

**GENOA TOWNSHIP  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
JUNE 11, 2002**

**MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Genoa Township Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order by Vice-Chairman Figurski at 7:00 p.m. at the Genoa Township Hall. The Pledge of Allegiance was then said.

The following board members were present constituting a quorum for the transaction of business: Barbara Figurski, Judy Stornant, Jean Ledford and Chris Hensick. Also present were Township Ordinance Enforcement Officer Adam VanTassell and approximately 20 persons in the audience.

Moved by Ledford, supported by Hensick, to approve the Agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

A Call to the Public was made with no response.

***02-16...A request by Thomas and Beverly Smith, Section 10, 5425 Wildwood for a 6.5-foot side yard variance with a 3.5 foot setback and a 31 foot front yard variance with a 4 foot setback to construct an addition.***

Smith - This request is for a 627-sq. ft. addition. Our neighbors have supported us on this request. Our cottage is the second oldest on the lake and needs to be updated. We don't want to join the lots because we may sell the other parcel sometime in the future. A Call to the Public was made with no response. Moved by Ledford, supported by Hensick, to deny the request for variance since no practical difficulty exists because the petitioner owns a vacant parcel adjoining this parcel. In addition there is no space for a garage on the existing lot. The petitioner uses the side of the lot for parallel parking. The motion carried unanimously.

***02-18...A request by Mark IRestoration, Section 5, 1091 Victory Dr. for a 25-foot front yard variance with a 50 foot setback to install additional parking.***

A Call to the Public was made with no response. Moved by Hensick, supported by Ledford, to grant a 25-foot front yard variance for the addition of a parking surface as presented by Desine, Inc. for nine additional spaces with curbing. The practical difficulty is the extensive wetland characteristics of the parcel that will not allow for an expansion in any other area. The motion carried unanimously.

***02-24...A request by John Edwards, Section 22, 3671 Highcrest for an 8'6" waterfront variance with a 33-foot setback to construct a deck.***

Dale Cooper addressed the board on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Sharp's home does not meet the ordinance requirements. A comparison was then presented of the two developed sites. He referenced sections 3.40 and 3.4202 of the Zoning Ordinance that would allow an expansion. Figurski advised Cooper that the rear of this particular property is the roadside and those sections are not applicable here. A call to the public was made with the following response: Andrew Warner - This home detracts from the beauty of the lake. I am troubled with the deck that has already been built and now the petitioner is asking for a variance. The structure is massive and detracts from the area. Trees will not block the view from across the lake. I am requesting denial. Al Sharp - I have owned my property since 1981. My old cottage was 30' from the lake. The new home was set back further. This petitioner knew what he was doing when he built the house too close to the lake. If you are going to approve a variance, it is better the way that it is now than with a trellis. VanTassell - I gave notice to Mr. Edwards in February that the home was not in compliance. Work was again started in April and a "work stop order was issued". They were advised to remove the structure or apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Cooper - The contractor did try to deal with it. Hensick - The distance from the lake of the neighboring home should be accurate because that calculation determines the setback for this parcel. I would request that the petitioner provide a survey relative to the setback of lot 13. Moved by Hensick, supported by Stornant, to table until the next regular meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

***02-25...A request by Patricia and John Warner, Section 9, 1030 Sunrise Park for a 10-foot front yard variance with a 25-foot setback, a 6-foot side yard variance with a 4-foot setback and a 4-foot side yard variance with a 6-foot setback to construct an addition.***

A Call to the Public was made with no response. Moved by Ledford, supported by Stornant, to grant a 10' front yard variance and 4' and 6' side yard variances for a second story addition for the continuation and expansion of a nonconforming structure. The motion carried unanimously.

***02-26...A request by Heileman Signs, Section 6, 2798 E. Grand River for a sign variance regarding height, total square feet allowed and the number of signs allowed for Krug Ford.***

Mike Krug - We will eventually do a renovation of the existing facility, but that is down the road. Today, we just want to conform to Ford's standards. A call to the public was made with the following response: Pat Ray - I live in Chilson Hills. This facility is old and nonconforming. There is light and noise pollution at all times with paging, etc. I would like to see conformance with the existing standards and strongly object to any variance.

Moved by Hensick, supported by Ledford, to table the request until a survey of the location of the pole signs in relation to the property line is provided by the petitioner. The motion carried unanimously.

***02-27...A request by Eleanor McGraw, Section 22, 4284 Highcrest, is for a 7-foot side yard variance with a 3-foot setback to construct an addition.***

A call to the public was made with no response. Moved by Stornant, supported by Hensick, to grant a 7' side yard variance for a second story addition which would allow the expansion of an existing nonconforming use. The motion carried unanimously.


***02-28...A request by Schonsheck Inc. and Kraft Properties, Section 5, 955 Grand Oaks, is for a 10-foot front yard variance for an existing building.***

A Call to the Public was made with no response. Moved by Hensick, supported by Ledford, to grant the request to expand an existing nonconforming structure and permit a 10' variance on the south side. The practical difficulty is the existing nonconforming structure and the "General Use of the Property" document that provided for a 40' setback to the front property line. The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Ledford, supported by Stornant, to approve the Minutes of the 05-14-02 regular meeting of the board as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Hensick, supported by Ledford, to recommend that meetings of the Zoning Board of Appeals be changed from the 2nd Tuesday of the month to the third Tuesday to allow the Zoning Board to receive the minutes of the Planning Commission when relative to a petition originating from the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

  
Paulette A. Skolarus  
Genoa Township Clerk