

ء ۾

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
MICHIGAN CITY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2021

The Michigan City Board of Zoning Appeals met in a regular meeting in person, along with a live FaceBook and Zoom stream, on Tuesday, October 12, 2021, at 6:00 p.m, the date, time, and location for holding of said meeting.

Chairman Zimmer called the meeting to order and, upon roll call, the following board members are present:

Karen Janus, Fred Klinder, Lester Norvell, Lawrence Zimmer, and Kathryn Stransky.

Also present: Steven A. Hale, BZA Counsel; Skyler York, Planning Director; and, Marilyn M. Jones, RPR, CSR, the Board's stenographer.

The first item of business was approval of the minutes from the August 10, 2021, meeting. Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes.

With a roll call vote of all ayes and no nays, the motion carried and the August 10, 2021, minutes are approved.

The first petition before the Board: B-120-21 of Nick and Amy Georgitsis requesting Development Standard Variance to allow for a five-foot tall fence containing greater than 80% visibility on a double frontage lot (2 front yards) located at 410 Duneland Beach Drive.

Mr.and Mrs. Georgitsis approached the lecturn and explained the need for the variance, in that they had already purchased the fence when they bought the home in May and were unaware of the "double frontage" issue.

Mrs. Georgitsis described the fence to the board and requested approval of their petition. Board Member Stransky commented that seeing the fence has helped her understand the request, along with the diagrams provided.

Chairman Zimmer commented that Maywood is really more like an alley.

Chairman Zimmer call for the departmental reports.

Planning Director York read his report (H.I.) into the record and recommended approval of the petition without conditions.

Counsel Hale read his attorney report (H.I.) into the record at the end enumerating for the board the choices they have regarding the petition.

Chairman Zimmer calls for comments from the board. Hearing none, the public comment portion of the meeting was opened.

Hearing no public comments, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

Board Member Norvell moved to accept the findings of fact, the Planning Department's report, the information provided by the Petitioners, and that the petition be approved. Seconded by Board Member Janus.

Roll call vote was taken as follows:

12 AYES NAYS

13 Karen Janus
Lester Norvell
14 Lawrence Zimmer
Fred Klinder
15 Kathryn Stransky

With a roll call vote of all ayes and no nays, the Petition B-120-21 is granted and approved by the Board.

The next petition called: Petition B-121-21 of BCP Development LP/Robert A. Behar, MD, MBA, requesting <u>Special Exception Use</u> to allow for light retail auto-related use, installation and sales of wheels and tires, in the former Gordon Food Service building located at 5400 Franklin Street.

Mr. Scott Robertson, who is with R&R Tires Express, explained the business plan of tire and wheel alignment and installation at 5400 Franklin Street. Board Member Stransky asked Mr. Robertson to expound on the business and plan for the building. There will not be roll-up garage doors in the front of the building; they will be located in the back of the building; there will be no car repairs, or wrecked cars on the premises; no fluids - strictly tires installation and alignment; the building will be painted with the company colors, the south side block corner will be installed with

glass windows that conform to the code for glare; 6,000 square feet will be occupied for the business, and the remainder will be sed for storage of new tires, and used tires; none of the tires will be stored outside of the building. Mr. Robertson explained that this is a very low-key business with much less traffic than what Gordon Food Service experienced in this location. This company is a national franchise company; tires and wheels is all they do. A brief discussion was had regarding the building design and the company's desire to work with the community and be a good steward to the citizens that live here.

Counsel Hale clarified for the record that the petitioner in his opening remarks indicated that this petition is for a "variance," and that the petition is for a "special exception use." Board Member Stransky brought up the parking and ingress/egress for the building.

Mr. Robertson explained the Gordon Food Store numbers was 75 to 150 customers a day, and that his company will have 10 to 12 a day. Mr. York explained that he took this issue into consideration in his report. A brief discussion ensured regarding the ingress/egress, plenty of parking but a tight radius.

Chairman Zimmer called for departmental reports.

Mr. York read his departmental report for Petition B-121-21 of BCP Development (H.I.) into the record, recommending approval of Special Use, all repairs done inside, no storage of vehicles, displays not to encroach into parking spaces in front of the building; conditions: no roll-up doors in the front of the building, no outdoor displays of merchandise, except as provided in 14.05(3), displays should not spill over and take up parking space in front of the building. Mr. Robertson acknowledged what Mr. York just explained regarding displays.

