

Mike Kowall, Supervisor
Terry Lilley, Clerk
Beverly J. Spoor, Treasurer



Trustees
Carol J. Burkard
Michael Powell
Todd T. Birkle
Forrest Jay Brendel

WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP

7525 Highland Road • White Lake, Michigan 48383-2900 • (248) 698-3300 • www.whitelaketwp.com

WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

August 26, 2010 at 7:00 p.m.

7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383

Ms. Spencer called the regular meeting of the White Lake Township Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called: Mr. Artinian and Mr. Gilbert were absent.

ROLL CALL: Robert Artinian – Secretary - **Absent**
Wayne Gilbert – Vice Chairperson - **Absent**
Mike Lanthier
Mike Long
Josephine Spencer - Chairperson

Also Present: Jason Iacoangeli, Staff Planner
Lynn Lindon, Recording Secretary

Visitors:1

Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Long noted the minutes of June 24, 2010 could not be approved this evening.

Mr. Long moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Lanthier supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (3 yes votes)

Approval of Minutes:

a. Minutes of June 24, 2010

No action was taken this evening.

New Business:

	File No. 10-011 (Tabled from June 24, 2010)
Applicant:	George Selling 9110 Pontiac Lake Road White Lake, MI 48386
Location:	9110 Pontiac Lake Road, identified as 12-14-284-027
Request:	Variance to Article 6, for front yard setback, lot size, lot coverage, and to Article 4 Section 4.20 for accessory buildings in residential districts.

Ms. Spencer noted that this case was discussed in detail at the June 24 meeting.

Mr. Iacoangeli reviewed his report dated July 22, 2010. This is a single-family home located in the English Villas subdivision and is a legal non-conforming lot of record located on Pontiac Lake. The home is served by sanitary sewer and uses a private well. The applicant is seeking variances in order to construct a 440 sq. ft. addition on to the existing garage.

Earlier this evening, it was brought to his attention the numbers from the Assessing Department were contradictory to Mr. Seling's engineering survey by a difference of 273 sq. ft. The variance request for lot coverage using Mr. Seling's numbers would be 1.1% or 109 sq. ft. over the allowable. Mr. Seling explained that his son built next door and his son's lot was bigger so he increased his own lot to square it off with the road and the lake. He picked up 273 sq. ft. of property, at which the assessing department didn't have that information.

Mr. Seling stated with his new plan, he reduced the depth of the garage from 24 ft. to 20 ft., but had to leave it at 22 ft. to accommodate his extended cab vehicle. The utility pole prohibits him from attaching a 1-car garage. From the last meeting minutes, he referenced the shed, which will be removed. The existing garage is structurally sound and he will be adding to it. He referenced Mr. Long's comments of the proposed garage being too wide, but noted he reduced it as much as he could.

He received a letter from Brent Bonnivier, the township building official, stating if he could get a variance to put a new building up, the proposed building site could go up to 30%. His intentions are only to add to the existing garage, add a new door and windows and a new roofline.

Ms. Spencer noted for the record that 20 occupant/homeowners within 300 ft. were notified of the request. There were no letters received in favor or opposition and none were returned undeliverable by the postal service.

Mr. Long was concerned with lot coverage by extending beyond what would be permissible. This wouldn't be a practical difficulty because it could be brought to lot size. He has an existing garage and there would be a block wall in between the 2 garages. He also noted there wasn't any paperwork from the Assessing department. Mr. Iacoangeli felt comfortable using the numbers from the engineering survey, but will check with the assessing department tomorrow.

Mr. Iacoangeli indicated there was an ordinance change, that if you designed a building to not require variances, and connected to sewer, the Planning Director could grant larger lot coverage up to 30%. They do this mainly with lake lots. Or, applicants can come to the ZBA, and the Planning Director has the ability to waive the 1.1% and allow up to 30%, but it's up to his discretion.

Mr. Lanthier asked for clarification to variance 4, at which it was explained that detached accessory structures that will be less than 20 ft. must meet all other setback requirements for fire purposes. There is another section that states less than 10 ft. has to be treated like an addition to the home.

Ms. Spencer noted for the record that the county has no plans to widen the road and Mr. Seling's plans are acceptable to the county.

Ms. Spencer moved in File 10-011 to grant variance (1) minimum lot size to 9,569 sq. ft.; (2) maximum lot coverage is 1.1% for an end result of 21.1%; (3) a 25 ft. front yard setback for an end result of 5 ft.; that this would be 19 ft. from the traveled portion of the road; and (4) accessory buildings in residential areas for an end result of 11 ft., conditioned upon the survey of 2007 provided by Keft Engineering and the property recorded in the Assessing Department match, and all necessary reviews meet the satisfaction of the Assessing

Department when they double check the figures; and lastly that gutters and downspouts be added per the Building Department. Mr. Long supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Spencer – yes (there is a hardship with the utility pole, this is a minimal request and there will be a thorough check with Assessing and the '07 survey to make sure everything is in place); Long – yes (for the reasons stated); Lanthier - yes (for reasons stated and the applicant has reduced the garage to be more compliant) (3 yes votes)

Next Meeting Date:

- a. September 23, 2010

Adjournment:

Mr. Lanthier moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 pm. Mr. Long supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (3 yes votes)