





APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE OR NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Section 1: Applicant Information
Name of Applicant: Doug Seury, MEADOWLARK BULLDERS, LLC Address of Applicant: 3250 W. LIBERTY ROAD, LINE ARBOR, M. 48103 Daytime Phone: 734 - 262 - 0825 Fax: 734 - 332 - 1515 Email: doug@home with Meadowlark.com Applicant's Relationship to Property: GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR OWNER
Section 2: Property Information
Address of Property: 720 \$ 722 SPRING STREET, ANN APROR Zoning Classification: R2A Tax ID# (if known): 09-09-20-317-023 \$ 09-09-20-317-022 *Name of Property Owner: 722 SPRING STREET, UC - CHIARA & PETER BARBIER *If different than applicant, a letter of authorization from the property owner must be provided.
Section 3: Request Information
Chapter(s) and Section(s) from which a variance is requested: Required dimension: PROPOSED dimension: 60 Feontage 55 Feontage
Example: Chapter 55, Section 5:26 Example: 40' front setback Example: 32' Give a detailed description of the work you are proposing and why it will require a variance (attach additional sheets if necessary)
SEE ATTACHED NARRATIVE
Section 4: VARIANCE REQUEST (If not applying for a variance, skip to section 5)
The City of Ann Arbor Zoning Board of Appeals has the powers granted by State law and City Code Chapter 55, Section 5:98. A variance may be granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals only in cases involving practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships when ALL of the following is found TRUE . Please provide a complete response to each item below. These responses, together with the required materials in Section 5 of this application, will form the basis for evaluation of the request by staff and the Zoning Board of Appeals. (continued)

these hardshi	nardships or practical difficulties to complying with the ordinance? Are ps or practical difficulties an exception or unique to the property other properties in the City?			
SEE ATT	ACHED NARRATIVE			
	ardships or practical difficulties more than mere inconvenience, inability to er financial return? (explain)			
SEE AT	TACHED NARRATIVE			
3. What effect	t will granting the variance have on the neighboring properties?			
SEE ATT	ACHED NAR-RATIVE			
4. What physical characteristics of your property in terms of size, shape, location or topography prevent you from using it in a way that is consistent with the ordinance?				
SEE ATTACHED NARRATIVE				
	dition which prevents you from complying with the ordinance self- ow did the condition come about?			
SEE ATTACHED NARRATIVE				
Section 5: ALT	ERATION TO A NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURE			
Current use of	f the property			
	change is allowed in accordance with Structure Non-Conformance, Section (b), which reads as follows:			
' '	-conforming structure may be maintained or restored, but no alteration shall be to a non-conforming structure unless one of the following conditions is met:			
a.	The alteration is approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals upon finding that it complies as nearly as practicable with the requirements of this Chapter and that it will not have a detrimental effect on neighboring property.			
b.	The alteration conforms to all the requirements of this Chapter and is made to a building which will be a single-family dwelling on completion of the alteration and is located in an R1,R2, R3, or R4 district.			
C.	The structure is considered non-conforming due to the following reasons			
	(continued)			

Existing Condition	Code Requirement
Lot area	
Lot width	
Floor area ratio	
Open space ratio	
Setbacks	
Parking	
Landscaping	
Other	
Describe the proposed alterations and state why you are	requesting this approval:
The alteration complies as nearly as is practicable with the will not have a detrimental effect on neighboring property	
Wherefore, Petitioner requests that permission be grante and Section of the Ann Arbor City Code in order to perm	ed from the above named Chapter it

Section 6: Required Materials

The following materials are required for all variance requests. Failure to provide these materials will result in an incomplete application and will delay staff review and Zoning Board of Appeals consideration of the request. The materials listed below must accompany the application and constitute an inseparable part of the application.

All materials must be provided on 8 ½" by 11" sheets. (Continued

	Survey of the property including all existing and proposed structures, dimensions of property, and area of property.		
□ Buil	uilding floor plans showing interior rooms, including dimensions.		
□ Pho	Photographs of the property and any existing buildings involved in the request.		
□ Any	any other graphic or written materials that support the request.		
Section 7: A	cknowledgement		
S	GIGNATURES MUST BE SIGNED I	N PRESENCE OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
Ann Arbor hereto. (724) 20 Phone Number	City Code for the stated reasons, in 62-0825 home with mealowark.com	Signature Print Name I of the aforementioned statements, and the	
	cant, nereby depose and say that a contained in the materials submitted		
members o		ing & Development Services unit staff and nission to access the subject property for the Signature	
I have received a copy of the informational cover sheet with the deadlines and meeting dates and acknowledge that staff does not remind the petitioner of the meeting date and			
times.		4000	
contents them to be upon hi My Ac	I made oath that he/she has read the forego	Signature L, before me personally appeared the above named bing application by him/her subscribed and knows the own knowledge except as to those matters therein stated, he/she believes them to be true. Notary Public Signature TALL TIMAS Print Name	
Staff Use Only	Y		
		Fee Paid:	
File No.:			
	viewer & Date		
	Date:		
Stall Reviewer & L	Date:		

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION QUESTIONS

Section 4: Variance Request Questions:

1. Are there any hardships or practical difficulties to complying with the ordinance? Are these hardships or practical difficulties an exception or unique to the property compared to other properties in the city?

