

Coleman A. Young Municipal Center 2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 808 Detroit, Michigan 48226 Phone: 313.224.1339 Fax: 313.224.1310 www.detroitmi.gov/pdd

HEARING OFFICER: Russell Baltimore, Planning and Development

ADVISORY CITY DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES: Eric Johnson, Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Jamie Murphy, City Planning Commission Karen Gage, Planning and Development

DATE: 05/26/2021

PDD CASE: 2021-00029 APPLICANT: Steilantis / Aranear, Inc. LOCATION: 11509 Mack/4000 St Jean

Notices were mailed and published which contained the following information:

#### PLEASE NOTE OUR HEARINGS ARE TEMPORARILY ON ZOOM

Governor Gretchen Whitmer's "Stay Home, Stay Safe" Executive Order 2020-21 (EO 2020-21) went into effect on March 24, 2020. Consistent with the various executive orders from Governor Whitmer, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City of Detroit Planning and Development Department, Signage Waiver Hearings will be meeting remotely via the internet until further notice. This action is being taken in accordance with Governor Whitmer's Executive Order 2020-75, which provides temporary authorization of remote participation in public meetings and hearings. The Planning and Development Department, Signage Waiver Hearings will be held electronically, in compliance with the Open Meetings Act and EO 2020-75.

TO OWNERS AND RESIDENTS OF PROPERTY WITHIN 300 FEET OF: 11509 Mack/4000 St Jean (Mack Entrance) You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held at 2:15 PM on Thursday, May 13, 2021 The link below is for all of our Zoom Meetings: https://cityofdetroit.zoom.us/j/85361038176 Dial in number: +1 312 626 6799 US Meeting ID: 853 6103 8176

A public hearing for the Signage Waiver and Adjustments Ordinance was held on Thursday, May 13, 2021 @ 2:35pm by way of Zoom.

Hearing Officer Baltimore called the hearing to order.

## ADVISORY CITY DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Eric Johnson, Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Jamie Murphy, City Planning Commission Karen Gage, Planning and Development

#### Summary of the proposed signage:

Internally illuminated, pylon (pole) sign measuring **258 square feet** and **16 feet**, **5 inches tall**.

### I. STATEMENTS FROM THE ADVISORY CITY DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

 BSEED signage inspection location report: According to Chapter 4 of the Detroit City Code (Ordinance 2020-13), Section 4-4-40 requires that a pole sign shall not exceed 20 square feet in size. The petition is being requested to waive this requirement to increase the pole sign size to 258 square feet.

I, as a Detroit Sign Waiver Hearing Board Member, make the following recommendation: SWA/SGN Number: 2021-0028 (11509 Mack/4000 St. Jean): I recommend approving the sign waiver with a reduced sign area amount of 150 sq. ft.

- 2. CPC Zoning report: No action from CPC necessary.
- II. ARGUMENT FOR THE SIGNAGE WAIVER OR ADJUSTMENT FROM THE APPLICANT: Present from the Applicant: Bryan Schwing from Stailantis was present. Also present was Roger Briddick from Fairmont Sign who presented the case and was sworn in to speak on behalf of Steilantis / Aranear, Inc.

Mr. Briddick made the argument that due to the size, number of structures and complexity of the Stailantis FCA complex, a larger sign was needed to identify both the user and importance of the development. Mr. Baltimore displayed images from the permit submittal (the site plan, sign plan, sign elevation, and rendering) while Mr. Briddick explained the applicant's stance.

The following questions were asked by Mr. Johnson to Mr. Briddick:

- Without the requested waiver or adjustment, would the sign be subject to one or more practical difficulties (size, height, sightline, etc.) that would substantially hinder the communicative potential of the sign? Yes, without the larger size, delivery truck drivers, visitors, etc. would have a difficult time understanding what facility is located at the site.
- 2. Is there no form of alternative signage in accordance with this chapter that could effectively eliminate all such practical difficulties outlined in the previous question? *The signage proposal is part of the standard branding and signage that Stailantis uses throughout all of their facilities globally.*
- 3. Would the requested waiver or adjustment would be sufficient to effectively eliminate all practical difficulties referenced in the first bullet?

Yes.

- 4. Will the requested waiver or adjustment have a detrimental effect on the privacy, light, or air of the premises or neighboring premises? *No.*
- 5. Will the requested waiver or adjustment substantially affect the use or development of the subject premises or neighboring premises? *No.*
- 6. Will the requested waiver or adjustment substantially impair, detract from, or otherwise affect the aesthetic value of the subject premises or neighboring premises? No, on the contrary, it would add to the ability of passers by being able to identify the overall complex.
- 7. Will the requested adjustment increase the potential for distraction to, obstruct the flow of, or otherwise harm pedestrians or motor vehicles passing within view of the sign?

No.

8. Is the proposed signage for the subject premises, submitted as part of the application for the waiver or adjustment, in accordance with the spirit and intent of the regulations outlined in this chapter? Yes.

# III. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No Public comments in favor. No Public comments apposed.

# IV. ACTION OF THE HEARING OFFICER:

# **APPROVED**

We have reviewed the applicant's proposal and find that it although it exceeds the criteria set forth in **Sec. 4-40-2(c)**, we find that it does meet the criteria set forth in **Sec. 4-4-62(a)(3)**. While we agree that the size and scale of the overall development warrants a sign larger than what the ordinance permits, we do not agree that the size of the proposed sign is required. We are therefore approving the application of an **internally illuminated**, **pylon (pole) sign** measuring **16 feet**, **5 inches tall** with an adjusted area of **150 square feet**.

Sincerely,

Russell Baltimore Assistant Director Design Review Planning and Development Department

K. Gage G. Moots E. Johnson J. Murphy

C: