PUBLIC NOTICE
City of Berkley, Michigan
Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals
Monday, January 14, 2019
7:00 PM – City Hall
Council Chambers
Information: (248) 658-3320

CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Meeting of November 13, 2018

ITEMS FOR THE AGENDA

1. APPLICATION NUMBER PBA-11-18
   Berkley Green Lantern Properties, LLC—4033 Twelve Mile Rd, south side of Twelve Mile Rd., between Ellwood Ave. and Thomas Ave, Parcel ID: 25-18-102-037, is requesting a dimensional variance for off-street parking.

OTHER BUSINESS
LIAISON REPORT
PUBLIC COMMENTS
ADJOURN

Notice: Official Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals are stored and available for review at the Office of the City Clerk. The City of Berkley will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as signers for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting, to individuals with disabilities at the meeting upon four working days notice to the city. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the city by writing or calling: City Clerk, ADA Contact, Berkley City Hall, 3338 Coolidge, Berkley, Michigan 48072, (248) 658-3300.
A MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 PM, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2018 AT THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING BY CHAIR EVANS. UNOFFICIAL MINUTES

PRESENT: Steve Allen Greg Butts Scott Emmons
         Paul Evans Ryan Gesund Sue McAlpine
         Miles Uhlar

ALSO PRESENT: Timothy McLean, Community Development Director
               Ross Gavin, City Council Liaison
               Robert Brand, Applicant
               Mary Jo Kokochak, Applicant

*********

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
It was moved by Ms. McAlpine and supported by Mr. Emmons to approve the agenda as written.

AYES: Allen, Butts, Emmons, Gesund, McAlpine, Uhlar, Evans
NAYS: None

Motion Carried.

*********

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
It was moved by Mr. Allen to approve the minutes of October 8, 2018 with one spelling correction, and supported by Mr. Gesund.

AYES: Butts, Emmons, Gesund, McAlpine, Uhlar, Allen, Evans
NAYS: None

Motion Carried.

*********

1. PBA-09-18—27745 Woodward: The applicant is requesting a variance to install a sign on the building not fronting a street.

Community Development Director McLean gave a brief summary of the variance request. Mr. McLean stated that the property had received a variance in 1993 for a sign not fronting a street. However, the sign had been removed in the past few years. Installing a new sign would create a new non-conformity.

Mary Jo Kokochak (Applicant) stated that the previous sign is not larger than the previous sign. She believes the size would be the same.
Mr. Butts asked if the previous sign had a frame.

Ms. Kokochak responded that the previous sign did have a frame.

Mr. Uhlar asked if the applicant remembered the size of the old sign.

Ms. Kokochak responded that she did remember and believes it to be the same size as the proposed new sign.

Chair Evans asked for an interpretation of Sec.94-7(a) of the Code of Ordinances

Mr. McLean responded that the ordinance states that one sign per side of street frontage is permitted and that signs not fronting a street would not be permitted.

Ms. Kokochak stated that the signage on the front of the building is lettering and not really a sign.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing at 7:13PM

No comments during the Public Hearing

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing at 7:13PM

Discussion
Ms. McAlpine asked if the ordinance specifies a time limit on expiration of variance once the sign was removed.

Mr. McLean responded that the ordinance does not specify a time frame and that this is a gray area.

Mr. Uhlar stated that he believes the size of the sign would be the same as the previous sign.

Mr. Gesund asked about the reasons for the variance in 1993.

Mr. Allen stated that he can't see the name of the business when driving southbound on Woodward.

It was moved by Ms. McAlpine and seconded by Mr. Gesund to approve PBA-11-18 on the grounds that a practical difficulty was proven, with BA-10-93 as president.

AYES: Emmons, Gesund, McAlpine, Uhlar, Allen, Butts
NAYS: Evans

Motion Carried.

2. PBA-10-18—2600 Twelve Mile: The applicant is requesting variances to place signage on an awning not fronting a street and to install a second sign on the side of the building fronting Twelve Mile Rd.
Community Development Director McLean gave a brief summary of the variance request. The applicant is installing new signage facing Twelve Mile Rd. The property at 2600 Twelve Mile Rd. is located on the corner of Twelve Mile and Kenmore. The applicant is proposing signage on the west facing wall of the building that does not have street frontage.

