millennium arch sign (to be reviewed separately). As a result, the setback to the building will be increased to 15.6 feet (12.9 feet existing) at the closest point of the building.

Due to the angle of the building and the angle of West Stadium Boulevard, the building setback increases in both directions from the closest point of 15.6 feet. No part of the structure will be closer to the front property line than the existing overhang. This building addition will not increase impervious surface on the site. The modifications requiring Zoning Board of Appeals action are part of an overall upgrade to the site in order to improve the appearance and increase functionality of the site.

The addition of floor area requires an Administrative Amendment to an approved site plan. This was submitted in May 2010 and is currently being reviewed by planning staff. Zoning Board of Appeals approval is necessary for the Administrative Amendment to be approved.

Planning staff is currently completing a study (Area, Height and Placement Project) that would revise the setbacks and zoning standards for commercial districts within the City of Ann Arbor. The proposed minimum setback for the C2B district would be 10 feet and the district would also have a maximum setback of 25 feet. These revisions will be presented to the Planning Commission for action on July 8, 2010 and will need final approval from City Council. If these changes are adopted by City Council, the proposed addition would be conforming and Zoning Board of Appeals permission would not be necessary. The petitioner is aware of these proposed modifications, but has indicated the timing of the project is critical and they would like to proceed as soon as possible with the proposed modifications.

Staff would recommend that if the Zoning Board of Appeals approves this request it be conditioned that there is no parking of display vehicles in the remaining front open space. It is also recommended that any approval specifically exclude the 'Millennium Arch' sign as that is reviewed under the Sign Ordinance and not the Zoning Ordinance.

Questions to Staff by the Board

W. Carman (to M. Kowalski) - So, the arch will now be attached (Yes). Is that the revision? (Yes, and it becomes part of the structure.)

K. Loomis – Does the arch itself extend any further into the setback? (It does not, and that is why we don't require a variance.)

M. Kowalski – In the way it's set back and the site and building are angled, it's only 15 ft. 5 in., so it's only decreasing.

W. Carman – So your argument that this doesn't require a variance is due to the fact that this was already non-conforming with the overhang? (Yes. We allow two feet on the overhang, but this one was six feet over.) Was Stadium Blvd. widened - which would create this Non-Conforming condition?

W. Carman – I don't know what the Zoning Standards/Setbacks were in 1963, but I'm certain that they had them by then.

C. Kuhnke – Do you know what the setback was when this was constructed? (No.)

Presentation by the Petitioner

Mr. Joe Gilmore was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that he is the owner of Naylor Chrysler. The reason he has requested the appeal is that he is trying to add the Dodge and Ram lines to his current Chrysler and Jeep offerings. He stated that "Chrysler wanted me to move to Scio Township, but we fought to stay as we love Ann Arbor.

Their goal is to move all of the stores out to the auto mall in Scio Township. In order to stay in our current location, they require that I change the building to meet some of their facility requirements.

The shape is actually a 'Pentastar." Back in 1964, that was their (Chrysler's) facility. There are about six of these types of buildings left in the country. When I purchased the store two years ago, I drew up plans to tear down the front of the building, remodel with a square building and people hated the idea; they loved the building and felt it was an Ann Arbor icon.

Instead of that at the time, I remodeled everything inside, knowing that I was really going to try to stay. I've decided that if they wouldn't let me keep the building as is, I decided that we would just do without the additional Dodge and Ram lines. We have been working with Chrysler instead to try to reach a compromise to stay in our current location."

Mr. Frank Martin of Dorchen Martin Architects was also available to speak regarding the appeal. He expounded on the building shape and required square footages that Chrysler requires, and part of that is addressed by adding the overhang. We were approved by Chrysler Corporation, but need the Board's approval for the setback requirements. The "Arch" is one thing that Chrysler stipulates must be a part of this building. As Matt stated, we are actually further from the right-of-way than the current 'point' overhang. (He provided the Board with additional photos).