Board Member Klinder asked Mr. York to explain a variance versus a special exception use, and it was explained to Mr. Klinder.

Counsel Hale read his attorney report (H.I.) into the record, noting that this "special exception use" is different than a "use variance" and the standards that must be met are different, and that if the board finds that the standards for the "special exception use" are met, then the board would be correct in granting same. Counsel Hale explained the choices the board has in either granting or denying the request tonight.

1

2

Chairman Zimmer called for questions or comments from the board; hearing none, the public portion of the meeting was opened.

3

4

5

6

Zoom participant Tom Kulavik, remonstrated against the granting of the petition, citing several other available properties (Sears or Tire Barn buildings) that would be more suitable, in his opinion, for this business, as well as the fact that he feels the area is saturated with tire businesses, Belle Tire and Tire Discount, another tire business, right next door to Belle Tire. He also mentioned the wetland adjacent to this building.

7

8

Chairman Zimmer thanked Mr. Kulavik for his comments, and asked for more input from the public. Hearing none, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

9

10

11

Board Member Klinder moved that Petition B-121-21 be approved with the understanding that the Planning Department Report and recommendations and the attorney's report be included in the approval. Seconded by Board Member Janus.

12

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

13

15

AYES NAYS

14 <u>AYES</u>

Karen Janus Lester Norvell

16 Lawrence Zimmer

Fred Klinder

17 | Kathryn Stransky

18

19

With a roll call vote of all ayes and no nays, the Petition B-121-21 is <u>granted</u> and <u>approved</u> by the Board with the conditions as set out in the Planning Department's report.

20

21

The next petition called was: Petition B-122-21 of Clarence Davis requesting Special Exception Use to allow for used car sales in a B2 Zoning district located at 2001 East Michigan Boulevard.

2223

Counsel Hale advised the board that he has had conversations with Petitioner Davis and that there is a missing notification to an adjacent property owner and that due to that fact the board is not free to consider this matter this evening, and that the board continue this matter to their next regularly scheduled meeting.

25

24

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

It was moved by Mr. Klinder to continue the petition to the next meeting, seconded by Ms. Janus.

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

4 AYES

NAYS

5 Karen Janus

Lester Norvell

6 Lawrence Zimmer Fred Klinder

7 Kathryn Stransky

> With a roll call vote of all aves and no navs, the motion carries and the Petition B-122-21 is continued to the next meeting of the board.

> Mr. Zimmer questioned Use Variance and Special Exception Use on this petition. Mr. York explained the reasoning behind it being that it is a very unusual situation where there is a small portion of this property that actually has dual zoned -- possibly going back to when the 2011 zoning changes took place -- but it is a very small part of the lot Mr. Davis owns. So that is why the split. One parcel with Mr. Klinder questioned a little bit of dual zoning on it. if he was still able to sell the cars from that location. Mr. York explained he is storing the cars there.

15

16

Board Member Stransky notes the address is not the same in the paperwork and it should be corrected.

17

Chairman Zimmer calls for the next item on the agenda, Old Business. Approval of Findings and Orders.

18 19

The following petitions were called before the board for approval of findings of facts and orders:

20

21

B-117-21 of Ken Patel, 3311 Franklin Street. Hale read the Findings and Order into the record (H.I.) and requested a motion for approval.

22

23 Board Member Norvell moved to approve the document as read into the record by Counsel Hale. Seconded by Board Member Janus.

24

25

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

1	<u>AYES</u> <u>NAYS</u>			
2	Karen Janus Lester Norvell			
3	Lawrence Zimmer Fred Klinder Kathryn Stransky			
_				
5 6	With a roll call vote of all ayes and no nays, the Findings and order for Petition B-117-21 are approved.			
7	NEXT FINDINGS and ORDER on the agenda:			
8 9	B-118-21 of Theola Wright, 1324 West 8th Street. Counsel Hale read the Findings and Order for B-118-21 into the record (H.I.) and requested a motion for approval.			
10 11	Board Member Norvell moved to approve the document as read into the record by Counsel Hale. Seconded by Board Member Klinder.			
12	A roll call vote was taken as follows:			
13	<u>AYES</u> <u>NAYS</u>			
14 15 16	Karen Janus Lester Norvell Lawrence Zimmer Fred Klinder Kathryn Stransky			
17 18	With a roll call vote of all ayes and no nays, the Findings and Order for Petition B-118-21 are approved.			
19	NEXT FINDINGS and ORDER on the agenda:			
20	B-119-21 of Paul E. Taylor/Taylor Design Architects, 108 California Avenue.			
21 22	Counsel Hale read the Findings and Order for B-119-21 into the record (H.I.) and requested a motion for approval.			
23	Board Member Norvell moved to approve the document as			
24	read into the record by Counsel Hale. Seconded by Board Member Klinder.			
25	A roll call vote was taken as follows:			