Ms. McAlpine stated that in her profession, she has received donations from Tootie & Tallulah’s in the past.

After brief deliberation, it was the consensus that the Zoning Board of Appeals that there was not a conflict of interest and that Ms. McAlpine could remain impartial.

Mr. Evans asked about old signage on the side of the building fronting Kenmore.

Robert Brand (Applicant) stated that he believes this property has a unique circumstance, similar to that of Bagger Dave’s restaurant that had previously received a variance. Mr. Brand stated that motorists traveling east on Twelve Mile Rd would be unable to see the signage on the building without signage on the west facing wall.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing at 7:33PM

No comments during the Public Hearing

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing at 7:33PM

Discussion
Mr. Allen asked if the southeast elevation would be the location of the proposed second sign fronting Twelve Mile Rd.

Mr. McLean responded that this was correct.

Mr. Gesund stated there are options to consider; approve as written, could approve sign on west wall, or just the southeast elevation.

Mr. Allen stated that he visited the site and likes the existing awning sign. He stated he did not like the look of an illuminated box sign.

Mr. Evans stated it was difficult to find a practical difficulty in this case. He stated he would favor signage on the southeast elevation but not the west. He asked about window signage.

Mr. McLean responded that window signage not exceeding 50% of the glass is generally exempt from the sign ordinance.

Mr. Evans stated he believes the southeast elevation could be a practical difficulty.

Mr. Gesund stated that traffic heading west could see the southeast elevation.
Mr. Brand stated that the circumstances are similar to the variance granted for 27745 Woodward. He expressed concerns about traffic headed east not being able to see any of the signage.

Mr. Butts asked about the main entrance to the building.

Mr. Brand responded that there is a door to the building fronting Twelve Mile Rd, but that it was used for emergencies. The main entry point is on the west side of the building.

Mr. Evans asked if the applicant has considered placing signage on the Kenmore frontage.

Mr. Brand responded that he had not.

Mr. Uhlar stated he believes there is a legitimate argument for unique circumstances.

It was moved by Ms. McAlpine and supported by Mr. Butts to approve PBA-10-18 as proposed citing that a practical difficulty had been proven.

AYES: Gesund, McAlpine, Uhlar, Butts, Emmons
NAYS: Allen, Evans

STAFF COMMENTS
N/A

BOARD COMMENTS
Mr. Evans voiced appreciation for Mike Kerby’s long record of service on the ZBA.

Mr. Butts reminded everyone that the Department of Public Safety has a drop-off for old prescription medication.

Mr. Gesund stated that he attended the Downtown Master Plan Open House.

Council Liaison Ross Gavin stated that there is a City Council Work Session scheduled for November 16, 2018.

*********

PUBLIC COMMENTS
N/A

*********

With no further business, Chair Evans adjourned the meeting at 7:51 PM.
MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Berkley—Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Timothy McLean—Community Development Director
DATE: January 7, 2019
RE: Report for PBA-11-18

APPLICANT: Rosetti Architecture for Berkley Green Lantern, LLC

LOCATION: 4033 Twelve Mile Rd.

PARCEL ID: 25-18-102-037

REQUEST: The applicant is seeking a variance for parking. The building has approximately 3,458 square feet of usable floor area, requiring 58 parking spaces. The applicant is showing 42 parking spaces on the site plan.

REQUIRED: Berkley City Code, Chapter 138, Zoning, Article IV Off-Street Parking and Loading, Division 1. Off-Street Parking Requirements, Section 138-219 (3) Commercial, Restaurants, other. The minimum parking standard is one parking space per 60 square feet of usable floor area.

EXISTING ZONING/LAND USE: Twelve Mile District/Restaurant

SURROUNDING ZONING / LAND USE:

NORTH: Twelve Mile District/Business
SOUTH: R-1D/Single Family Residence
EAST: Twelve Mile District/Business
WEST: Twelve Mile District/Business

DISCUSSION:
The property owner of 4033 Twelve Mile Rd. (formerly Sila’s) is intending to renovate the interior of the building and operate it as a dine-in restaurant named Green Lantern. The property owner currently owns and operates similar dine-in restaurants in Madison Heights and Clinton Township as well as carry-out/delivery-only locations in Macomb, Rochester Hills, Royal Oak, and Sterling Heights.

