# Zoning Board of Appeals June 23, 2021 Regular Meeting 

## STAFF REPORT

## Subject: ZBA 21-025; 214 West Kingsley Street

## Summary:

Robb Burroughs of O/X Studios, representing property owners, is requesting a variance from Section 5.29.6.B.3.a Administrative Approval [Site Plans] in order to increase the floor area of a building within a multiple-family development by a Site Plan for Administrative Approval. Per Section 5.29.B.1, City Council approval of all site plans is required unless the proposed development is exempt from site plan review or has been delegated to the Planning Commission or administrative approval. Site plans for building additions of $10 \%$ of the existing floor area may be approved administratively by the Planning Manager, per Section 5.29.6.B.3.a. The applicants are requesting a variance to increase the Site Plan for Administrative Approval from 10\% to 22.2\% to accommodate an addition of 541 square feet beyond the allowable 354 square feet which would be permitted under the Administrative Amendment review. The existing building is 3,069 square feet building (with an addition approved to increase size to 3,537 square feet) and is located at 214 West Kingsley Street, part of the Kingsley Condominiums Site Plan development.

As the provisions of the Unified Development Code apply equally to properties across the City such as this one, City staff has applied the appropriate development review procedures to this proposed work.

## Background:

The subject building is part of the Kingsley Condominiums Site Plan with Planned Project Modifications, originally approved in 2016 (SP15-033) and amended twice (SP17-015 and SP19-021). The approved project consists of an elevated 49-unit unit, five-story building with parking underneath at grade, and an elevated 2 -unit one-story building. The fivestory building is constructed and most condominium units are occupied. The one-story building was previously existing, and was incorporated into the Kingsley Condominium development. It is currently 3,069 square feet and has been approved for two rooftop additions (one for each dwelling unit), for a total of 3,537 square feet.

The property is zoned R4D With Conditions. The site is 89,480 square feet and is in a 100-year floodplain.

## Description:

The property owners purchased both condominium units in the one-story building at 214 West Kingsley Street, part of the Kingsley Condominium development, and intend to combine this duplex into a single-family dwelling. The owners are proposing to reconfigure and expand the rooftop addition, an elevator shaft, and mechanical additions. The proposed work will increase the footprint of the building as well as increase its floor area. . These additions represent an increase of $22.2 \%$ to the approved 3,537 -square foot building size. As part of a site plan development, site plan approval is required for any increase in floor area. Increases up to $10 \%$ of the building floor area may be approved
administratively, increases of more than 10\% of the building floor area require approval by City Council.

## Standards for Approval- Variance

The Zoning Board of Appeals has all the power granted by State law and by Section 5.29.12, Application of the Variance Power from the UDC. The following criteria shall apply:
(a). That the practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

The applicant states the practical difficulty includes the location of the property within a floodplain and the required covenants and conditions specific to the overall development that is associated with the approved Site Plan.

Staff comment: The site plan applicability requirements set forth in the Unified Development Code are based on the scope of work, not presence of any natural feature (including floodplain) or ownership structure of the land.
(b). That the practical difficulties will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

The intent of the project is to convert a duplex to a single-family home that will be occupied by the petitioner. If the variance is not granted, the petitioner will be required to take the project to Planning Commission and City Council for approval including upgrading the entire property to current Unified Development Code (UDC) standards. The five-story building that is the other component of the site will not be occupied by the applicant and is out of their control.

Staff comment: The UDC does not utilize ownership share as a determinant of site plan review procedures for this property.
(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

The petitioner states that the additional 541 square foot second floor expansion will have no impact on the five-story adjacent building. This project has been approved by the HOA and the proposed addition pales in comparison to the size of the adjacent building that is 116,833 square feet.

Staff comment: The requested variance is not related to the physical characteristics of the land. It is seeking a variance from the required procedures
set forth in the Unified Development Code for site plan applicability, which would be more appropriately modified through legislative action.
(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self- imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

A vertical addition was already presented and approved by Planning staff in 2020 as a formal Site Plan Amendment. This addition, while larger than that approved, is consistent with the intent of this previous application. Any horizontal addition (outside of the existing building footprint) is limited by presence of the existing parking and drive aisle for the overall parking and most critically the location of this building in the floodplain.
(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure.

The applicant states the proposed addition takes up slightly more than half of the existing square footage of the roof deck/proposed second level and leaving 1,136 square feet as exterior roof deck and mechanical areas.

