

AGENDA

WYOMING ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

January 16, 2017

1:30 P.M.

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Approval of Minutes
- 4. Public Hearings:

Appeal #V160039

Applicant: Signworks of Michigan, Inc.
Location: 755 54TH ST S.W. (Zoned B-2)

Request: The petitioner requests a variance from the City of Wyoming Zoning Code as follows:

Zoning Code section 90-705 (5) Sign Illumination specifies that luminous tubing is prohibited on signage except for lettering and images. The petitioner proposes to border a freeway sign with luminous neon tubing. The requested variance is to allow this luminous border. P.P. #41-17-36-101-050

Tabled	_____	Closed	_____
Granted	_____	Denied	_____
Motion by	_____		
Seconded by	_____		
Yeas	_____	Nays	_____

- 5. Public Comment:
- 6. New Business:

Application No.	V160039	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	
Applicant:	Signworks of Michigan, Inc.	Approve	
Address:	755 54TH ST SW	Deny:	X

FINDINGS OF FACT SHEET

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to the intended use that do not apply generally to other property or class of use in the same vicinity and district because:

The petitioner proposes to replace an existing expressway sign for Hampton Inn. Both the existing sign, and the proposed sign, would have a neon border. Zoning Code Section 90-705 (5) Sign Illumination prohibits luminous tubing on signs except for lettering and tubing. The existing sign is nonconforming. A variance is requested for the replacement sign. Every business property along U.S. 131 is entitled to an expressway sign, with many providing them. The proposed border illumination allows for the outline of the sign to be seen from a greater distance at night, but would not improve the legibility of the actual message, Hampton Inn. The sign can otherwise be constructed with a red band as part of the sign that would be internally lit. There is nothing exceptional or extraordinary regarding the property or use that merits granting the requested variance.

2. That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights because:

The business is otherwise entitled to an expressway sign that conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. That the granting of such variance will not diminish the marketable value of adjacent land and improvements, or unduly increase congestion in the public streets because:

The granting of the variance would not diminish the marketable value of the adjoining properties or increase traffic congestion.

4. That the condition or situation of a specific piece of property, or the intended use of said property, for which the variance is sought is not of so general or recurrent a nature as to make reasonably practicable the formulation of a general regulation for such condition or situation because:

The property is strategically located at the off ramps to U.S. 131 at 54th Street. This location affords the business great visibility along both high volume traffic corridors. Zoning ordinances are structured to, over time, bring nonconforming structures into conformance. A general regulation to allow illuminated borders should only be considered in the context of allowing such borders to signs city-wide, which is a community aesthetics issue.