Based on the usable square footage of the existing building, it is considered a non-conforming structure as defined in Sec.138-151 of the Berkley City Code. Specifically, the building is considered non-conforming due to a deficiency in the minimum number of parking spaces required. The usable floor area of the building is calculated at 3,458 square feet. The parking standard for restaurants is “one space
per 60 square feet of usable floor area." With this standard, the minimum parking requirement would be 58 spaces. The applicant is able to provide 42 on-site parking spaces. Sec.138-154 of the Berkley City Code specifies requirements for non-conforming structures. Specifically, the ordinance states:

Sec. 138-154. - Requirements for nonconforming structures.
A nonconforming building shall be maintained. Maintenance shall include necessary repairs and incidental alterations. Alterations shall not aggravate the nonconforming characteristic.

A building may be added to or enlarged if such addition conforms to the regulations of the applicable zoning district. Such addition or enlargement shall be treated as a separate building in determining conformity to all of the requirements of this chapter.

Based on this ordinance, if there was no increase to the non-conformity, it could be maintained. However, the applicant is proposing to add an outdoor seating/dining area. This increases the size of the existing building. With the increase in the non-conforming structure, the applicant would have to become compliant on minimum parking standards. With 42 on-site parking spaces, the applicant is 16 spaces short of the minimally required 58. If the applicant installs bicycle racks on the premises, this would reduce the minimum standard to 56 spaces. The applicant is seeking a variance on the minimum required parking.

In order to meet the criteria for a dimensional variance, the applicant must demonstrate a practical difficulty according to the standards of Sec.138-606 of the Berkley City Code.

SEC. 138-606. - STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES:
The zoning board of appeals shall not vary the regulations of this chapter, as authorized in this section unless it shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

(1) Dimensional (non-use variances).
   A. The need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property.
   B. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner or previous property owners.
   C. Strict compliance with the ordinance will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.
   D. The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to applicant as well as other property owners.
   E. The requested variance will not adversely impact the surrounding properties.

Please see the attached GIS image, practical difficulty test, and Ch.138, Div 5: Non-Conforming Buildings & Uses.
Has the applicant met his/her burden in demonstrating that the request meets ALL of the standards as follows? (circle YES or NO)

YES NO 1. The need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property.

YES NO Are the physical dimensions substantially different from other properties in the district? (size, shape…)

YES NO Are there any physical anomalies associated with the property? (a river, a mountain…)

YES NO -

The standard has been met because__________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

YES NO 2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner or previous property owners.

YES NO Did the property satisfy the ordinance prior to action by the applicant?

YES NO Did the owner or previous owner create the unique conditions presented in support of the variance?

YES NO -

The standard has been met because__________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

YES NO 3. Strict compliance with the ordinance will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

YES NO Requirements create an unbuildable lot or prevent the use

YES NO Requirements prevent a fully compliant building/structure (unnecessary burden)

YES NO Not merely an inconvenience

YES NO -

The standard has been met because__________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Berkley Zoning Board of Appeals
Dimensional (non-use variance) Request

Case No. BA-11-18

Date: January 14, 2019

4. The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial just to applicant as well as other property owners.
   YES NO  Granting a variance is fair to both applicant and neighbors
   YES NO  Allows applicant to do something others are typically allowed
   YES NO  If relief is warranted, minimize number and extent of variances within reason – don’t grant 10’ if 5’ is reasonable.
   YES NO  -
   The standard has been met because

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

5. The requested variance will not adversely impact the surrounding properties.
   YES NO  Disrupt access to light and air
   YES NO  Interfere with development or continued use
   YES NO  Public safety concerns
   YES NO  -
   The standard has been met because

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

Other considerations:
- Conditions may be attached to any affirmative decision
- Situation likely to often encounter?
- Not compromise intent & purpose of Zoning Ordinance
DIVISION 5. - NONCONFORMING BUILDINGS AND USES

Footnotes:

--- (6) ---


State Law reference—Nonconforming uses and structures, MCL 125.583a, MSA 5.2933(1).

Sec. 138-151. - Definitions.

Nonconforming use: Nonconforming uses are uses that were lawful when established but are no longer permitted within the zoning district or are now permitted only under a special use permit.

Nonconforming structure: Nonconforming structures include structures that were lawfully constructed but are no longer in compliance with the provisions of this chapter. Nonconforming structures may include signs, fences, buildings, and lots. Structures may be nonconforming in regard to size, parking, setbacks, height, or other similar characteristics.

