The City of Ferndale

Agenda
Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2019 @ 7:00 PM
FERNDALE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.a. Approval of the Minutes of September 17, 2019.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.a. 390-454 Hilton Road - Nonuse Variance

4.b. 21350 Woodward Avenue - Sign Appeal

5. ADJOURNMENT
CITY OF FERNDALE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

FROM: Barb Miller

SUBJECT: Approval of the Minutes of September 17, 2019.

INTRODUCTION
approval of the minutes of September 17, 2019.

SUMMARY & BACKGROUND
approval of the minutes of September 17, 2019.

BUDGETARY CONTEXT
N/A

CIP#
N/A

ATTACHMENTS
BZA Minutes of September 17, 2019.pdf

STRATEGIC PLANNING CONTEXT
Organizational and Financial Excellence

RECOMMENDED ACTION
approve the minutes of September 17, 2019 as submitted.
MINUTES
City Council MEETING
September 17, 2019
City Hall, 300 E 9 Mile, Ferndale MI, 48220 7:00 PM

1) Roll Call

COUNCIL PRESENT: Ian Williamson
Laura Moore
Judy Palmer
Leah Deasy
Mike Steidemann
Greg Pawlica
Austin Colson

COUNCIL ABSENT: None

2) Approval of Agenda

Moved by Judy Palmer, seconded by Austin Colson to approve the agenda as presented.

For: Ian Williamson, Laura Moore, Judy Palmer, Leah Deasy, Mike Steidemann, Greg Pawlica, Austin Colson
Against: None
Abstain: None
7 - 0 - 0

MOTION CARRIED

3) Approval of Minutes

3.a Approval of the Minutes of August 20, 2019

Cover Page
BZA Minutes-JL- 2019 08 20.docx

Moved by Judy Palmer, seconded by Austin Colson to approve the Minutes of August 20, 1029 as amended.

For: Ian Williamson, Laura Moore, Judy Palmer, Leah Deasy, Mike Steidemann, Greg Pawlica, Austin Colson
Against: None
Abstain: None
7 - 0 - 0

MOTION CARRIED
4) Public Hearings

4.a Sign Appeal 1921 Hilton Road

City Planner Lyons introduced Adam Loomis, Assistant Building Official, who is handling signs and has been working with applicants on sign appeals. Loomis introduced the appeal for 1921 Hilton Road.

Applicant requests a blade sign extending 39" from the face of the building instead of 24" for a dimensional variance of 15". Applicant stated he tries to avoid any variances if possible. Unique circumstances - use same size of blade sign but the ornament on front of building, use it as a projecting sign but have it fit into the steel work on front of the building. It's a nicer solution and one less image sign on the front of the building and does meet all other requirements of the ordinance.

Chair Williamson opened and closed the PH at 7:21 PM. No one in attendance.