The ordinance without a variance would require 2 separate houses to be built, one on an extremely un-conforming lot (720 Spring Street) which would severely constrain the ability to make a home that would fit the neighborhood. This option would not be consistent with the intent of current zoning laws.

Building 2 homes would also require a separate driveway and utilities that would go right through the root structures of two landmark healthy and mature American Elm trees, killing trees that are valued by the neighbors, and creating much more impervious surface area on the lots.

This is a very unique situation in the way these lots were split, and a unique situation in that one of the lots has only 15 feet of frontage to the street. It is unlikely that a similar situation exists in the city of Ann Arbor.

For the porch setback, we are asking for a variance that is more in line with the houses that have projecting porches on the block so that we have less chance of impacting the root structure of the trees, and a more consistent look with the other homes on the block. Of the homes within 100 feet, only 2 have projecting front porches, which throws off the average from those that have projecting front porches.

2. Are the hardships or practical difficulties more than mere inconvenience, or inability to obtain a higher financial return?

The practical difficulties with building 2 separate home have little to do with economics or inconvenience, and more to do with a desire to avoid creating an ugly and destructive presence that would be a detriment to the neighborhood.

In some ways, killing the trees and building 2 separate homes would be the easiest way to develop these lots, but the results would not be desirable to anyone in the area. The owner's desire is to build pretty homes that match the neighborhood, protect the neighbor's views and promote a healthier ecology on the lot, both for forest and water management.

The porch setback being more consistent with the neighboring homes is meant to protect the trees to every extent possible while also keeping a consistent look on the street.

The positive aspects of granting the variances far outweigh the relative benefits of using the existing zoning as it currently exists. Combining the lots with a variance to

allow a duplex would be far more in keeping with the intent of the zoning, and with the neighborhood character, where there are many connected duplex homes, and of this block, which has several similar projecting front porches.

3. What effect will granting the variance have on the neighboring properties?

The only effect granting the variance would have on the neighboring properties is a positive one. The neighborhood would keep two landmark trees and the forest ecology in the middle of the block would remain intact. The streetscape would remain similar to the way it is currently and a curb-cut would be removed at the street. The property would maintain more water-pervious area and an adjacent lot that is at-risk would be taken off the market.

Several neighbors have signed a letter in support of granting the variance, and the project has a high level of support among the affected neighbors.

4. What physical characteristics of the property in terms of size, shape, location or topography prevent you from using it in a way that is consistent with the ordinance?

Nothing would prevent the owners from developing 2 homes on the lots as they are at present, but it would be more detrimental to the neighborhood than combining the lots and granting a variance to build a 2-unit home.

If 720 and 722 Spring Street were combined, at 55 feet the combined lot would lack 5 feet of frontage on Spring Street for a legal 2-unit home, although the *average* width of the lot is 60.1 feet wide. At nearly 12,976 square feet total, the lot is 35% larger than the minimum 8500 square feet required to build a 2-unit home. No other zoning variances are needed for this project.

The zoning variance is being requested to create one lot with a duplex that is more conforming with the neighborhood and more consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance.

5. Is the condition which prevents you from complying with the ordinance self-imposed? How did the condition come about?

This condition affecting the duplex arose as an offshoot of an extremely unconventional lot split, followed by a change in zoning in later years. The owners would like to make these lots become a single lot that will support 2 connected homes, like many others in the neighborhood. This would be far less detrimental to the neighborhood in many respects than building two separate houses, and more in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinances.

The issue affecting the front setback arose as a result of the nearest homes having mostly indented front porches, or none at all. We are requesting a variance to be more conforming with the homes on the block that have projecting front porches.

December 26th, 2014

Chiara & Peter Barbier 722 Spring Street, LLC 7750 Partlo Road Whittemore, MI 48770

To The Ann Arbor Zoning Board of Appeals,

We hereby authorize Doug Selby and Meadowlark Builders to represent 722 Spring Street, LLC in all matters regarding our application for variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Meadowlark Builders is our General Contractor for this project, and as such will be responsible for all city approvals and permits.

Thank you,

Chiara Barbier

Chiale Bashier Peter Barbier Pet I Robi