Questions to the Petitioner by the Board

D. Gregorka – Staff mentioned that you currently park cars into the front setback for display. Will you continue to park those in the front open space if you receive this approval? (F. Dorchen – No.)

J. Gilmore – We currently have an existing variance to park cars there, but once we redo the building we won't park cars there anymore because there simply won't be enough room and it's not the best place to display them. We want people to be able to see into the showroom.

C. Kuhnke – It seems that you'll still be parking cars along the driveway where there is asphalt and a proper drive? (J. Gilmore – For display purposes?) For any purpose. (J. Gilmore – There is actual parking on the other side; this side is solely for pulling up people's cars after they've been washed after service - when the owner picks it up.)

D. Gregorka (To Staff) - Is there a formal variance granted for that? (M. Kowalski – Yes, there is). How do we deal with that if we don't want cars parked there?

W. Carman – You could add a rider to it.

D. Gregorka – If we make this contingent on that, we could override the variance? (Yes).

M. Kowalski – They are also going through an Administrative Amendment for the site plan with Planning and would not allow this either – so this change will become a part of that and will preclude any parking there.

Public Comment - None.

Discussion by the Board

- W. Carman (To Staff) Since this is Non-Conforming and we are not providing a variance, this will still be Non-Conforming, correct? (Yes, although it is noted in the staff report that the area, height and placement project that staff is working on would reduce that setback to ten feet which would make this a conforming building if it passes the Planning Commission and City Council).
 - W. Carman That isn't clear that those will pass.

D. Tope (To Staff) – This is the situation that got it here to begin with; the Zoning Ordinance changed, the setbacks changed, it was existing so it was made non-conforming. Do you have any idea how many buildings within that stretch between Pauline to Liberty? How many structures are Non-Conforming due to the Ordinance? (M. Kowalski – I don't know). So this condition is not unusual. (Probably not.)

W. Carman – Did you do averaging of setbacks? (M. Kowalski – That is for residential and not commercial). I don't think that is true. When this passed, it affected structures on Main Street.
We should talk about this afterwards.

175 D. Tope – Are you contemplating adding the amendment to the motion regarding the display vehicles?

D. Gregorka – I think we should make this 'subject to' not parking display vehicles in the front open space.

D. Tope – That is what I was referencing – Not all vehicles but 'display' vehicles.

MOTION

Moved D. Gregorka, Seconded by S. Briere, "In the case of ZBA10-004, 2060 West Stadium Boulevard, I move that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants Permission to Alter a Non-Conforming Structure, from Chapter 55, Section 5:45 (per the attached plans) and subject to prohibiting display vehicles to be parked in the front open space immediately in front of the building (and as shown on the site plan – only other than currently marked parking) and based on the following findings of fact:

a. The alteration complies as nearly as practicable with the requirements of the Zoning Chapter.

b. The proposed building will not encroach any further to the front property line other than the existing building overhang.

c. The alteration will not have a detrimental effect on neighboring property

d. There are other similar buildings in the area that are in the same proximity to the road.

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED – UNANIMOUS Permission to Alter a Non-Conforming Structure - Approved.

On a VOICE VOTE - MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED - UNANIMOUS

208	D.	OLD BUSINESS - None.			
209 210 211	E.	NEW BUSINESS - None.			
212	F.	REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS - None.			
213 214	AUDII	UDIENCE PARTICIPATION - GENERAL - None.			
215 216	<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>				
217218219	Move	Moved by D. Gregorka, Seconded by W. Carman "that the meeting be adjourned."			
220 221	On a	On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO ADJOURN - PASSED - UNANIMOUS			
222 223	Adjournment - 6:45 p.m. (Submitted by: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V – Zoning Board of Appeals)				
224 225 226	*The	Yearly Organizational meeting followed the Reg	gular Sess	ion.	
227 228	0	aralleum	1-28-1	0	
229	Carol	Kuhnke, Chairperson	ated	ZBA Minutes	