Williamson - steel projection ornamenting building - is that permitted?
Loomis - yes ornamentation is allowed - the distance of the projection would not increase
Williamson - what is the total square footage including the Green Buddha lettering?
   Loomis - facing Hilton 18 square feet east & south, 49 square feet north
Williamson - 10% of total wall figure?
Applicant - 90 100 lineal feet
Williamson - % of building
Applicant - under 10%
Pawlica - does the extension of the sign remain on your property?
Applicant - this property has a strange line - in this specific location it’s outside of the property line
Palmer - is the arch being removed?
Applicant - no, it’s in line with the pedestrian walkway. You can see it on Google Earth - the projection over the landscaping, the blade sign would not reach within that landscaping, you couldn't walk under this because it’s all landscaped.
Pawlica - is there a recommendation from staff?
Lyons - no, we haven’t provided them in the past.
Steidemann - the signage with words is clear but at what time is it a sign?
Colson - what was the decision to go to 39".
Applicant - to center that graphic within the sign, it's an aesthetic decision, it looks better nested within it rather than against the building.
Deasy - for staff - the only aspect we're looking at is that the blade sign ordinance says it can come out 2', they meet the ordinance, except for coming out further. It's simple, it's a more aesthetically pleasing sign, in terms of area of the signage, nothing is actually bigger than our ordinance allows except for the projection. The intent of the ordinance is really to regulate the scale of the signage.
Steidemann - it's slightly over
Applicant - the concept of blade signs is they're over pedestrian walkways and it reduces congestion. We're 15' from the sidewalk to the front of the building.
Lyons - because of pictorial usage - that's the reason for the variance.
Steidemann - what's the least variance we can offer - can the projection be reduced to conform to code?
If we pass this, how will the next person use it against us? Could the variance be worded that as long as it's within the architectural detail?
Williamson read the variance requirements
Lyons - in the definition it does reference attachment to buildings and separate features are separate.
Palmer - it's very rare to get signs like this - architectural feature we can't touch, if they take this peacock anywhere else, it would be ok?
Lyons - if it's attached to the wall, it exceeds the number
Williams - if it would be attached to the detail, it would be allowed
Palmer - if it wasn't sitting on the architectural detail there would be no need for a variance.
Pawlica - the width of the logo is 26.5" - the projection is to the end of the logo, not the extension of the architectural feature.
Colson - signs on architectural features was not allowed in the past?
Lyons – correct
Pawlica - if they put the logo on top of the architectural detail facing Hilton, no variance is required
Palmer - there are other options within our code
Pawlica - the logo is very attractive - there's not a hardship that's unique to the situation that you've had no control over. We would be setting a precedent to create some other type of architectural detail
Moore - it's a beautiful building but do we, without telling them what to do, do we recommend what's allowed?
Williamson – it’s a design choice on their part; a hardship isn't required but a difficulty/peculiar to the building
Applicant - we could add it as a front projecting logo, we wanted to reduce the logos so it would be one logo rather than two
Palmer - we're now finding alternatives, does that give us a reason to ask if there is a reason to have a vote?
Williamson - they can withdraw their application at any time, or they could go for four concurring votes
Deasy - seeing practical difficulty created by distance of setback from pedestrian area; blade sign is within an architectural feature; and setback to create a better, more aesthetic sign
Pawlica - this was a new building?
Applicant - partially new, but not this part
Steidemann - Motor City Pawn - because of speed of 8 Mile location of train tracks granted.
Williamson - they modified their request and reduced the decals which reduced the variance
Steidemann - Hilton is a much slower road, no bend in the road, this feels very different; I see two signs.
Loomis - this business does have three street frontages
Pawlica - it's very unique for any business to have three sides instead of two
Steidemann - You have a parking lot all the way to Rosewood
Deasy - if the board likes the sign and think it's good for the character, even reusing an industrial building within an industrial area is a unique condition.
Pawlica - it's not the idea of the building but the situation was created by the owner; they placed it here and now they want to add something; if they'd created it in the beginning we wouldn't be here; now they want to add this element to create a sign; it's not something that was forced upon them
Applicant - that's true, our original intent was to create two signs
Pawlica – the owner is asking us to make an exception for a sign - you've been a pleasure to work with - it's a nice design and nice element - always setting precedent, then anybody can come back and say it's out of code but it's pretty
Deasy - I'm not seeing anything about the applicant having created the unique feature
Steidemann - did we pass the Greenleaf?
Williamson - it was over two store fronts
Pawlica - two storefronts, one address; we granted because it was crossing multiple store spaces
Moved by Greg Pawlica, Seconded by Laura Moore to deny the dimensional variance application to allow a variance of 15” from the 24” maximum projection for a total projection of 39”, at 1921 Hilton Road, Sidwell number 24-25-27-489-007, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings
1. that no one spoke in support of or opposition to the proposal;
2. that section in Ordinance 1050, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Projecting/Blade Signs) requires that projecting/blade sign project no more than 24” from the building surface.
3. that the unique conditions were not put upon the business owner, but created by the business through the design of the architectural element.

Pawlica - motion to deny the variance of 15" - hardship was created by the business owner
Deasy - it's the unique condition of the building
Williamson – they have made their request; their application is based on practical difficulty on the site;
(Page 2 of application)
Applicant - what about the opportunity to reduce the signage by one unit
Palmer - you could put it next to the other signage

For: Laura Moore, Judy Palmer, Mike Steidemann, Greg Pawlica, Austin Colson
Against: Ian Williamson, Leah Deasy
Abstain: None
5 - 2 - 0

MOTION CARRIED

4.b Sign Appeal 2625 Hilton Road
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Loomis – introduced the application for a wall sign variance at 2625 Hilton Road.

Applicant - it's a partial hardship for the north wall which doesn't face a street - if you're going southbound, you can pass the building before you see the sign on the east sign on the building; it's not a big sign

Williamson - do you have signs on east and south? Because the north side has a step back where would you be proposed to place sign?
Applicant - above the setback on the second elevation

Williamson - do you have any issue with difficulty seeing the sign
Applicant - no
Williamson - have you considered a blade sign?
Applicant - they want comparable signs
Williamson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:26 pm. No one from the public in attendance.

Steidemann - parking on north/south of building?
Applicant - primary parking on south end; if you're going southbound, you go by the lot; northbound works well

Pawlica - what is the variance amount? 58.5"
Loomis - it's for the location, not the size
Pawlica - it's a 22' wall sign with projection of 3" from building face, and because it not on a street front
Pawlica - it's an additional sign? with no street frontage on that side
Palmer - if they wanted a second sign on Hilton
Steidemann - why wouldn't you want a blade sign
Applicant - it's a dispensary, not all people embrace and being discreet
Williamson - same ordinance exists for this as in the last

Pawlica - looking across the street at Ferndale Electric - they have one sign in the middle of the building and there's no unique situation that's been forced on them. If we set a precedent, we're going to have others coming saying they have the same situation.

Colson - I don't see a practical difficulty that's similar throughout the city and the building isn't that unique
Applicant - it used to be a warehouse, now it's a been turned into an office and more pedestrian traffic
Colson - but so have a lot of other buildings
Moore - would agree with Colson - not seeing a unique condition
Applicant - I thought yes, there is a condition on Woodward Heights
Moore - as a driver, most of the time you know where you're going
Deasy - I see an exciting location - retail in a former industrial location - the city is doing a lot to change - the proper response is to look at the ordinance for that district to give more latitude to these businesses coming in
Lyons - everyone is talking about the sign ordinance near end of year; PC considered a lot of changes and we need to look at legalities and innovation; encourage walkability and accessing businesses off sidewalk. With the industrial ordinance they would have had to use the Hilton entrance

Deasy - I think this city should have different sign ordinances for different zoning, CBD isn't necessarily right for industrial
Lyons - yes, we're looking at this
Deasy - you have to treat these areas differently
Steidemann - don't always agree but they're not mine to change; you see the subway size, that's similar; agree with Deasy that the rules need to change but we can't at this time

Steidemann - finding #1, page 21, what should go in there with 2 findings -
Applicant - what are the odds, there is a fair amount, better than 50/50 to consider - it's a partial hardship
Palmer - hardship is not a consideration; practical difficulty but we don't see it; there isn't a uniqueness
Applicant - it hurts that we're not on Woodward Heights
Palmer - they side 3 streets
Moved by Mike Steidemann, seconded by Greg Pawlica to deny consideration of the variance request for a wall sign on a non-street frontage by applicant I Signs and Designs at 2625 Hilton Road, Sidwell number 24-25-27-437-009, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that no one spoke in support of or opposition to the proposal;
2. that section in Ordinance 1050, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Projecting/Wall Signs) requires that wall signs are located on a street frontage.

For: Ian Williamson, Laura Moore, Judy Palmer, Mike Steidemann, Greg Pawlica, Austin Colson
Against: Leah Deasy
Abstain: None
6 - 1 - 0

MOTION CARRIED

Steidemann - I would allow some signage on the parking lot side

Lyons - we gave them several other options for consideration; there's probably some type of middle ground we can consider; I understand the intent and it's very limiting; it comes up all the time.

Williamson - the development is changing character of the city; we have an ordinance for a traditional, walkable area where places like Motor City didn't get their variance because they didn't fit in with their size.

Palmer - I don't think our sign ordinance has been changed in 30 years; and yes, our districts are changing dramatically.

Lyons - we can talk about signs
Pawlica - it's very interesting that they're both Medical Marihuana

Pawlica - I agree with Deasy - we can't cookie cutter a design for the complexity of this community; but as Steidemann said, we're bound to the existing ordinance, I welcome changes
Lyons - we do too, we never tell anyone, no don't come here, we give them that research

Williamson - look at architectural detail vs blade sign; it wouldn't aesthetically look right; we need to consider those two items; we should look at the blade signs
Palmer - the logo next to the name seemed a simple solution
Lyons - it meets the ordinance
Steidemann - 40 sf or 10%, whichever is less
Pawlica - he was emphatic and doesn't want to come back; a lot of people said beware of visual noise - street signs, building signs, etc.
Williamson - you can also reduce the level of interest
Deasy - the visual noise vs cool architectural features; it's a balance
Lyons - if there's findings and facts to support - and the applicant presenting their uniqueness
Pawlica - if that architectural detail was pre-existing it would be different
Deasy - it wasn't part of what we could consider
Steidemann - either way - a tree, a blockage

5) **Adjournment**
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

_____________________________________
Barbara Miller, Deputy City Clerk
CITY OF FERNDALE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

FROM: Justin Lyons

SUBJECT: 390-454 Hilton Road - Nonuse Variance

INTRODUCTION
The applicant is requesting a nonuse variance related to the standards listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 – Architectural compatibility and design guidelines (d) Non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings (1) Building materials and colors. b. The existing ordinance prohibits vinyl siding as an exterior finish material on non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings. The applicant is requesting a variance to install new vinyl siding on an existing multiple-family residential building, Legato at Webster.

SUMMARY & BACKGROUND
See attached staff report for summary and background.

BUDGETARY CONTEXT
N/A

CIP#
N/A

ATTACHMENTS
20191119-390 Hilton Rd BZA Staff Report.pdf

20191119-390 Hilton Road BZA Application.pdf

20191119-390 Hilton Rd BZA PH.pdf

STRATEGIC PLANNING CONTEXT
Organizational and Financial Excellence

RECOMMENDED ACTION
See attached staff report for potential variance motions.
REQUEST  Nonuse Variance
APPLICANT  Legato at Webster Place
           390 Hilton Road, Ferndale, MI 48220
OWNER  Same as above
LOCATION  390-454 Hilton Rd
PARCEL NUMBER  24-25-35-356-002
ZONING  Mixed Use 2 (MXD-2)
STAFF  Justin Lyons, Planning Manager
ATTACHMENTS  Board of Zoning Appeals Application – October 31, 2019

Summary
The applicant is requesting a nonuse variance related to the standards listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 – Architectural compatibility and design guidelines (d) Non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings (1) Building materials and colors. b. The existing ordinance prohibits vinyl siding as an exterior finish material on non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings. The applicant is requesting a variance to install new vinyl siding on an existing multiple-family residential building, Legato at Webster. The applicant cited that the existing building already has non-conforming vinyl siding and should be allowed to replace with new vinyl siding because the building was constructed prior to the architectural compatibility ordinance was adopted in 2010.

Please review the attached information, submitted by the applicant, identifying the reasons for the variance requested.

