



City of Plymouth
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
201 S. Main Street Plymouth, MI 48170
Thursday, May 3, 2018, 7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Giummo called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.
The Board said the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Scott Silvers, Mike Gowen, Jim Burrows, Ed Krol, Mike Devine, Joe Elliott, Kara Giummo
ABSENT: None

Also present was Community Development Director John Buzuvis.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES

A motion was made by Comm. Elliott and seconded by Comm. Burrows for approval of the April 5, 2018 meeting minutes.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion was made by Comm. Krol and seconded by Comm. Elliott for approval of the agenda.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

6. OLD BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A) Z18-05, 1260 W. Ann Arbor Trail, Non-Use Variance, Exceed 35% lot coverage, Zoned R-1, Single Family Residential

The applicant requested postponement prior to the meeting.

B) Z18-06, 650 Church, Non-Use Variance, Signage, Zoned R-1, Single Family Residential

Chair Giummo and Comm. Devine stated conflicts of interest and stepped down from the dais.

Comm. Silvers and Comm. Gowen replaced them on the dais.

Vice Chair Elliott took over the meeting.

Don Soenen, applicant presented his case. He explained that the ground sign is consistent with the surrounding Main Street ground signs. Mr. Soenen explained the need to advertise to the community and promote the events. He stated that the future land use map identifies the site as mixed use, which would allow a sign such as the one proposed. Mr. Soenen said the sign is LED with a programmable message.

Board Questions

Comm. Krol asked about the future land use designation.

Comm. Silvers told the board that the future land use designation doesn't have any bearing on their decision because it is not yet adopted.

Comm. Burrows asked about the size of the sign. He felt that it was a large, particularly compared to other signs in the area.

Comm. Krol asked how many lines of text would be visible. It was stated that the number of lines would vary.

Comm. Gowen asked if the sign would take the same location as the temporary sign. It was confirmed that it would be in the same location as the existing sign.

Comm. Elliott asked about the top portion of the sign. It was confirmed that it was backlit and would likely have PARC and the address displayed.

Citizen Comments

Beth Stewart, 650 Church tenant spoke in favor of the variance.

Jennifer Kehoe, 418 Blunk explained how the inappropriate zoning came about and spoke in favor of the variance.

Leslie Greenheisen, 650 Church tenant spoke in favor of the variance.

Kara Gavin, 312 Blunk spoke in favor of the variance.

Keith Bruda, 650 Church tenant spoke in favor of the variance.

Board Discussion

Comm. Burrows believed the sign was at least 65 square feet, not 64 square feet as presented.

Comm. Krol read a section of the sign ordinance. He felt that there were 2 frontages, which could possibly be combined into one.

Comm. Gowen felt that an 8 foot sign would be small given the size of the building.

Comm. Silvers said that he went through the checklist and felt that all the practical difficulties were met. He said the school was independent of the zoning ordinance and the current zoning is inappropriate for the use.

Comm. Elliott mentioned height, area, and base structure as the elements to consider in the variance request. He felt like the sign should be pushed into the ground further which would assist with the overall height and the size of the base.

Comm. Krol felt that the sign should be proportionate to the building.

A motion was made by Comm. Silvers, supported by Comm. Krol, to approve the variance request Z18-06, 650 Church as submitted. The variance is to construct a ground sign. The finding of fact is that it meets all the practical difficulties required for variance approval, there is an existing building that was previously independent of the sign ordinance and now must meet the sign ordinance and the mismatch creates a hardship, and the proposed sign will have no negative impact on neighboring properties.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

C) Z18-07, 167 S. Union, Exceed maximum number of rooms, Zoned RM-1, Multi-Family Residential

Comm. Silvers and Comm. Gowen stepped down and Comm. Devine and Chair Giummo joined the board.

Chair Giummo read the administrative review from the city.

Rod MacIntyre, applicant presented his case. He showed pictures to the board about the inspiration and desired look for the project. Mr. MacIntyre explained that he could build the same building without a variance if they reduced the bedroom count per unit to one bedroom.

Citizen Comments

Bob Bake, 260 S. Union opposed the variance request.

Tom Clark, 154 S. Union opposed the variance request.

Dale Freels, 168 S. Union opposed the variance request.

Sandy Freels, 168 S. Union opposed the variance request.

Louann Debeliso, 197 S. Union opposed the variance request.
Peter Costa, 163 S. Union opposed the variance request.
Susan Gruno, 157 S. Union opposed the variance request.
Dan Sullivan, 160 S. Union opposed the variance request.
Rod MacIntyre responded to the comments brought forward by the neighbors.

Board Discussion

Comm. Krol asked about the storage building.
Comm. Devine asked about lot coverage and if it applied in the RM-1 district. It was confirmed that lot coverage does not apply. He did not see a hardship and felt that the density was too much.
Comm. Elliott agreed with Comm. Devine and felt that there wasn't anything unique, nor was there a hardship.
Chair Giummo also did not see a hardship.
Comm. Krol commented that the front yard setback was currently noncompliant. He felt that the request was based on inconvenience, but did not have a hardship.
Comm. Elliott asked about the storage units.
Comm. Burrows felt that the carports cluttered the site.
Rod MacIntyre reiterated that he could build the same structure dimensionally as one bedroom units, rather than two bedroom units.

A motion was made by Comm. Elliott, supported by Comm. Devine, to approve the front yard and rear yard variance requests Z18-07, 167 S. Union as submitted. The variance is to exceed the maximum number of rooms by 5 rooms. The findings of fact that there are no practical difficulties and nothing unique about the property.

MOTION DENIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Comm. Burrows asked about how to inform the Planning Commission about the inconsistencies with the sign ordinance.
Comm. Elliott suggested summarizing the inconsistencies and presenting it to the Planning Commission during citizen comments.
Comm. Elliott wanted the board to try harder to stay on topic and not get into the weeds.
Comm. Krol felt that background material was appropriate to making a decision.
The board discussed motion making and the supplemental documents that have been included in the packets.
Comm. Elliott wanted the checklist to match the ordinance.
Comm. Krol wanted the variance checklist to have subtitles.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Krol, supported by Comm. Burrows to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 PM.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY