# GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP <br> ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS <br> SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 <br> 7:30 P.M. <br> AGENDA 

## Call to Order:

Pledge of Allegiance:
Introductions:
Approval of Agenda:
Call to the Public: (Please Note: The Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m)

1. 20-17 ... A request by William and Kristi Shaffer, 5294 Sharp Drive, for a side yard setback to allow for a cantilevered chimney.
2. 20-18 ... A request by Ventures Design, 3470 Pineridge Lane, for a waterfront setback variance to install a swimming pool and a variance to construct retaining walls in the required waterfront yard.

## Administrative Business:

1. Approval of minutes for the August 18, 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.
2. Correspondence
3. Township Board Representative Report
4. Planning Commission Representative Report
5. Zoning Official Report
6. Member Discussion
7. Adjournment

GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP VARIANCE APPLICATION
2911 DUR ROAD｜BRIGHTON，MICHIGAN 48116
（810）227－5225｜FAX（810）227－3420


Applicant／Owner：WILLIAM 产KnIstiSHAFEENEmail：the chaffers 20 of GMAAIL．com Property Address： 5294 SHARP Phone： 8109236306 Present Zoning：$\angle R R$ Tax code： $11-22-100-022$

ARTICLE 23 of the Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance describes the Variance procedure and the duties of the Zoning Board of Appeals．

Each application for Variance is considered individually by the ZBA．The ZBA is a board of limited power；it cannot change the Zoning Ordinance or grant relief when it is possible to comply with the Zoning Ordinance．It may provide relief where due to unique aspects of the property with strict application of the zoning ordinance to the land results in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship．

The applicant is responsible for presenting the information necessary to support the relief requested．While much of the necessary information is gathered through the completed application，other information may be gathered by on－site visits，other sources，and during the ZBA meeting．ZBA members，township officials and township staff may visit the site without prior notification to property owners．

Failure to meet the submittal requirements and properly stake the property showing all proposed improvements may result in postponement or denial of this petition．

Please explain the proposed variance below：

1．Variance requested／intended property modifications：SEEKING RELIEF FROM
$\qquad$ CHIMNEY OF $15 \frac{1}{2}$＂．PLEASE SEE ATTACHED．

The following is per Article 23.05 .03 of the Genoa Township Ordinance:

Criteria Applicable to Dimensional Variances. No variance in the provisions or requirements of the Ordinance shall be authorized by the Board of Appeals unless it is found from the evidence that all of the following conditions exist:

## Under each please indicate how the proposed project meets each criteria.

Practical Difficulty/Substantial Justice. Compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, density, or other dimensional provisions would unreasonably prevent the use of the property. Granting of a requested variance or appeal would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district and is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity of the subject parcel.


Extraordinary Circumstances. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or the intended use which are different than other properties in the same zoning district or the variance would make the property consistent with the majority of other properties in the vicinity. The need for the variance was not self-created by the applicant.


Public Safety and Welfare. The granting of the variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.


Any Variance not acted upon within 12 months from the date of approval is invalid and must receive a renewal from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

After the decision is made regarding your Variance approval a land use permit will be required with additional site plan and construction plans.

Date:
 Signature:


PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY／GUBGTANTIAL لレETICE

CロMPLIANCE WITH THE GTRICT LETTER DF THE REGTRICTIUNG GロVERNING AREA， GETBACKG，FRONTAGE，HEIGHT，BULK， DENGITY，ロR ロTHER PRロVIGIロNB WロULD UNREABロNABLY PREVENT THE UGE DF THE PRDPERTY．GRANTING DF A REQUEGTED VARIANGE OR APPEAL WロULD Dロ BUBgTANTIAL JUBTICE Tロ THE APPLICANT AB WELL AG THE ロTHER PRDPERTY ロWNERG IN THE DIGTRICT AND IG NECEGGARY FOR THE PREGERVATIロN AND ENJUYMENT ロF A GUEGTANTIAL PROPERTY RIGHT GIMILAR Tロ THAT PロGGEGGED BY ロTHER PRDPERTIEG IN THE SAME ZロNING DIGTRICT AND VICINITY DF THE SLEJECT PARCEL

WE DU THINK THAT ロUR REQUEGT IG REABロNABLE Tロ ロUR ENJロYMENT ロF THE PRDPERTY．ロUR EITE PLAN CLEARLY INDIGATEG ロUR EFFロRTG Tロ GロMPLY WITH AN ODD GITE．THE CANTILEVERED FIREPLACE WAG NロT A LARGE CロNGERN DURING THE DEGIGN PHAGE，AG ロUR TALKG WITH GENDA TロWNGHIP INDICATED THAT THE ZロNING ロRDINANEE WAG LIKELY TD PROVIDE FGR CANTILEVERED FIREPLACEG．PARTICULARLY A CANTILEVER ロF

ロBVIロUELY，THE VIRUG PUT ALL PLANNING ロN HロLD IN FAVロR DF BTABILITY，AND THE ANTICIPATED GRDINANCE CHANGE DID NロT ロCCUR．

## EXTRADRDINARY CIRCUMETANCEG

THERE ARE EXCEPTIGNAL OR EXTRADRDINARY CIRCLMETANCEE ロR CロNDITIUNG APPLICABLE Tロ THE PRロPERTY ロR THE INTENDED UBE WHICH ARE DIFFERENT THAN DTHER PRDPERTIEG IN THE GAME ZロNING DIETRICT ロR THE VARIANCE WロULD MAKE THE PRIPERTY CロNGIGTENT WITH THE MAJロRITY OF ロTHER PRDPERTIEG IN THE VICINITY．THE NEED FロR THE VARIANCE WAE NDT GELF－CREATED EY THE APPLICANT．

THE EXTRADRDINARY CIRCUMGTANCE THAT EXIGTB WITH THIS GITE IS THE UNIQUE AND IRREGULAR GHAPE ロF THE LロT．BEING A GLIVER DF PRDPERTY BロLNDED BY A CUL－DE－GAC AND THE LAKE，THE BロUNDARIES HAVE BEEN A CUNTINUING CHALLENGE．AB EVIDENCED BY ロUR GITE PLAN AND EUILDING FロロTPRINT，WE HAVE BTRUGGLED Tロ CロMPLY WITH ALL ORDINANCEE．HAVING ACCOMPLIGHED THIE， WITH THE EXCEPTIロN GF THE FIREPLACE， THE GRANTING DF THIG VARIANGE WロULD Gロ A LONG WAY IN RECOGNIZING THE DIFFICLLTY AND MAKING THIS PRロPERTY A LITTLE MロRE CロNGIGTENT WITH THE NEIGHEDRING PRDPERTIEG．

PUBLIC gAFETY AND WELFARE
THE GRANTING DF THE VARIANCE WILL NロT IMPAIR AN ADEQUATE GUPPLY ロF LIGHT AND AIR TO ADJACENT PRDPERTY ロR UNREAGロNABLY INCREAGE THE CONGEGTIGN IN PUBLIC GTREETG， INCREAGE THE DANGER DF FIRE ロR ENDANGER THE PUBLIC GAFETY， CロMFDRT，MロRALG，DR WELFARE DF THE INHABITANTS ロF THE TOWNGHIP ロF GENDA．

ロUR 15 1／2＂PRロJECTIロN IB Tロロ BMALL Tロ THREATEN THE PUBLIC BAFETY， WELFARE，$\square R$ ANY ロF THE CONDITIロNS LISTED IN THIS QUESTIロN．

## IMPACT ロN BURRQUNDING NEIGHBロRHロロD

THE VARIANEE WILL NDT INTERFERE WITH ロR DIgCロURAGE THE APPRロPRIATE DEVELロPMENT， CロNTINUED UBE，ロR VALUE DF ADJACENT PRDPERTIEG AND THE GURRロUNDING NEIGHBGRHロロD．

AGAIN，QUR 15 V／2 PRQJECTIQN IS Tロロ SMALL Tロ HAVE ANY IMPACT ON NEIGHEDRING PROPERTIEG ロR DEVELロPMENTE．

## MEMORANDUM

2911 Dorr Road
Brighton, MI 48116
810.227 .5225
810.227.3420 fax
genoa.org

SUPERVISOR
Bill Rogers

## CLERK

Paulette A. Skolarus
TREASURER
Robin L. Hunt

## TRUSTEES

Jean W. Ledford
H. James Mortensen

Terry Croft
Diana Lowe
MANAGER
Michael C. Archinal

| TO: | Genoa Township Zoning Board of Appeals |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Amy Ruthig, Zoning Official |
| DATE: | September 9, 2020 |
| RE: | ZBA 20-17 |