Aerial Photo of Site & Surroundings
General Requirements for Appeal (Section 24-246)
In deciding appeals, the Board must find:

A. The action proposed will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties; increase the danger of fire; unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area; harm the environment; or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the City;
B. The action proposed will be compatible with adjacent uses, and of such height, location, size and character that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the surrounding neighborhood;
C. The action proposed will not unreasonably increase congestion in public streets, make vehicular and pedestrian traffic more hazardous than is normal for the district involved, taking into account sight distances, traffic flow, provisions for pedestrian traffic, and minimization of potential traffic conflicts;
D. The action proposed will not create a nuisance;
E. The plight of the applicant results from special or unique circumstances peculiar to the property and not from general neighborhood conditions; and
F. The alleged hardship has not been created by the applicant or any person having a current interest in the property.

Nonuse or Dimensional Variance Considerations (Section 24-427 (c))
The applicant must present substantial evidence to show that if the Zoning Ordinance is applied strictly, practical difficulties to the applicant will result. To grant a nonuse or dimensional variance, the Board must find:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing building materials and colors for non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings will unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome.
2. The intent and purpose of this Ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done.
3. A lesser variance than that requested would not give substantial relief to the owner of the property or be more consistent with justice to other property owners.
4. The standards set forth in Section 24-426 are satisfied.

Example Zoning Variance Motions
MOTION by __________________, seconded by ______________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals APPROVE the nonuse variance application to allow a variance from the required building materials requirements in Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 (d) (1) b. at 390-454 Hilton Road, Sidwell number 24-25-35-356-002, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings
1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 24, Article IX, Section 24-184 – Architectural compatibility and design guidelines (d) Non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings (1) Building materials and colors. b. prohibits vinyl siding as an exterior finish material on multiple-family residential buildings, and the applicant is requesting nonuse variance to allow for new vinyl siding as an exterior finish material;
2. that a practical difficulty does exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does not have other available alternatives in building materials that would allow for all applicable zoning requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be not observed, and the applicant will be denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the architectural compatibility ordinance;
4. That the proposal does not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was not created by the applicant, instead the hardship was created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 24-426 regarding granting a variance have been met.

MOTION by____________________, seconded by____________________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals DENY the nonuse variance application to allow a variance from the required building materials requirements in Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 (d) (1) b. at 390-454 Hilton Road, Sidwell number 24-25-35-356-002, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 24, Article IX, Section 24-184 – Architectural compatibility and design guidelines (d) Non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings (1) Building materials and colors. b. prohibits vinyl siding as an exterior finish material on multiple-family residential buildings, and the applicant is requesting nonuse variance to allow for new vinyl siding as an exterior finish material;
2. that a practical difficulty does not exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does have other available alternatives in building materials that would allow for all applicable zoning requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be observed, and the applicant will be not denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the architectural compatibility ordinance;
4. That the proposal does/do not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does not result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was created by the applicant and the hardship was not created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 24-426 regarding granting a variance have not been met.
# Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) Application

## 1. Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Legato at Webster Place**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>390 Hilton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip Code</td>
<td>Ferndale, MI 48220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>( ) 248-404-7072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmcpartlin@krametriad.com">kmcpartlin@krametriad.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interest in the Property (e.g. fee simple, land option, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner (if other than applicant)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone ( )</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>390-454 Hilton Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Legal Description | LOTS 145 THRU 153 INCLUSIVE OF HUGO SCHERER'S SUB AS RECORDED IN LIBER 12 OF PLATS, PAGE 8, OAKLAND COUNTY RECORDS, BEING A PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 35, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST, CITY OF FERNDALE, OAKLAND COUNTY |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>(PLEASE SEE ATTACHED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Width</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Use(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District of Adjacent Properties to the:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Commercial</td>
<td>South Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C/O Kramer-Traid Management Group
320 East Big Beaver Road Suite 190
Troy, Mi 48083**
3. **Request.** Check the type of request you are applying for. If you are uncertain, consult Article 18 Board of Zoning Appeals or contact the Community Development Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type (check all applicable)</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance Section</th>
<th>Complete Application Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonuse or Dimensional Variance</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, &amp; 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Variance</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>4, 6, 7, &amp; 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals from and review any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by an administrative official or body charged with the enforcement of this Ordinance, other than site plans and special land use or planned unit development applications</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>7, &amp; 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description of request:** The Board of Directors of Legato at Webster Place would like to have all the failing existing siding replaced on the 14 unit residential building using Cedar Discovery Perfection Shingle double 7" vinyl siding on the front of the building in Natural Slate and Double 5" Dutchlap vinyl siding on the sides and back of the building in Slate.

4. **Criteria for ALL Variances.** If there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in carrying out the strict letter of this Ordinance, the BZA may grant a variance in any of its rules or provisions relating to the construction, or structural changes in, equipment, or alteration of buildings or structures, or the use of land, buildings, or structures, so that the spirit of the ordinance shall be observed, public safety secured, and substantial justice done. Please respond to the following statements. The applicant must demonstrate all of the following criteria in order to obtain a variance. Granting of a variance by the BZA shall not constitute an assurance that a building permit will be issued.

a. **Public Safety and Welfare.** Describe how the request will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties; increase the danger of fire; unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area; harm the environment; or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the City.

**This variance request will not impair anything as it is the existing siding that has failed that will be replaced.**
b. **Compatibility with Neighborhood.** Describe how the request will be compatible with adjacent uses, and of such height, location, size and character that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the surrounding neighborhood.

The new vinyl siding will have an updated fresh look compared to the existing siding and will harmonize with the homes across the street that are sided with the same vinyl siding in different colors that the Association would like to install.

c. **Traffic Impacts.** Describe how the request will not unreasonably increase congestion in public streets, make vehicular and pedestrian traffic more hazardous than is normal for the district involved, taking into account sight distances, traffic flow, provisions for pedestrian traffic, and minimization of potential traffic conflicts;

This request will not in any way increase anything in the public street, pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The new vinyl siding will be much more aesthetically pleasing then the current "tired" look of the building.

d. **Nuisance.** Describe how the request will not create a nuisance;

This will not in any way create a nuisance. The Association will be replacing the existing siding and paint all the painted trim which will improve the view building and property values.

e. **Unique Circumstances.** Describe how the request results from special or unique circumstances peculiar to the property that exist which are not applicable to the general neighborhood conditions.

As the building sits between two commercial properties it also is across the street from residential single family homes of which many are vinyl sided in the same fashion as what is proposed for Legato at Webster Place.
f. **Not Self-Created.** Describe how the alleged hardship has not been created by the actions of the applicant or any person having a current interest in the property.

A hardship will only exist if the Association is only allowed to use natural clay brick, glazed brick, ceramic tile, stone, finished metal panels, glass, glass block, plank wood, fiber cement materials, cement plaster and similar materials as all options are going to require maintenance in the years to come.

5. **Criteria for NONUSE or DIMENSIONAL Variances.** The BZA may grant an area variance only upon a finding that practical difficulties exist. Please respond to the following statements. The applicant must demonstrate all of the following criteria in order to obtain a variance:

a. **General Practical Difficulty.** Describe how strict compliance with the area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, density, or other dimensional matters unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or be unnecessarily burdensome.

There will be no General Practical Difficulty as the plan is to replace the failing existing siding with vinyl siding that will offer very little required maintenance in the future.

b. **Intent of Ordinance.** Describe how the granting of the request will observe the intent and purpose of this ordinance and uphold substantial justice.

The change in the new vinyl siding will be minimal. The look will be cohesive with the homes in the neighborhood that also vinyl siding.

c. **Lesser Variance.** Describe how granting a lesser variance would not give substantial relief to the applicant and/or be more consistent with justice to other properties.

If this Variance Application is not approved is will prove to be a hardship to the Non-Profit Association. There will be additional costs between $40,000 and $60,000 to install the types of siding that are currently allowed by the City of Ferndale. The additional cost does not include the extensive maintenance that will be required in the future.
6. **Criteria for USE Variances.** The BZA may grant an area variance only upon a finding that *unnecessary hardship exists*. Please respond to the following statements. The applicant must demonstrate all of the following criteria in order to obtain a variance:

a. **Land Use Regulation Difficulty.** Describe how 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.

As this is a Non-Profit Association, allowing the variance to use vinyl siding will prevent future maintenance expenses that compose a financial hardship that may result in unsightly conditions.

b. **Unique Circumstances of the Property.** Describe the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property and not to general neighborhood conditions.

By requiring the Non-Profit Association to install anything but pleasantly appealing Cedar Discovery Perfection Double 7" vinyl siding on the front of the building and Double 5" Dutchlap vinyl siding with new commercial grade gutters and downspouts will cause a financial hardship both now and in the future.

c. **Neighborhood Character.** Explain how the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

If anything, the replacement of the current siding with vinyl siding will improve the aesthetics of the building and surrounding homes. The current conditions of the existing siding is very poor and needs to be addressed as soon as possible at a reasonable cost to the homeowners.
d. Previous Actions. Describe why the need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner or previous property owners.

Legato at Webster Place is a Non-Profit Association community of only 14 homeowners that is attempting to replace "as built" conditions that have since deteriorated. Requiring each homeowner to pay double the cost for non-vinyl siding may prove to be detrimental to well being of the Association.

e. Lesser Variance. Describe why granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this chapter, not injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the general welfare and substantial justice will be done.

Approval to the installation of vinyl siding will not only offer financial savings now, it will offer savings in the future as well. This will also improve the aesthetics of the neighborhood as the products that will be used will be inline with the products used on the homes directly across the street.

7. Criteria for APPEALS. An appeal shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of the order, determination or decision appealed from, or, if the appeal is from a decision of a public body, within thirty (30) days of the date of the approval of the minutes of the public meeting at which the decision was made. BZA shall review all documentation submitted constituting the record upon which the action appeal from was taken. Describe the nature of the appeal request, the decision that was made, when and by whom on the following page:

8. Completing the BZA Application. The following checklist includes all documents required for the Community Development Director to declare the application complete and begin the BZA process:

- Payment in full of the required fee ($450 commercial, $175 owner-occupied single family)
- 2 copies of the completed application form
- 4 copies of a plan or sketch of the site indicating the location of any and all buildings, property
lines, parking lots, dimensions, and other pertinent information about the proposed variance to assist the BZA in making its decision.

☐ A copy of the complete legal description of the property.
☐ Proof of property ownership.

Kevin C. McPartlin* (applicant).

I do hereby swear that the information given herein is true and correct.

Signature of Applicant

Date

Signature of Property Owner

Date

Agent for Legato Web Web

Kevin C. McPartlin* (property owner), hereby give permission for City of Ferndale officials, staff, and consultants to go on the property for which the above referenced site plan is proposed for purposes of verifying information provided on the submitted application.

