

**WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR VIRTUAL MEETING
September 23, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Spencer called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. She then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Debby Dehart, Planning Commission Liaison, present in White Lake, MI
Michael Powell, Township Board Liaison, present in White Lake, MI
Nik Schillack, present in White Lake, MI
Jo Spencer, Chairperson, present in White Lake, MI

Absent:

Dave Walz, Vice Chairperson

Others:

Justin Quagliata, Staff Planner
Nick Spender, Building Official
Hannah Micallef, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOVED by Member Schillack, SUPPORTED by Member Dehart, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion CARRIED with a voice vote (4 yes votes).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting of August 26th, 2021

Member Schillack clarified language regarding the fourth case presented in the minutes to reference a state of emergency was also declared by the State.

**MOVED by Member Powell, SUPPORTED by Member Dehart to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes of August 26th, 2021 as amended.
The motion CARRIED with a voice vote (4 yes votes).**

CONTINUING BUSINESS:

- A. Applicant:** Michael Epley
6075 Carroll Lake Road
Commerce, MI 48382
- Location:** **9386 Bonnie Briar**
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-14-276-014
- Request:** The applicant requests to construct an enclosed porch and attached garage, requiring variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Front-Yard Setback, Side-Yard Setback, Rear-Yard Setback, and Minimum Lot Area. A variance from Article 7.28.A, Repairs and Maintenance to Nonconforming Structures is required due to both the value of improvements and the increase in cubic content.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 22 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 0 letters were received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata presented his staff report.

Member Schillack stated the parcel number on the new survey was incorrect. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed. He added there was a survey that showed the existing boundaries and structures, and a builder prepared plot plan.

Chairperson Spencer said the surveyor's certificate dated June 8, 2021 had a signature and the certificate with the revision dated September 1, 2021 did not. Member Powell said the surveyor provided an existing survey which did not include anything being proposed. The survey was used to complete the proposed plan by the applicant. He added he personally spoke with the applicant's surveyor, Grant Ward. The first survey dated June 8, 2021 used the present shoreline for the rear lot line, but the elevation of the water was not shot that day. The ordinary high-water mark was not represented on the June 8, 2021 survey; the line represented the edge of the water. The water was 4 inches higher than the ordinary high-water mark on June 8, 2021. Grant Ward went back to the site today, and the shoreline was steep. A drop in 4 inches of vertical elevation was not horizontal, and where the ordinary high-water mark was drawn was worst case scenario.

Member Schillack stated the survey received a week ago was dated September 1, 2021, and the survey received today had the same date. Staff Planner Quagliata said there could have been a revision date on the new survey. Member Powell added the label for the ordinary high-water mark had been revised.

Member Dehart asked if the interior well pump went bad, what was the guideline on relocating it. Member Powell said the Oakland County standard was 50 feet from a grinder pump, but sometimes deviations were granted if the 50 feet was not achievable.

Michael Epley, applicant, was present to speak on his case. He said he noticed the survey did not utilize the verbiage "ordinary high-water mark." He had to go back to the surveyor. He said the shed was notated on the survey. He added his clients said the shed was there when they bought the lot, and they would like to keep it. The roof overhang on the proposed structure was shifted, and minimized the variance from the side yard lot line.

Staff Planner Quagliata stated he informed the applicant about the water's edge notation on the survey on September 15, 2021, and the revised survey was received September 17, 2021.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 7:37 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 7:37 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

A. Practical Difficulty

- Chairperson Spencer said the side yard setback did not pose a practical difficulty, and ensuring 10 feet on the side yard was crucial for health, safety, and welfare. Member Powell agreed.
- Member Powell said the lot was substandard and narrow, and locating an addition was difficult. There was also a topographic issue on the west side of the lot, and an existing architectural issue with the current house. Member Dehart agreed.

B. Unique Situation

- Chairperson Spencer said there was no practical difficulty, so there was not a unique situation in regards to the side yard setback.
- Member Schillack said there was a unique situation with the topography and shape of the lot.

C. Not Self-Created

- Chairperson Spencer said the request was self-created in regards to the side yard, as the garage width could be reduced to meet the side yard setback. Member Schillack agreed.
- Member Schillack said there was also a self-created hardship in regards to the homeowner's wanting to keep the shed.

D. Substantial Justice

- Chairperson Spencer said if the side yard setback variance was denied, a smaller garage could be built in compliance with the ordinance.

E. Minimum Variance Necessary

- Chairperson Spencer said reducing the garage on the east side would be the minimum variance.
- Member Schillack added removing the shed would also be the minimum variance necessary.