(Ord. No. O-6-99, § 1, 6-21-1999)

Sec. 138-152. - General requirements; uses and structures.

Nonconformities that substantially and adversely affect the orderly development and market value of other property in the district shall not be permitted to continue without restriction.

If a nonconforming structure or a structure containing a nonconforming use becomes physically unsafe or unlawful due to lack of repair and maintenance, and is declared to be unsafe by the city and unlawful by reason of physical condition, it shall not be restored, repaired, or rebuilt except in conformity with the regulations of the applicable zoning district.

The city council may acquire by purchase or condemnation private property for the purpose of removing nonconforming structures or uses. The elimination of such nonconformity shall be declared to be for public purpose and public use. The acquired property shall not be used for public housing. The city council may institute and prosecute proceedings for the condemnation of nonconformities under the power of eminent domain in accordance with the provisions of the city charter or in accordance with Michigan Act No. 149 of the Public Act of 1911, as amended, or any other applicable statutes.

If a building permit has been obtained and work had been commenced and carried on continuously prior to the adoption of this chapter, then the adoption of this chapter shall not limit the construction of the building.

When a building or portion thereof is moved from one district to another, or to another location within the same zoning district, it must be made to conform to all the regulations of said district.

No nonconformity shall be permitted to continue if it was unlawful at the time it was established.

(Ord. No. O-6-99, § 1, 6-21-1999)

Sec. 138-153. - Requirements for nonconforming uses.
A nonconforming use may be continued and maintained provided there is no increase or enlargement of the area occupied by or devoted to such use. A nonconforming use shall not be added to or enlarged unless said use is made to conform to all regulations of the zoning district.

There may be a change of tenancy, ownership, or management of an existing nonconforming use provided there is no change in the nature of the nonconforming use.

Once a nonconforming use has stopped and the building that houses the nonconforming use remains vacant for 180 days, any subsequent use of the property shall be conforming.

(Ord. No. O-6-99, § 1, 6-21-1999)

Sec. 138-154. - Requirements for nonconforming structures.

A nonconforming building shall be maintained. Maintenance shall include necessary repairs and incidental alterations. Alterations shall not aggravate the nonconforming characteristic.

A building may be added to or enlarged if such addition conforms to the regulations of the applicable zoning district. Such addition or enlargement shall be treated as a separate building in determining conformity to all of the requirements of this chapter.

If a nonconforming building is damaged or partially destroyed by less than 50 percent of its market valuation (exclusive of foundations) as determined by a licensed assessor or appraiser, then the building may be restored and its previous occupancy or use continued. If a nonconforming building is damaged or partially destroyed by 50 percent or more than 50 percent of its market valuation (exclusive of foundations), then any restoration or new construction must comply with all current building and zoning codes.

(Ord. No. O-6-99, § 1, 6-21-1999)

Secs. 138-155—138-185. - Reserved.
THE CITY OF BERKLEY
Building Department
3338 Coolidge, Berkley, Michigan 48072
(248) 658-3320

Notice
Meeting of the Berkley
Zoning Board of Appeals

Notice is hereby given, that there will be a meeting of the Zoning
Board of Appeals to be held at the City of Berkley in the Council
Chambers, 3338 Coolidge, Berkley, Michigan on Monday, January 14,
2019 at 7:00 p.m. or as near thereto as the matter may be reached.

Application Number PRA-11-18
Berkley Green Lantern Properties, LLC, 4033 Twelve Mile Rd, south
side of Twelve Mile Rd., before Ellwood Ave. and Thomas Ave., is
requesting a dimensional variance for off-street parking.

Berkley City Code
Chapter 138 Zoning, Article IV, Division 1, Sec.138-219(3), Parking space requirements by use.

Comments on the granting of the above variance may be made in
person on the night of the meeting or in writing. All written com-
ments must be in the hands of the Berkley Building Department be-
fore 7:00 p.m. on the date of the Public Hearing.

TIMOTHY MCLEAN
Community Development Director

Published: Sunday, December 23, 2018
CITY OF BERKLEY, MICHIGAN
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
APPLICATION FORM

A complete application, a check payable to the 'City of Berkley', and 15 copies of a survey, folded plans, and other applicable data must be submitted to the City of Berkley one month prior to the date of the ZBA hearing.
Fee: $300.00  If an application is withdrawn more than 3 weeks prior to the meeting date, 90% of the fee will be refunded.  If the application is withdrawn less than 3 weeks prior to the meeting, no refund will be given.
Account Number: 1019.