REPORT ON THE PETITION FOR B-120-21, 410 Duneland Beach Drive

Date of Report: 10-12-21

WATER DEPARTMENT: R.E. Russell, Superintendent, has no objections.

SANITATION DEPARTMENT: Arber Himaj, Engineer with the Sanitary District, has no objections

FIRE DEPARTMENT: Jeff Bruder, Fire Marshall, the Fire Department does not have any objections

PLANNING DEPARTMENT: The petitioner is requesting a Development Standard Variance to allow construction of a 5' fence with greater than 80% visibility on a double frontage lot (2 front yards).

Zoning Ordinance Requirements

The subject property is zoned R1D, Single Family Residential District

Required	Requested	Comments
ZO 16.05 (b) (1) Fences and walls located within the front yard shall not exceed three and one-half feet in height and shall not be in excess of 49 percent solid or opaque.	Construction of a 5' fence.	Petitioner is situated on a double frontage lot.
percent sond or opaque.		

The standards for a development standard variance are found in the zoning code in [16.05(b)(1)] and are set out below in italics with the department's proposed findings.

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community because of the following:

PROPOSED FINDING: The approval <u>will not</u> be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community. Petitioner is requesting to place the fence 16' from the road behind the tree line as well as the fence having greater than 80% visibility. The property in question is not on a corner lot and the proposed fence will not have an impact on vehicular or pedestrian visibility

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

PROPOSED FINDING: The use and value of the area adjacent to the property <u>will</u> <u>not</u> be affected in a substantially adverse manner. The fence will add value to the property and will not impact the light, view, air, or sight line from adjacent property owners.

Docket No. B-120-21 Page 1 of 2

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. Practical difficulties shall result from exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district. The variance shall be necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other property owners in the same zoning district.

PROPOSED FINDING: The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance <u>will</u> result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. The allowance of this fence will ensure that the petitioner is able to secure their property along the road as well as any pet on premises.

Recommendation

PROPOSED FINDING:

The Department recommends approval of the requested development standard variance for a 5' high fence to encroach into the rear, docket no. B-120-21 with no condition of approval.

Docket No. B-120-21 Page 2 of 2

Attorney Report

Petition No.: B-120-21

Petitioners: Nick & Amy Georgitsis
Owners: Nick & Amy Georgitsis

Request: Development Standards Variance

Location: 410 Duneland Beach Drive, Michigan City, Indiana

The record includes:

1. The materials submitted by the Petitioners, including:

- (a) Petition for Development Standards Variance.
- (b) Petitioner's proposed Development Standards Variance Preliminary Finding & Order.
- (c) Hand-drawn map.
- (d) Manufacturer's specs and description of the type and size of fencing.
- (e) Two (2) photographs of similar fencing.
- (f) Acknowledgement of Public Hearing Notice Requirements.
- (g) Hand-drawn Map of Neighboring adjoining/abutting Property Owners with names and addresses.
- (h) Notice of Public Hearing.
- (i) Affidavit of Service.
- (j) Mailing notice documentation (white mailing receipts and green card receipts).
- 2. Planning Department Report.
- 3. This Report.
- 4. Materials and testimony that may be presented at the public hearing to be held on October 12, 2021.

The Property is located in R1C Single Family Residential District. Petitioners are requesting Development Standards Variance too allow a 5' high fence; Section 1605(b) of our Zoning Ordinance prohibits fences in a front yard greater than 3½ feet high. Petitioner's property is a double frontage lot, which means there are "front yard" requirements on two sides of the home. The proposed fence will be located in a yard that is used as a traditional back or rear yard, but which fronts upon a street.

The appropriate standards to be considered by the BZA for the proposed Development Standards Variance are found at Section 28.11(b) of the zoning ordinance and in the Planning Department Report, namely:

- (a) The approval will or will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.
- (b) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will or will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.
- (c) The strict application of the terms of the Zoning Ordinance will or will not result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. Practical difficulties shall result from exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district. The variance shall be necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other property owners in the same district.

The BZA may, under Section 28.05(b):

- grant the request; or,
- 2. partially grant the request, or grant it with limitations which MUST be included in the motion; or,
- 3. grant the request, but subject to certain conditions which MUST be included in the motion; or,
- 4. deny the request; or,
- 5. table the request until a future meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven A. Hale

REPORT ON THE PETITION OF B-121-21, BCP Development, 5400 Franklin Street

WATER DEPARTMENT: Chris Johnsen, Superintendent, has no objections.

SANITATION DEPARTMENT: Steve Stanford, Operations Manager, had no objections.

FIRE DEPARTMENT: Fire Marshall, Rob Schaffer, has no objections

PLANNING DEPARTMENT: The petitioner is requesting a special exception use to allow a former grocery store to be converted into Wheel and Tire retailer and installer.

Zoning Ordinance Requirements

The subject property is zoned B2, General Commercial

Required	Proposed	Comments
ZO 07.02 General Commercial B2 Minor automobile service and repair is granted by Special Exception Use in the B2 Zoning District	The petitioner proposes to convert an existing former grocer into a new use of a wheel and tire retailer and installer.	This location is in a large multi-unit building with parking in the front and rear. The new owner has been told they cannot install roll up doors on the front façade of the building.

Proposed Findings for the Special Use Exception

The standards for the special exception use have been set out below in italics [24.05] with the planning department's findings provided below.

- General Welfare. The proposal will not be injurious to the public health, safety, and general
 welfare of the community.
 PROPOSED FINDING: This proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding community,
 public health, safety, or general welfare. This use is similar to other uses in the immediate
 vicinity.
- 2. Surrounding Property. The special exception use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purpose already permitted, nor substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood. The establishment of the special exception use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

 PROPOSED FINDING: Granting the special exception will not harm or diminish the use of the surrounding or adjacent properties or commercial tenants. The new tenant will make installations in the rear of the building where new roll up doors will be placed. Other uses in this building are take out and retail uses that have regular turnover in parking.
- 3. Hazard. The special exception shall not be hazardous to adjacent property, or involve uses, activities, materials or equipment which will be detrimental to the health, safety or welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, odor, fumes or glare.

PROPOSED FINDING: There are no hazards associated with granting this special exception use. The adjacent uses are retail and takeout in use and have constant turnover in parking. The proposed use should be no heavier than the commercial grocery store use that existing before.

4. Public Facilities and Services. The use will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as: highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, water and sewage facilities, refuse disposal and schools. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets. PROPOSED FINDING: This parcel has all the necessary public facilities directly adjacent or already existing at this location. All other essential public facilities are adequate for this location.

Date of Report: 10/12/21

- 5. Development Requirements. The development of the property will be consistent with the intent of the development requirements established by this ordinance for similar uses. The development will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be compatible with, and not significantly alter, the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, based upon the County Comprehensive Land Development Plan.

 PROPOSED FINDING: This development is consistent with the intent of the County Comprehensive Land Development Plan and Michigan City 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- 6. Ordinance Intent. Granting the special exception use will not be contrary to the general purposes served by this ordinance, and will not permanently injure other property or uses in the same zoning district and vicinity.
 PROPOSED FINDING: Approval of this special exception use will not permanently alter the pattern of development found in this area. Given the nature of the adjacent uses parking should be able to be shared and the installation will be happening in another location of the lot at the rear of the building. This should not permanently injure the other properties or adjacent uses.
- 7. County Land Development Plan. The proposed use will be consistent with the character of the zoning district in which it is located and the recommendations of the County Land Development Plan.

 PROPOSED FINDING: The requested special exception use will be consistent with the character and intent of the underlying zoning district and County Land Development Plan.
- 8. Use Regulations. Where there are use-specific regulations contained in Article 14, the special exception use shall comply with all of the regulations applicable to the use.

Section 14.05 - Motor Vehicle Dealers and Service
The following requirements shall be complied with for the specified use:

- (a) Vehicle Service and Repair, Major and Minor.
- (1)All repair work shall be conducted completely within an enclosed building.
- (2) Storage of wrecked, partially dismantled, or other derelict vehicles is prohibited, unless such storage is required under police or court order. Vehicles awaiting repair shall not be stored outdoors for more than seven days and shall be screened with an eight foot high screen wall in accordance with Section 17.03.
- (3) There shall be no outdoor storage or display of vehicle components and parts, supplies, or equipment or other merchandise, except within an area defined on the site plan which extends no more than ten feet beyond the building.

Docket No. B-121-21 Page 2 of 3

Recommendation

The Department would recommend approval of the proposed special exception use B-121-21 subject to the following conditions:

Date of Report: 10/12/21

- 1. There shall be no overhead or rollup doors placed on the front façade of the building facing Franklin Street/US 421.
- 2. There shall be no outdoor display or merchandise except as provide in 14.05 (3) and shall not occupy more than two parking spaces in front of the façade.

Docket No. B-121-21 Page 3 of 3

Attorney Report

Petition No.: B-121-21

Petitioner: BCP Development LP/Robert A. Behar, MD MBA

Owner: GFS Merger I LLC

Request: Special Exception Use

Location: 5400 Franklin Street, Michigan City, Indiana

The record includes:

1. Material submitted by Petitioner, including:

- (a) Petition for Special Exception Use.
- (b) Petitioner's proposed Special Exception Use Preliminary Finding & Order.
- (c) Acknowledgement of Public Hearing Notice Requirements (unsigned) and dated 8/9/21 and a second signed and dated 9/26/21.
- (d) Map of neighboring property with adjoining/abutting Property Owners names and addresses and location noted (2 pages).
- (e) ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey dated June 25, 2021 prepared by Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc. (2 pages).
- (f) White mailing receipts, addressed and postmarked 9/27/21.
- (g) Copy of Notice of Public Hearing.
- (h) Affidavit of Service.
- (i) Small copy of map of surrounding property with name, address and location of adjoining property owners.
- 2. Planning Department Report.
- 3. This Report.

4. Materials and testimony presented at the public hearing held October 12, 2021.

Petitioner is requesting approval for minor auto repair services including the sale and installation of wheels and tires in a B2 General Commercial District.

Minor automobile service and repair is a Special Exception Use in a B2 zoning district, with use requirements as set out in Section 14.05(a) of our zoning ordinance. A copy of Section 14.05(a) of our zoning ordinance is attached hereto for convenience.

The appropriate standards to be considered by the BZA for the proposed Special Exception Use are found at Article 24, Section 24.05 of our zoning ordinance and in the Planning Department report, namely that this Board find the following to be true:

- (a) The proposal will not be injurious to the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community.
- (b) The proposal will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purpose already permitted, will not substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood, and will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for permitted uses.
- (c) The proposal will not be hazardous to adjacent property, or involve uses, activities, materials or equipment which will be detrimental to the health, safety or welfare of persons or property.
- (d) The proposal will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as: highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, water and sewage facilities, refuse disposal and schools; and adequate measures have been, or will be, taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
- (e) The proposal will be consistent with the intent of the development requirements established by the zoning ordinance for similar uses; and the development will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be compatible with, and not significantly alter, the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, based upon the Comprehensive Land Development Plan.

- (f) The proposal will not be contrary to the general purposes served by the zoning ordinance; and will not permanently injure other property or uses in the same zoning district and vicinity.
- (g) The proposal will be consistent with the character of the zoning district in which it is located and the recommendations of the County Land Development Plan.
- (h) The special exception use shall comply with all of the regulations application to the use as set out in Article 14, and specifically the requirements of Section 14.05(a) of our zoning ordinance, which requirements are applicable.

The BZA may, under Section 28.05(b) of the zoning ordinance:

- 1. Approve the request if findings are made consistent with the requirements of Section 24.05; or,
- 2. Approve the request, with the findings consistent with Section 24.05 but subject to certain conditions which MUST be included in the motion; or,
- deny the request; or,
- continue the hearing until a future meeting upon ar appropriate request or to obtain additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven A. Hale