## STAFF REPORT

| File Number: | ZBA\#20-17 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site Address: | 5294 Sharp Drive |
| Parcel Number: | 4711-22-100-022 |
| Parcel Size: | .243 Acres |
| Applicant: | William and Kristi Shaffer, 3732 Conrad, Brighton |
| Property Owner: | Same as owner |
| Information Submitted: Application, site plan, conceptual drawings |  |

## Request: Dimensional Variances

Project Description: Applicant is requesting a side yard setback variance to allow a cantilevered chimney in the side yard setback.

Zoning and Existing Use: LRR (Lakeshore Resort Residential), Single Family Dwelling is being constructed on the property.

## Other:

Public hearing was published in the Livingston County Press and Argus on Sunday August 30, 2020 and 300 foot mailings were sent to any real property within 300 feet of the property in accordance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

## Background

The following is a brief summary of the background information we have on file:

- Per assessing records, the home is currently under construction.
- In 2020, a land use permit was issued for a new home.
- Parcel is serviced by public sewer and private well.
- See Record Card.

The proposed project is to construct a cantilevered chimney into the side yard setback. In order to construct the proposed addition, the applicant would be required to obtain a side yard variance.
Township staff is in the process of updating the entire Zoning Ordinance. Included in the update, is an change to Sec. 11.01.04 Projections into Yard to allow for a chimney encroachment of 2 feet into the side yard. Please see the current ordinance below that demonstrates what is currently allowed to project into the side yard setback:
11.01.04 Projections into Yards: Certain architectural features may project into the required yards as follows:

## PERMITTED PROJECTIONS INTO REQUIRED YARDS

| Projection | Front Yard | Rear/ <br> Waterfront <br> Yard | Interior <br> Side Yard | Corner Side Yard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air conditioning equipment shelters | -- | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Arbors and trellises | Permitted up to 4 feet from any lot line |  |  |  |
| Awnings and canopies | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Bay windows | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Decks, open or enclosed* | See Section 11.04.02 |  |  |  |
| Eaves, overhanging | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Fences and walls* | See Section 11.04.04 |  |  |  |
| Flagpoles | Permitted up to 4 feet from any lot line |  |  |  |
| Gardens and landscaping | Permitted in all yards |  |  |  |
| Gutters | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Laundry drying equipment | -- | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | -- |
| Light standard, ornamental | Permitted in any yard |  |  |  |
| Mechanical equipment such as HVAC | -- | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | -- |
| Paved terraces | Permitted up to 4 feet from any lot line |  |  |  |
| Unroofed porches and stoops* | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Approved signs* | See Article 16 |  |  |  |
| Stairways, open unroofed | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Steps | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Television or radio towers or antennas* | -- | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |
| Window air conditioning units | 3 ft . | 5 ft . | 3 ft . | 3 ft . |

## Variance Requests

The following is the section of the Zoning Ordinance that the variances are being requested from:
Table 3.04.01 (LRR District):

| SINGLE FAMILY STRUCTURE | Side Yard <br> Setback |
| :---: | :---: |
| Required Setbacks | $5^{\prime}$ |
| Setback Amount Requested | $1^{\prime} 3.5^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Variance Amount | $3^{\prime} 8.5^{\prime \prime}$ |

## Summary of Findings of Fact- After reviewing the application and materials provided, I offer the possible findings of fact for your consideration:

Please note that in order for a variance to be approved it has to meet all of the standards in 23.05.03.
(a) Practical Difficulty/Substantial Justice -Strict compliance with the side yard setback would prevent the applicant from constructing the addition. The variance requested appears to be the least necessary to provide substantial justice and granting of the requested variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the property due to other properties in the vicinity with reduce side yard setbacks.
(b) Extraordinary Circumstances - The exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property is the triangular shape of the lot, location of the cul-de-sac at the front of the property and with irregular shoreline which creates a difficult building envelope. Due to the difficult building envelope the need for the variance is not self-created.
(c) Public Safety and Welfare - The granting of this variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.
(d) Impact on Surrounding Neighborhood - The proposed variance would not have an impact on the appropriate development, continued use, or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

## Recommended Conditions

If the Zoning Board of Appeals grants the variance requests staff recommends the following conditions be placed on the approval.

1. $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$

## GENOA TOWNSHIP








| $\substack{\text { SHAFFER } \\ \text { RESIDENCE }}$ |
| :---: |











| From: | Mike Siwik |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Amy Ruthig |
| Subject: | Variance Request For 5294 Sharp Dr / Shaffer Residence |
| Date: | Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:46:23 AM |

RE: Variance request by William and Kristi Shaffer at 5294 Sharp Drive for a side yard setback to allow for a cantilevered chimney.

We are one of two neighbors living directly next to the property in question. We have no objections to the Shaffer's request for the above mentioned variance, and see no reason why it should not be granted.

Regards,

Michael and Patricia Siwik
5300 Sharp Drive

Sent from Mail for Windows 10


[^0]
*** Information herein deemed reliable but not guaranteed***

*** Information herein deemed reliable but not guaranteed***

GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP VARIANCE APPLICATION
2911 DOR ROAD | BRIGHTON, MICHIGAN 48116
(810) 227-5225 | FAX (810) 227-3420


Applicant/Owner: Ventures Design email: Lubig@Ventures-design, com
Property Address: 3470 Pineridge $L_{n}$ Phone: $(734$ ) $395-4375$
Present Zoning: LRR Tax Code: $11-22-202-014$
ARTICLE 23 of the Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance describes the Variance procedure and the duties of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Each application for Variance is considered individually by the ZBA. The ZBA is a board of limited power; it cannot change the Zoning Ordinance or grant relief when it is possible to comply with the Zoning Ordinance. It may provide relief where due to unique aspects of the property with strict application of the zoning ordinance to the land results in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

The applicant is responsible for presenting the information necessary to support the relief requested. While much of the necessary information is gathered through the completed application, other information may be gathered by on-site visits, other sources, and during the ZBA meeting. ZBA members, township officials and township staff may visit the site without prior notification to property owners.

Failure to meet the submittal requirements and properly stake the property showing all proposed improvements may result in postponement or denial of this petition.

Please explain the proposed variance below:

1. Variance requested/intended property modifications: Requesting a variance to build into the waterfront setbade to constrmet retaining walls and a pool. We are requesting a 21 foot variance.

- The following is per Article 23.05 .03 of the Genoa Township Ordinance:

Criteria Applicable to Dimensional Variances. No variance in the provisions or requirements of the Ordinance shall be authorized by the Board of Appeals unless it is found from the evidence that all of the following conditions exist:

## Under each please indicate how the proposed project meets each criteria.

Practical Difficulty/Substantial Justice. Compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, density, or other dimensional provisions would unreasonably prevent the use of the property. Granting of a requested variance or appeal would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district and is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity of the subject parcel.
There is a very significant grade drop approx 60 ft from the water. The wall will cut into the area of the grave drop to create more functional/practical space. The current lakefront set back is in line with the back of the howe leaving no room for the pol or walls.
Extraordinary Circumstances. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or the intended use which are different than other properties in the same zoning district or the variance would make the property consistent with the majority of other properties in the vicinity. The need for the variance was not self-created by the applicant.

Similar properties have drops in grade between the home and the water but not as drastic compared to the property in question. Neighboring properties also have reaming walls in similar locations near the water front.

Public Safety and Welfare. The granting of the variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { The proposed pool and walls will not be visable from the street. The } \\
& \text { pool will be elevated ami protected with an auto cover. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Impact on Surrounding Neighborhood. The variance will not interfere with or discourage the appropriate development, continued use, or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

The walls will be retaining the current grade before the significant drop off. So there will be po added height interfering with the current sight line.

Any Variance not acted upon within 12 months from the date of approval is invalid and must receive a renewal from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

After the decision is made regarding your Variance approval a land use permit will be required with additional site plan and construction plans.

Date: $8 / 20 / 2020$ signature:

## MEMORANDUM

2911 Dorr Road
Brighton, MI 48116
810.227.5225
810.227.3420 fax
genoa.org

## SUPERVISOR

Bill Rogers
CLERK
Paulette A. Skolarus
TREASURER
Robin L. Hunt
TRUSTEES
Jean W. Ledford
H. James Mortensen

Terry Croft
Diana Lowe

## STAFF REPORT

File Number: ZBA\#20-18
Site Address: 3470 Pineridge Lane
Parcel Number: 4711-22-202-014
Parcel Size: . 449 Acres
Applicant: Ventures Design
Property Owner: Ralph and Mary Slider, 9903 Doornoch, Brighton

Information Submitted: Application, site plan, conceptual drawings

## Request: Dimensional Variances

Project Description: Applicant is requesting a waterfront setback variance to install an in ground pool and a variance to allow retaining walls in the required waterfront yard.

Zoning and Existing Use: LRR (Lakeshore Resort Residential) Single Family Dwelling located on property.

## Other:

Public hearing was published in the Livingston County Press and Argus on Sunday August 30, 2020 and 300 foot mailings were sent to any real property within 300 feet of the property in accordance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

## Background

The following is a brief summary of the background information we have on file:

- Per assessing records the current home is under construction.
- In 2019, a waterfront setback variance to construct a new home was denied. (See attached minutes)
- In 2019, a permit was issued to construct a new home.
- The parcel is serviced by a well and public sewer.
- See Assessing Record Card.


## Summary

The proposed project is to install an in ground swimming pool and retaining walls in the waterfront yard. The applicant is required to obtain a waterfront setback variance to install the in ground swimming pool and a variance to allow retaining walls in the required waterfront yard.

## Variance Requests

The following is the section of the Zoning Ordinance that the variance is being requested from:

### 11.04.01 Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses in General

(g) Setback from Shoreline: Detached accessory buildings shall be setback at least fifty (50) feet from the nearest edge of any lake shoreline, except in the Lakeshore Resort Residential District where accessory buildings shall meet the shoreline setback requirements for the principle structure as specified in Table 3.04.02. Detached accessory buildings shall be setback at least twenty-five (25) feet from the edge of any wetland.

Table 3.04.01 (LRR District):

| Table 3.04.01 <br> LRR District | Waterfront <br> Setback |
| :---: | :---: |
| Requirement | 80.5 |
| Request | 60 |
| Variance Amount | 20.5 |

11.04.04 Fences, Walls and Screens
(b) Chain link fences shall not be erected in any front yard within a residential district, unless enclosing a retention pond that has been approved by the Planning Commission. Fences shall not be permitted in the required waterfront yard.

## Sec. 25.02 Definitions

Fence: A structure of definite height and location constructed of wood, masonry, stone, wire, metal, or any other material or combination of materials serving as a physical barrier, marker, or enclosure, (see also "Wall").

Summary of Findings of Fact- After reviewing the application and materials provided, I offer the possible findings of fact for your consideration:

Please note that in order for a variance to be approved it has to meet all of the standards in 23.05.03.
(a) Practical Difficulty/Substantial Justice -Strict compliance with the waterfront yard setback would prevent the install of the in ground swimming pool and retaining walls. The granting of the waterfront setback variance for the in ground pool would not provide substantial justice and is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that
possessed by other properties in the same vicinity of the subject parcel. Staff cannot confirm the granting of the retaining walls in the waterfront yard would be necessary to provide substantial justice due to the substantial grading of the site for the new home. The Board could request the applicant to supply additional information in regards the retaining wall request.
(b) Extraordinary Circumstances - In regards to the retaining wall request, the exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property is the topography of the lot however it appears that the property has had substantial grading since construction of the home. Applicant needs to confirm that the need for the retaining walls was not self-created and is the least amount necessary. In regards to the in ground swimming pool request, there are no exceptional or extraordinary conditions of the property due to the large building envelope.
(c) Public Safety and Welfare - The granting of the variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.
(d) Impact on Surrounding Neighborhood - The proposed variances would have little or no impact on the appropriate development, continued use, or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

## Recommended Conditions

If the Zoning Board of Appeals grants the variance requests staff recommends the following conditions be placed on the approval.

1. Applicant should ensure that grading on site will not affect neighboring properties.

10 foot separation from the two structures, so Mr. Bush's home can be five feet from the property line.

Chairman Tengel noted that the Building Department and the Drain Commissioner's Office will address the issue of the soil erosion concerns. That is an issue that is beyond the scope of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The call to the public was closed at 7:10 p.m.

Board Member Rassel stated last month the concern was with the height variance request and the applicant has addressed that concern.

Moved by Rassel, seconded by Ledford, to approve Case \#19-05 for Brad and Amber Busch at 792 Pathway Drive for a side variance of 4' 11 " and to build an accessory structure without a principle structure, based on the following findings of fact:

- Strict compliance with the zoning requirements would prevent the applicant from constructing the proposed accessory structure. Granting the variance to construct the proposed structure on the lot would give the applicant substantial justice due to other accessory structures in the area on lots without principal dwellings.
- The exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property is the narrow lot size and that the parcel with house cannot be combined to this parcel. Granting of the variance for the structure on a lot without a principle structure would make it consistent with other properties in the vicinity.
- The need for the variance is not self-created.
- The granting of the variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.
- The proposed variance would have little or no impact on the appropriate development, continued use, or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.


## The motion carried unanimously.

3. 19-06... A request by Ralph and Mary Slider, 3470 Pineridge Lane, for a waterfront variance to construct a new single-family home.

Mr. and Mrs. Slider were present. They are requesting a 6.5 foot waterfront yard setback variance. This building will not be further toward the lake than the existing home.

Mr. Slider stated the challenge with the property is that it narrows toward the road so it would be difficult to get a boat from the road into the garage. Because of the curve of the properties, both of the homes on either side of them actually face away from him so their house would not impede their lake view.

Chairman Tengel does not believe there is a hardship or practical difficulty with the property that would justify granting this variance. Board Member Ledford agrees. Mr. Slider noted that the covered patio can be shorted by nine feet and then an uncovered deck could be built fifteen feet further out from that instead of the size of the covered patio that is being proposed.

Mr. Slider noted that his neighbor was granted a 102 foot variance in 2002, which allows them to place their home 63 feet from the water's edge.

The call to the public was made at 7:26 pm with no response.

Board Member Rassel agrees that there is no practical difficulty with the property. Board Member Kreutzberg agrees.

Moved by Board Member Rassel, seconded by Board Member Kreutzberg to deny Case \#19-06 for Ralph and Mary Slider of 3470 Pineridge Lane for a waterfront yard setback variance of 6.5 feet, due to the following findings of fact:

- Strict compliance with the waterfront yard setback would prevent the applicant from constructing the new home with the same setback as the existing home While the adjacent homes have reduced waterfront setbacks the majority of the homes in the vicinity are setback further from the water than what is proposed. Granting the variance would provide substantial justice to the applicant in consideration of the adjacent homes however this is not supported by review of properties in the district or vicinity. Granting of the variance request is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity of the subject parcel.
- There are not exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or the intended use which are different than other properties in the same zoning district. The variance would not make the property consistent with the majority of other properties in the vicinity.
- The need for the variance is self-created by the applicant.
- The granting of the variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or
increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.
- The proposed variance would have little or no impact on the appropriate development, continued use, or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.
The motion carried unanimously.

4. 19-07... A request by Lynda and Jackie Williams, 4219 Homestead Drive, for a waterfront variance to construct a sunroom to an existing home.

Ms. Lynda Williams and Ms. Jackie Williams stated they are requesting to add an allseasons sunroom to their home. They are requesting an 11 foot, 7 inch waterfront setback variance. The hardship is that this is the only location on their home where they can put this addition because of the type of roofline of the home.

Board Member Kreutzberg's concern is the sight line of the lake for the neighbor to the left. This would block their view.

The call to the public was made at $7: 37 \mathrm{pm}$.

Mr. Mark O'Brien at 4225 Homestead Drive, which is directly to the south of the Williams' property is concerned with his sight line of the lake being blocked. It will cause the value of his property to decrease.

The call to the public was closed at 7:38 pm.

Board Member Rockwell feels the requested variance is self-created.

Motion by Board Member Ledford, seconded by Board Member Rassel, to deny Case \# 19-07 for 4219 Homestead Drive for the applicants and property owners, Lynda \& Jackie Williams, for waterfront setback variance of 11.7 feet from the required 40 feet to 28.5 feet, due to the following findings of fact:

- There are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions of the property. The variance would not make the property consistent with the surrounding properties.
- The need for the variance to construct the sunroom is self-created.
- Strict compliance with the setbacks would cause the applicant to be unable to construct the sunroom but does not unreasonably prevent the use of the property. There are other homes in the vicinity that do not meet the waterfront


## GENOA TOWNSHIP



Design Proposal

## 3740 Pineridge Ln Brighton, MI 48116

## Prepared By:

Ventures Design 29454 Haas Rd Wixom, MI 48393

4) VENTURES

## Previous Structure



- Trees have been removed to north and south improving line of site


## Previous Structure


(1) ventures

## Proposed Structure



- Retaining wall with grade
- Pool w/ Autocover
- No fence required


## Proposed Structure


(I) VENTURES

## Proposed Structure


(1) ventures

## Proposed Structure


(1) ventures

## Comparison with previous structure


(1) VENTURES

## Allowed per Zoning Guidelines - Second Story deck extending 15'



- Due to the elevation of a deck, this structure would impede line of site significantly whereas walls built to support a lower level area would not.

Similarly allowed- Pool/ walls on Highcrest Drive


## ZBA Approved walls for 3940 Hichrest Drive - August 20, 2019


(1) VENTURES

## Technical Plans
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## Technical Plans




[^1]
*** Information herein deemed reliable but not guaranteed***

*** Information herein deemed reliable but not guaranteed***

*** Information herein deemed reliable but not guaranteed***


# GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP <br> ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS <br> AUGUST 18, 2020-6:30 PM 

## MINUTES

Call to Order: Chairman Rassel called the regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order at $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. The members and staff of the Zoning Board of Appeals were present as follows: Greg Rassel, Michele Kreutzberg, Jean Ledford, Bill Rockwell, Marianne McCreary, and Amy Ruthig, Zoning Official.

Pledge of Allegiance: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
Introduction: The members of the Board introduced themselves.

## Approval of the Agenda:

Chairman Rassel noted that the applicant for Case \#20-17 has requested to be tabled this evening.

Moved by Board Member McCreary, seconded by Board Member Ledford, to approve the agenda with the tabling of Case \#20-17 at the owner's request until the September 15, 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

## Call to the Public:

The call to the public was made at 6:33 pm with no response.

## New Business

1. $20-12 \ldots$ A request by Brett and Jennifer Landacre, 528 S. Hacker, for a side yard variance to construct a detached accessory structure or a variance to construct a detached accessory structure in the front yard.

Ms. Jennifer Landacre was present. She was before the board last month and had her item tabled as the Board requested she obtain a survey. The survey has been submitted to the Township. She is requesting a rear yard setback variance of one foot to construct a $40 \times 24$ detached structure. A variance would have been needed to put this building anywhere on their property and this location makes the most sense for the building because there is an existing concrete pad. They will be removing the existing accessory structure on their property. This location avoids them being under the power lines. She provided examples of other properties in the area that have accessory buildings that do not meet the required setbacks. Because of the existing concrete pad, people who live behind her are using this area as access to their homes.

Having this structure will eliminate this. It will not negatively affect any of the values or public safety of the neighborhood.

Board Member McCreary reviewed the survey and stated that she is never in favor of supporting a one-foot setback; however, because of the easement, nothing can be built to the rear of the proposed location of the barn.

The call to the public was made at 6:48 pm with no response.
Moved by Board Member McCreary, seconded by Board Member Kreutzberg, to approve Case \#20-12 at 528 S. Hacker for Brett \& Jennifer Landacre for a 29 foot side yard variance from the required 30 feet for a 1 foot side yard setback to construct a $40 \times 24$ accessory building with a height not to exceed the requirement as documented by Ordinance 11.04.01.j, based on the following findings of fact:

- The subject property was split from an original parent parcel and the splits that were created left the abutting parcel with a section of land that touches, and that parcel is separated by a 33 -foot-wide road easement. The portion of the property that is abutting this property where the request for a setback is, does not have a home on it.
- The exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property is the configuration of the lot and power lines. The need for the variance is not self-created. Due to the unusual configuration of the split of the property from the original lot, it provides substantial justice to the applicant and affords the same rights as other properties in the surrounding area.
- The granting of the variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of Genoa Township.
- The proposed variance should have limited impact on the adjacent neighbors nor the values of homes surrounding it. This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. All existing detached accessory structures will be removed prior to Certificate of Occupancy issuance.

## The motion carried unanimously.

2. 20-13 ... A request by Mark St. Germain, 4071 Homestead Drive, for two side yard setback variances to construct a second story to an existing home.

Mr. St. Germain was present. He has a 1,200 square foot home and he would like to add a bedroom and a bathroom. It makes more sense to build up instead of toward the road or the lake. He would be adding 800 square feet and stay within the footprint of the existing home.

Board Member McCreary asked if the applicant and his neighbor are aware that the neighbor's home encroaches onto his property. Mr. St. Germain learned this when he obtained the survey. He is not sure if the neighbor is aware.

Board Member Kreutzberg wanted to confirm that the height of the home will not exceed the 25 feet height limit. Ms. Ruthig explained how the home height is determined. She confirmed that the proposed home is within the ordinance.

The call to the public was made at $6: 59 \mathrm{pm}$ with no response.

Moved by Board Member Kreutzberg, seconded by Board Member Ledford, to approve Case \#20-13 for Mark St. Germain of 4071 Homestead Drive granting two two side yard setback variances of 2.6 feet from required 10 feet for a 7.4 foot setback and variance of 5.7 feet from required 10 feet for a 4.3 foot setback to construct a second story addition to an existing home, based on the following findings of fact:

- Granting the variances would provide substantial justice. Strict compliance with the setbacks would unreasonably restrict use of the property. The proposed structure will maintain the same setbacks as the existing home. Granting these variance will provide substantial justice in granting the applicant the same rights as similar properties in the neighborhood and is not self-created.
- The extraordinary circumstances are the narrow lot and location of the existing home.
- The granting of these variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare.
- The proposed variance would have little or no impact on the appropriate development, continued use or value of adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood.
This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. Structure must be guttered with downspouts.
2. Building height must not exceed 25 feet.

## The motion carried unanimously.

3. $20-14 \ldots$...A request by Jeff Weber, 5498 Sharp Drive, for a variance to construct a detached accessory structure in the front yard.

Mr. and Mrs. Weber were present. They would like to build a $12 \times 18,8$ foot high shed. They have two front yards so they require a variance. Their three neighbors have structures in the front yards. Theirs will be smaller than those buildings.

The call to the public was made at 7:03 pm.

Mr. Jeff Dhaenens of 5498 Sharp Drive stated that he has submitted an email to the Township in support of this request.

The call to the public was closed at 7:05 pm.

Moved by Board Member Ledford, seconded by Board Member Rockwell, to approve Case \#20-14 for Jeff Weber of 5498 Sharp Drive for a variance from Section 11.04.01(c) of the Genoa Township Ordinance to construct a $12 \times 18$ detached accessory building in the front yard, based on the following findings of fact

- Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would prevent the applicant from constructing a detached accessory structure. Since detached accessory structures are common in this area granting the variance would provide substantial justice and is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity of the subject parcel.
- The exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property is that it is bordered by Merrow Lane on the south and east portion of the property and by Sharp Drive on the west portion of the property, the location of the creek and existing location of the home. Granting the variance would make the property consistent with the majority of other properties in the vicinity. The need for the variance is not self-created.
- The granting of the variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of Genoa.
- The proposed variance will not interfere with or discourage the appropriate development, continued use or value of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood.
This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. Section 03.03.02-Home Occupations of the Zoning Ordinance must be followed.
2. Building height shall not exceed 14 feet.

The motion carried unanimously.

## Administrative Business:

1. Approval of minutes for both July 21, 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals meetings.

Needed changes were noted. Moved by Board Member McCreary, seconded by Board Member Rockwell, to approve both July 21, 2020 ZBA meeting minutes as corrected The motion carried unanimously.
2. Correspondence - Ms. Ruthig had no correspondence this evening.
3. Township Board Representative Report - Board Member Ledford provided a review of the August 3 and August 17, 2020 Board Meetings.
4. Planning Commission Representative Report - Board Member McCreary provided a review of the August 10, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.
5. Zoning Official Report - Ms. Ruthig stated there are six cases scheduled for next month's meeting. She is deciding if she will again have two separate meetings, and possibly on two separate days.
6. Member Discussion - There were no items to discuss this evening.
7. Adjournment - Moved by Board Member Ledford, seconded by Board Member Rockwell, to adjourn the meeting at 7:29 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary
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