For Community Development Director Use

Fee:

File No:

Signature: Date:

* Agent for Legato at Webster Place
Kramer-Triad Management Group, LLC
320 East Big Beaver Road Suite 190
Troy, MI 48083
kmcpartlin@kramertriad.com
248-404-7072
CITY OF FERNDALE
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The City of Ferndale Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. at Ferndale City Hall, 300 E. Nine Mile, to consider an application submitted by Legato at Webster Place for variances from the standards listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 (General Provisions; Architectural Compatibility) at:

Sidwell No. 24-25-35-356-002, T1N, R11E, SEC 35 OAKLAND COUNTY CONDOMINIUM PLAN NO 1892 LEGATO AT WEBSTER PLACE UNIT 2 L 38015 P 172 8-25-06 FR 351-003, commonly known as 390 Hilton Road.

Chapter 24, Article IX, Sec. 24-184 (d) (1) b. prohibits vinyl siding as an exterior finish material on non-residential, mixed use and multiple-family residential buildings. The applicant is requesting a variance to install new vinyl siding on a multiple-family residential building.

Any resident or property owner may participate in the hearing or submit written comments to the Community and Economic Development Department prior to Monday, November 18, 2019. For more information, please contact the Community and Economic Development Department at 248-546-2366 or review the request beginning November 15, 2019 at https://www.ferndalemi.gov/council-meetings.

Justin Lyons, Planning Manager
Community & Economic Development
ced@ferndalemi.gov
CITY OF FERNDALE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

FROM: Justin Lyons

SUBJECT: 21350 Woodward Avenue - Sign Appeal

INTRODUCTION
The applicant, Dunning Properties, LLC, is requesting two variances from the sign regulations listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII. Signs at the existing auto dealership at 21350 Woodward Avenue. Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs) permits one (1) wall sign per street frontage with size requirements that the sign shall not exceed 10% of wall surface excluding the calculated area of windows and doorways or 40 sq. ft., whichever is smaller. The applicant is requesting two (2) variances:

1. The applicant is proposing one (1) new wall sign in addition to the existing wall sign on the south frontage, one more sign than the sign ordinance permits.
2. The applicant is proposing that the additional wall sign be 372 feet in size. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a total variance of 332 feet.

SUMMARY & BACKGROUND
See attached staff report.

BUDGETARY CONTEXT
N/A

CIP# N/A

ATTACHMENTS
20191119-21350 Woodward Ave BZA Staff Report.pdf
20191119-21350 Woodward Ave BZA Application.pdf
20191119-21350 Woodward Ave BZA PH.pdf

STRATEGIC PLANNING CONTEXT
Organizational and Financial Excellence

RECOMMENDED ACTION
See attached staff report for potential sign appeal motions.
## Community and Economic Development – Staff Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>Sign Appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT</td>
<td>Dunning Honda (John Taylor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21350 Woodward Avenue, Ferndale, MI 48220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>Taylor, Dunning Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3745 Jackson Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>21350 Woodward Avenue, Ferndale, MI 48220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCEL NUMBER</td>
<td>24-25-34-477-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING</td>
<td>C-3 (Extended Business); Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>Justin Lyons, Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHMENTS</td>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals Application – October 31, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

The applicant, Dunning Properties, LLC, is requesting two variances from the sign listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII. Signs at the existing auto dealership at 21350 Woodward Avenue. Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs) permits one (1) wall sign per street frontage with size requirements that the sign shall not exceed 10% of wall surface excluding the calculated area of windows and doorways or 40 sq. ft., whichever is smaller. The applicant is requesting two (2) variances:

1. The applicant is proposing one (1) new wall sign in addition to the existing wall sign on the south frontage, one more sign than the sign ordinance permits.
2. The applicant is proposing that the additional wall sign be 372 feet in size. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a total variance of 332 feet.

The applicant cited the building’s location that is adjacent to the Woodward Avenue bridge as a practical difficulty at the property as a reason for the Board of Zoning Appeals to consider the variances. Note that the applicant proposed using the City’s logo as part of the new wall sign in “option 2”. If the Board of Zoning Appeals were to grant the variances, staff has already notified the applicant that the City logo would not be permitted to use at the site.

Please review the attached information, submitted by the applicant, identifying the reasons for the variances requested.
Aerial Photo of Site & Surroundings

Image of 21350 Woodward Avenue from Oakland County Property Gateway denoted in red (2019)

Image of 21350 Woodward Avenue from Google Street View (June 2019)
General Requirements for Appeal (Section 24-246)
In deciding appeals, the Board must find:

A. The action proposed will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties; increase the danger of fire; unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area; harm the environment; or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the City;
B. The action proposed will be compatible with adjacent uses, and of such height, location, size and character that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the surrounding neighborhood;
C. The action proposed will not unreasonably increase congestion in public streets, make vehicular and pedestrian traffic more hazardous than is normal for the district involved, taking into account sight distances, traffic flow, provisions for pedestrian traffic, and minimization of potential traffic conflicts;
D. The action proposed will not create a nuisance;
E. The plight of the applicant results from special or unique circumstances peculiar to the property and not from general neighborhood conditions; and
F. The alleged hardship has not been created by the applicant or any person having a current interest in the property.