Respectfully submitted,


Matt Kowalski AICP
City Planner




# ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION 

City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
City Hall: 301 E Huron Street Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647
Phone: 734-794-6265 Fax: 734-794-8460 Email: planning@a2qov.orq

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

| ADDRESS OF PROPERTY <br>  <br> 214 W. Kingsley Ave. |
| :--- |
| ZONING CLASSIFICATION |
| RAD |
| NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER */f different than applicant, a letter of authorization from the property <br> owner must be provided |
| PARCEL NUMBER |
| Alan Salter and Christine Lezote |

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

## NAME

Kob Burroughs


## APPLICANTS RELATIONSHIP TO PROPERTY

Architect

## REQUEST INFORMATION

$\square$ VARIANCE REQUEST
Complete Section 1 of this application

REQUEST TO ALTER A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE Complete Section 2 of this application

## REQUIRED MATERIALS

One hard copy application complete will all required attachments must be submitted. Digital copies of supportive materials included in the submitted hard copy will only be accepted in PDF format by email or accompanying the hard copy application on a USB flash drive.
Required Attachments:
$\square$ Boundary Survey of the property including all existing and proposed structures, dimensions of property, and area of property.
$\square$ Building floor plans showing interior rooms, including dimensions.Photographs of the property and any existing buildings involved in the request.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All information and materials submitted with this application are true and correct.
Permission is granted to City of Ann Arbor Planning Services and members of the Zoning Board of Appeals to access the subject property for the purpose of reviewing the variance request.

Property Owner Signature :


Date


## Section 1 city of Ann Arbor Planning Services - Zoning Board of Appeals Application

## VARIANCE REQUEST

ARTICLE(S) AND SECTION(S) FROM WHICH A VARIANCE IS REQUESTED: (Example: Article 3, Section 5.26)
Section 5.29.6-B. 3a
REQUIRED DIMENSION: (Example: 40' front setback) Feet: Inches:

PROPOSED DIMENSION: (Example: 32 foot 8 inch front setback ) Feet: Inches:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK AND REASON FOR VARIANCE:
CONVERSION OF APPROVED DUPLEX TO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE. SECOND LEVEL ADDITION PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FOR 468SF ADDITION (LIVING SPACES) - CURRENT SECOND LEVEL ADDITION PROPOSED FOR 1,363SF (468 APPROVED; 354 @ 10\%; 541 = 1,363). REQUEST IS FOR APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL 541 SQUARE FEET BEYOND PRESCRIBED 10\%, OR 12.2\%.
The City of Ann Arbor Zoning Board of Appeals has the powers granted by State law and City Code Chapter 55, Section 5:29. 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 statements are found to be true. Please provide a complete response to each of the statements below.

The alleged practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the Person requesting the variance, and result from conditions that do not exist generally throughout the City.
SEE ATTACHED NARRATIVE FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The alleged practical difficulties that will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.
(2)

Allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this chapter, the practical difficulties that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.
(3)

The conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self-imposed practical difficulty. (4)

A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure. (5)
NE: 214 West Kingsley

1) Practical difficulties include location of property (both larger development and specifically this condo section) in a floodplain and the required covenants and conditions specific to the larger development (Kingsley Condos) that this is associated with by site plan.
2) The intent of this project is to construct a single-family residence that will be occupied by the petitioner. As a result, there is no financial return being considered as part of this effort. The greater burden is that failure to approve this request (allowing an additional 541 SF of addition) would result in the petitioner being required to take this addition to an existing building all the way through the site plan approval process, including approvals by both planning commission and city council. This would likewise require upgrading the entire property (the current approved site plan) to current standards, most of which is out of the control of the petitioner.
3) Approval of this request would allow for the construction of the additional 541 SF of additional second floor expansion. There is zero impact on the adjoining properties including the primary property this is associated with. In fact, the HOA for this property has already approved this addition and are in support of the proposed addition as a result. In context to the scale of both the adjoining Kingsley Condo's and the substantial amount of new construction either recently completed or under construction, this addition is relatively diminutive in scale. There is zero impact on this site specifically nor within the context of the surrounding properties and neighborhood. The proposed project in fact reduces the total approved dwelling units associated with the primary project by 1 lessening the density by default. This addition, totaling 895 SF (468 Sf previously administratively approved; 354 SF allowed by the $10 \%$ regulation; 541 SF proposed beyond that granted by right) greater than the previously approved addition, pales in comparison to the overall constructed and approved square footage on this property, which totals approximately 116,833 SF.
4) A vertical addition was already presented and approved by Planning staff in 2020 as a formal Site Plan Amendment. This addition, while larger than that approved, is consistent with the intent of this previous application. Any horizontal addition (outside of the existing building footprint) is limited by presence of the existing parking and drive aisle for the overall parking and most critically the location of this building in the floodplain.
5) The addition is composed of living space for the proposed single-family residence. It takes up slightly more than half of the existing square footage of the roof deck/proposed second level ( 1,363 SF), leaving 1,136 SF as exterior roof deck and mechanical zones.




214 W. Kingsley SE Street View


214 W. Kingsley SW Street View


214 W. Kingsley Aerial View





