

The Meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Easter, Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke

ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: City Attorney Vanerian, Building Official Wright, Recording Secretary Joyce

REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

ZBA 11-01-18APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 29, 2018, ZONING BOARD OF
APPEALS MEETING MINUTES

Motion by O'Rourke, seconded Hecht, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the October 29, 2018, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes.

COMMUNICATION: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Public Hearing

Open Public Hearing 7:35 p.m.

Case: 2018-06 Applicant: Sean Ammori

Location: 1010 E. West Maple Rd. Walled Lake, MI 48390 Request: Non-Use Variance

This matter relates to property located at 1010 E. West Maple Road. The applicant is requesting a variance from Article 20.00 Signs Section 20.08 of the Walled Lake Zoning Ordinance to

allow for a freestanding sign on a parcel with a building that is setback less than the required forty (40) feet from the right-of-way.

Sean Ammori who is representing 1010 East West Maple stated that they are requesting signage to be placed by the road that the City would approve based on the renovation that they have done to their building. The building is currently in the setback and some of the documents that they presented were just ideas of what they were thinking. They would like to collaborate with the City to see what would work.

Chairman Easter clarified that they have filled out the Zoning application, but they want to work with the City to see what recommendations the City has for the proposed sign. Mr. Ammori stated that this was what they were proposing.

Commissioner Rundell commented on the McKenna report about the fact that they preferred building signs rather than pylon signs. The facing of the building is perfect for two signs, one on each side of equal dimensions. He feels this would be much better than a pylon sign in the rightof-way in front of the parking lot.

Chairman Easter stated that when you look down the front of the building, the entire front of the building is covered with City planted trees except the doorway. From the street side it is a non-viewable front expanse. Then there are two businesses to the side – one of which sets back 60 - 80 feet back from the roadway. The trees would hide the signage for the back businesses. There is an incumbrance due to this.

If the signs are put on one side of the building; then only people driving one direction can see what businesses are there. Mr. Ammori stated that the pylon sign is currently single-sided but could be double sided. It doesn't need to be double-sided as the back side would face the parking lot and it is below the trees. The sign is 8-feet to the top of the sign.

Commissioner Gunther also felt that the trees would be an obstruction. It was felt that the signs needed to be to the front of the building.

Mr. Ammori stated that he has been trying to tenant the building and many of the potential tenants that are quality tenants have made comments regarding the signage. They were wondering if, because of the positioning of the building, a pylon sign would be placed in front. This is a concern of potential clients. They are looking for something that will show signage from both the east and west bound direction.

Mr. Zy Axisha, construction manager for the property, stated that they could move the pylon sign, but they are trying to do their best and weigh all options. They would really like some type of road side signage.

Chairman Easter asked Jim Wright, Building Official, if they gave up three parking spaces and moved the sign back into the parking lot if this would be an option. This would place the sign on their property instead of in the easement. If it was made a two-sided sign it would be visible from both directions of traffic.

Jim Wright stated that there were a couple of things to take into consideration and went over McKenna's review letter. On a corner lot, you are allowed signage on the building frontage of the two streets. They would be able to put a sign on the front of the building as well as the side of the building. He suggested that they ask for a variance for signage on the other side of the building so then there would be signage on three sides of the building which would be taller than the trees are. It accomplishes what they are looking for to be able to have signage plus they are not conflicting with the ordinance as far as pylon signs which are a violation of the ordinance. Plus, you are avoiding the trees.

The applicant could ask to table this case to come back and ask for a variance for a third sign on the east side of the building. He could have three sign – front and both sides.

Jim Wright stated that he has been working with the construction manager for quite some time. There is not yet a layout yet for tenants - it is a wide-open space. He suggests that wall signage for this building to comply with it and look ahead to what they plan to do with future doorways to allow tenants in. You are currently allowed to have a sign at each individual entrance of a building. Right now, there is only one doorway coming in off the front of the building.

The Commission felt that the applicant should table this case and come forward with an explicit plan for what signage they would like. The Commission felt they should ask for a variance for a third sign. They could come back and be on the January agenda. It was suggested they submit drawings with elevations from the street view.

ZBA 11-02-18 MOTION TO TABLE ZBA CASE 2018-06 SO THAT THE APPLICANT CAN BRING BACK DETAILED SITE PLANS AND BUILDING ELEVATIONS FOR SIGNAGE.

Motion by Hecht, seconded O'Rourke, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To table ZBA Case 2018-06.

Close Public Hearing 7:55 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

ADJOURNMENT

ZBA 11-03-18 MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion by Hecht, seconded by Gunther, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

Janell Joyce Recording Secretary Jason Easter Chairman