Criteria for Sign Appeals (Section 6-268)
The sign board of appeals may hear requests for variances from these regulations. A variance may be granted by the sign board of appeals in cases involving practical difficulties or unique conditions regarding the sign and/or its location. The burden of proof lies with the applicant. Requests for variances shall be reviewed for compliance with the following:

(1) Variances may be granted for any one of the following conditions:
   a. The applicant has demonstrated a variance is needed due to a practical difficulty on the site, such as varied topography, horizontal or vertical road curvature, or presence of structures or desired trees that limits visibility of a sign on the premises;
   b. A variance is warranted due to the relatively large size of the site, frontage or building; or
   c. A variance would significantly improve the conformity of an existing sign.

(2) To grant a variance for one of the conditions specified above, all of the following standards must also be met:
   a. The inability to conform with the regulations is due to a practical difficulty or unique condition that includes more than mere inconvenience or mere inability to attain a supposed higher financial return;
   b. That the alleged practical difficulties or unique condition, or both, 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;
   c. That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by the regulations, the individual practical difficulties that will be suffered by a failure to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance, and will not be contrary to the public purpose and general intent of these regulations;
   d. The variance granted is the minimum necessary to allow the applicant to have a reasonable outlet for free speech and meet the intent of these sign regulations; and
   e. The variance will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the public.
Example Sign Appeal Approval Motions

MOTION by __________________, seconded by __________________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals APPROVE the variance application to allow a variance of one (1) from the required maximum number of wall signs (Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267), at 21350 Woodward Avenue, Sidwell number 24-25-34-477-001, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs requires a maximum number of one (1) wall sign per street frontage, and the applicant is requesting variance to allow for an additional wall sign on the south frontage;
2. that a practical difficulty does exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does not have other available alternatives for signs that would allow for all applicable regulatory requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be not observed, and the applicant will be denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the wall sign ordinance;
4. That the proposal does not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was not created by the applicant, instead the hardship was created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 6-268 regarding granting a sign appeal have been met.

MOTION by __________________, seconded by __________________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals APPROVE the variance application to allow a variance of 332 feet from the required 40 square feet maximum wall sign size (Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267), for a total size of 372 feet at 21350 Woodward Avenue, Sidwell number 24-25-34-477-001, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs permits one (1) wall sign per street frontage with size requirements that the sign shall not exceed 10% of wall surface excluding the calculated area of windows and doorways or 40 sq. ft., whichever is smaller, and the applicant is requesting variance to allow for a 372 feet wall sign on the south frontage;
2. that a practical difficulty does exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does not have other available alternatives for signs that would allow for all applicable regulatory requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be not observed, and the applicant will be denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the wall sign ordinance;
4. That the proposal does not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was not created by the applicant, instead the hardship was created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 6-268 regarding granting a sign appeal have been met.
Example Sign Appeal Denial Motions

MOTION by ________________, seconded by ________________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals DENY the variance application to allow a variance of one (1) from the required maximum number of wall signs (Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267), at 21350 Woodward Avenue, Sidwell number 24-25-34-477-001, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs requires a maximum number of one (1) wall sign per street frontage, and the applicant is requesting variance to allow for an additional wall sign on the south frontage;
2. that a practical difficulty does not exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does have other available alternatives for signs that would allow for all applicable regulatory requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be observed, and the applicant will be not denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the wall sign ordinance;
4. That the proposal does not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does not result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was created by the applicant and the hardship was not created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 6-268 regarding granting a sign appeal have not been met.

MOTION by ________________, seconded by ________________, that the Board of Zoning Appeals DENY the variance application to allow a variance of 332 feet from the required 40 square feet maximum wall sign size (Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267), for a total size of 372 feet at 21350 Woodward Avenue, Sidwell number 24-25-34-477-001, after a Public Hearing was held as set and published for this date and place, the motion is accompanied by the following findings:

Findings

1. that section Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs permits one (1) wall sign per street frontage with size requirements that the sign shall not exceed 10% of wall surface excluding the calculated area of windows and doorways or 40 sq. ft., whichever is smaller, and the applicant is requesting variance to allow for a 372 feet wall sign on the south frontage;
2. that a practical difficulty does not exist in that conformity with the strict letter of the Ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome in that the applicant does not have other available alternatives for signs that would allow for all applicable regulatory requirements to be met;
3. that the intent of the City’s ordinance will be observed, and the applicant will not be denied rights enjoyed by others in the same zoning district as other property owners if required to meet the wall sign ordinance;
4. That the proposal does not impair the public health and safety of inhabitants of the City;
5. that the plight of the applicant does not result from conditions or circumstances unique to the property; and
6. that the alleged hardship was created by the applicant, instead the hardship was created by the unique circumstances of the property.

Therefore, the requirements of Section 6-268 regarding granting a sign appeal have been met.
Sign Appeals Application

1. Identification
   Applicant Name: Dunning Honda of Ferndale
   Address: 21350 Woodward Ave.
   City/State/Zip Code: Ferndale, MI 48220
   Phone: (734) 558-5255
   Fax: ( )
   Signature: [Signature]
   Interest in the Property (e.g. fee simple, land option, etc.)