The Zoning Board of Appeals meets the second Monday of every month. The meetings are held at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 3338 Coolidge Highway, Berkley, Michigan 48072.

APPLICANT:
Name: Rossetti
Phone: [REDACTED]
Address: 180 West Fort, Suite 400, Detroit, MI 48226

PROPERTY OWNER:
Name: John Spreitzer of Green Lantern Pizza
Phone [REDACTED]
Property Owner Address: 15506 15 Mile Road, Clinton Township, MI 48036

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:
Address: 4033 Twelve Mile Road
Lot & Subdivision: 22-28, 88-90 Berkley School-Park
Current Zoning Classification: Twelve Mile District
Current Use of Property: Restaurant

VARIANCE REQUEST:
Description of Request: Approve moving parking space for an existing nonconforming structure.
There is no reduction in parking spaces proposed. There is no increase in parking load proposed.

From the City of Berkley Code, Chapter 138 Section 138-154

Has the City refused a permit for the request? No, but directed by Community Development Director

GROUND FOR APPEAL:
There are two types of variances: non-use variances and use variances. A use variance permits the use of land that is otherwise not allowed in a zoning district. A non-use variance is a variance regarding setbacks; height; parking; sign size or placement; fences and walls.

In either case, the applicant must prove to the Zoning Board of Appeals that not receiving this variance will cause undue hardship or practical difficulty. Please complete either the use variance or non-use variance sections (whichever is applicable to your request)—DO NOT COMPLETE BOTH SECTIONS.
NON-USE VARIANCE

A non-use variance is a variance regarding setbacks; height; parking; sign size or placement; fences and walls. The need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property because the existing property does not conform to the current parking space requirements.

The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner or previous property owners because there is no change of use of the property.

Strict compliance with the ordinance will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome because it is technically infeasible to add the required number of parking spaces.

The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to applicant as well as other property owners because there is not an increase in parking load.

The requested variance will not adversely impact the surrounding properties because: The existing number of parking spaces is not changing.

USE VARIANCE

A use variance permits the use of land that is otherwise not allowed in a zoning district.

The building or land cannot be reasonably used for any of the uses permitted by right or by special use permit in the current zoning district because:

The need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property because:

Proposed use will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood because:

The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner or previous property owners because:

I understand that ZBA members may need to access my property to better understand my case. I understand that financial hardship cannot be considered. I have received the brochure outlining ZBA procedures and requirements.

[Signature of Applicant] 12/14/2018

Signature of Applicant  Date

Office Use Only
Date Application Received: 12/14/18  Fax: 305-  Receipt Number:

Hearing Date:  Case Number: ZBA-11-18

Zoning Board of Appeals Decision:  January 2017
Hi Tim,

I am a homeowner at 3292 Thomas, south of 12 Mile, located diagonally across the street from the new Green Lantern restaurant. I am the first house on the east side of the street where parking is allowed. I am very concerned about their overflow parking, and frankly, parking by their customers who will just opt to park on Thomas rather than do so in their congested lot.

I see Green Lantern has requested a variance for off-street parking. Can you share with me more specifically what they are requesting. I will write my concerns in more detail once I have a better understanding of what they are requesting. I do plan to attend the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on January 14th.

I would like the City to seriously consider changing it to one-sided parking on Thomas, south of 12 Mile, so this block will not become an issue. I feel certain that the majority of our 16 homeowners on this first block south of 12 Mile all feel the same way — although the impact to me will be the greatest.

During the final months of Sila’s Restaurant being open, our block was continually lined with cars on both sides, making it nearly impossible for me to pull my car out of my driveway. On two occasions, customers parked at the end of my driveway — police had to come to get the car owners to move their vehicle. I worry also that the clientele of Green Lantern will elicit more bar-goers. Sila’s was a restaurant with a bar — Green Lantern seems likely to to draw more of a bar crowd — thus making my concern even greater. I’d appreciate hearing back from you today so that I can prepare for the upcoming meeting.

Thank you.

Lori Zinser

3292 Thomas