   Property Owner (if other than applicant)
   Taylor, Dunning Properties LLC
   Address: 3745 Jackson Rd
   City/State/Zip Code: Ann Arbor, MI 48103
   Phone: (734) 558-5255
   Fax: ( )

   Brief description of request:
   On the south end of our building we would like to add a professional painted logo DUNNING HONDA Welcomes you to Ferndale! Pictures attached with dimentions.

2. Criteria for Variance from the Sign Regulations. The Board of Zoning Appeals may hear requests for variances from these regulations. A variance may be granted by the Board only in cases involving practical difficulties or unique conditions regarding the sign and/or its location. The burden of proof lies with the applicant. Requests for variances shall be reviewed for compliance with the following:

   Variances may be granted for any one (1) of the following conditions:
1. The applicant has demonstrated a variance is needed due to a practical difficulty on the site, such as varied topography, horizontal or vertical road curvature, or presence of structures or desired trees that limits visibility of a sign on the premises. Describe the practical difficulty involved with the application.

Dunning Honda can't be seen from northbound WOODWARD traffic that comes over the bridge until you are almost past the store. This includes our inventory of vehicles. This location is also at a major disadvantage from southbound traffic as there is not way to get to our dealership from that direction, other than going to 8 mile and turning around under the bridge and coming up thenorth side.

2. A variance is warranted due to the relatively large size of the site, frontage or building. Indicate how the size of the site, frontage or building warrant consideration of a variance.

In my opinion, our south facing side of the building coming into Ferndale is a big white block industrial looking building with a small sign, service door and a couple of entrance doors.

Personally I believe this addition would help entering our city look and feel inviting.

3. A variance would significantly improve the conformity of an existing sign. Describe how.

3. Criteria for APPEALS.
To grant a variance for one of the conditions specified above, all of the following standards must also be met. Explain how each is met.

a. The inability to conform with the regulations is due to a practical difficulty or unique condition that includes more than mere inconvenience or mere inability to attain a supposed higher financial return.

Our business is blocked by the bridge and also the walls on the bridge. mostly all anyone can see while driving down Woodward is half of a big white building when coming from the south. In addition we believe this is a friendly welcome to Ferndale.

b. That the alleged practical difficulties or unique condition, or both, 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.

We have not noticed this condition with any other business located on Woodward.

c. That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by the regulations, the individual practical difficulties that will be suffered by a failure to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance, and will not be contrary to the public purpose and general intent of these regulations.

We honestly feel this is an opportunity to improve our building along with investing in our new community. Our goal is to become a responsible business partner Helping to improve Ferndale and our surrounding neighbors with additional investments.

We look forward to working with our new neighbors.
d. The variance granted is the minimum necessary to allow the applicant to have a reasonable outlet for free speech and meet the intent of these sign regulations.

Our desire is to help our dealership survive here in Ferndale. Our Goal is to improve the look and feel entering Ferndale that we believe we have an opportunity to offer.

e. The variance will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

This request is in no way adversely affecting any person, Business, plant or animal

This request is a positive opportunity for Dunning Honda, Ferndale and our neighbors.

4. Completing the Application. The following checklist includes all documents required for Planning Commission to consider the appeal. You will be contacted by the CED Department with your hearing date.

- Completed application form.
- Application fee.
- 1 electronic version and 3 copies of computer-generated photographs indicating the sign on the building/property with dimensions, material specifications, colors and other pertinent information about the proposed variance to assist the Board in making its decision.
CITY OF FERNDALE
300 EAST 9 MILE ROAD
FERNDALE, MI 48220
Phone : (248) 546-2525
HTTP://WWW.FERNALEMI.GOV/

Received From:
TAYLOR DUNNING PROPERTIES LLC
Date: 10/31/2019     Time: 4:58:59 PM
Receipt: 185624
Cashier: tbrown
Workstation: Drawer: 1

ITEM REFERENCE       AMOUNT
---------------------  --------
BDINV Building Dept. Invoice
00042674             $600.00
---------------------  --------
TOTAL                $600.00

Checks 1939
Total Tendered: $600.00

Change: $0.00
CITY OF FERNDALE
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The City of Ferndale Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. at Ferndale City Hall, 300 E. Nine Mile, to consider an application submitted by Dunning Properties, LLC for variances from the standards listed in Ordinance 1087, Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs) at:

Sidwell No. 24-25-34-477-001, T1N, R11E, SEC 34 WOODWARD HOMES SUB LOTS 8 TO 18 INCL, commonly known as 21350 Woodward Avenue.

Chapter 6, Article VIII, Sec. 6-267 (Sign Standards for Permitted Signs; Wall Signs) permits one (1) wall sign per street frontage with size requirements that the sign shall not exceed 10% of wall surface excluding the calculated area of windows and doorways or 40 sq. ft., whichever is smaller. The applicant is requesting two (2) variances:

1. The applicant is proposing two wall signs on the south frontage, one more sign than the sign ordinance permits.
2. The applicant is proposing that the additional wall sign be 372 feet in size. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a total variance of 332 feet.

Any resident or property owner may participate in the hearing or submit written comments to the Community and Economic Development Department prior to Monday, November 18, 2019. For more information, please contact the Community and Economic Development Department at 248-546-2366 or review the request beginning November 15, 2019 at https://www.ferndalemi.gov/council-meetings.

Justin Lyons, Planning Manager
Community & Economic Development
ced@ferndalemi.gov