Member Powell MOVED to approve the variances requested by Michael Epley from Article 3.1.6.E and Article 7.28.A of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-14-276-014, identified as 9386 Bonnie Briar Drive, in order to construct a two-car attached garage addition that would encroach 0' into the required east side yard setback and 6.5' into the required rear yard setback, and exceed the allowed value of improvements to a nonconforming structure by 120%. A 282 square foot variance from the required lot size is also granted from Article 3.1.6.E. This approval will have the following conditions:

- **The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.**
- **The applicant shall submit a sealed survey prior to the issuance of a building permit that clearly defines the distance between the legal water elevation of Pontiac Lake to the outside edge of the finished surface of the garage, and it shall not exceed the variance of 6.5 feet.**
- **An as-built survey shall be required to verify the approved setbacks.**
- **The shed be moved 25 feet off the edge of any natural area.**
- **A foundation certificate shall be submitted prior to framing the proposed garage addition.**

Member Schillack SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (4 yes votes): (Powell/yes, Schillack/yes, Dehart/yes, Spencer/yes)

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Applicant: Ryan Heil
11600 Hazel Avenue
Grand Blanc, MI 48439
- Location: **English Villas Sub Lot 345**
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-14-282-002
- Request: The applicant requests to construct a house, requiring variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Front-Yard Setback, Side-Yard Setback, Maximum Lot Coverage, Minimum Lot Area, and Minimum Lot Width.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 22 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 0 letters were received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Dehart asked staff if the seawall and dock on the site were allowed since the Township did not permit them. Staff Planner Quagliata said yes, as long as a permit from the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) was obtained.

Chairperson Spencer asked staff if the Township verified EGLE permits had been obtained. Staff Planner Quagliata said the applicant could use the property for recreational purposes, but could not store items or camp on a vacant lot for an extended period of time.

Ryan Heil, applicant, was present to speak on his case. He confirmed both of the sheds were not his. He said he had the survey redone by Alpine, and Alpine verified the topographic data from the previous Dekeyser survey. He added the covered porch for the east door would be excluded. He wanted to build a house for his family that fit in with the surrounding houses.

Member Powell stated the westerly setback was proposed at 7.58 feet from the center of the house, but there seemed to be a narrower setback on the north end of the 2-foot overhang, making 6.56 feet the narrowest setback on the west side of house.

Chairperson Spencer the public hearing at 8:25 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 8:25 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

A. Practical Difficulty

- Member Dehart said there was a practical difficulty with the lot as it was nonconforming. Chairperson Spencer and Member Schillack agreed.

B. Unique Situation

- Chairperson Spencer said the lot was small and undersized, and when it was platted years ago, it was most likely meant for part time cottage living.

C. Not Self-Created

- Member Dehart said the applicant did what they could to work with the practical difficulty of the lot.

D. Substantial Justice

- Member Schillack said the applicant made an attempt to line his proposed house with the other surrounding homes.

E. Minimum Variance Necessary

- Chairperson Spencer said the applicant was asking for minimum variances, especially since the applicant was removing the covered porch.

Member Dehart MOVED to approve the variances requested by Ryan Heil from Article 3.1.6.E of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-14-282-002 in order to construct a new house that would exceed the allowed lot coverage by 11.82%, encroach 14.41 feet into the required front yard setback, and encroach 3.45 feet into the required east side yard setback and 3.44 feet into the required west side yard setback. A 38-foot variance from the required lot width and 6,652 square foot variance from the required lot size are also granted from Article 3.1.6.E. This approval will have the following conditions:

- **The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.**
- **The site plan shall be revised by a registered land surveyor to accurately reflect the location the rear yard setback is measured.**
- **The covered porch on the east side of the house is not permitted and shall be removed from all plans.**
- **A foundation certificate shall be required prior to the backfill inspection by the Building Department.**
- **An as-built survey shall be required to verify the approved setbacks and lot coverage.**
- **All HVAC mechanicals including generators shall not be placed on the sides of the house.**
- **The setbacks shall be measured from the exterior cladding of the building.**

Member Schillack SUPPORTED and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (4 yes votes) (Dehart/yes, Schillack/yes, Spencer/yes, Powell/yes)

B. Applicant:	Roger Lewis 85 N. Hulbert Street White Lake, MI 48386
Location:	9 Danforth Drive White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-26-126-035
Request:	The applicant requests a post-construction variance for the alteration of a nonconforming structure, requiring a variance from Article 7.23.A, Nonconforming Structures.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 40 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 1 letter was received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Powell asked staff what the previous Building Official did with this issue. Building Official Spencer said he spoke with the applicant earlier today while he was on site. He added the applicant had submitted a building permit for a new house, and the Building Department would include stipulations for when construction of the house needed to commence, if the permit was approved.

Member Dehart asked staff if a permit was issued to reconstruct the garage and raise the walls. Building Official Spencer said the permit submitted was for roof shingles, not the reconstruction of the garage. The proper permit was not obtained for the garage alteration.

Member Schillack asked staff if a demolition permit was approved for the house. Building Official Spencer said the renovation was added on to the roof permit, and that wasn't proper procedure. The "add on" permit was for a remodel, but when Building Official Spencer went to inspect the site, the house was over 50 percent demolished. At that time, Building Official Spencer required the applicant apply for a demolition permit. Since then, the applicant had not started construction of the new house.

Roger Lewis, applicant, was present to speak on his case. He said the garage was built long ago, and the walls were raised to accommodate current day vehicles.

Member Schillack asked the applicant what the value of improvement listed on his application was for. Mr. Lewis said it was for engineering and topographical services.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 9:09 P.M. She read a letter into the record addressed to the Township Board regarding the blight on 9 Danforth. She then closed the public hearing at 9:15 P.M.

Member Dehart asked staff if the garage was demolished and the permit for the house was approved, would the applicant have room to construct a detached garage. Staff Planner Quagliata said there was approximately 50 feet between the existing garage wall and the proposed house wall, so if setbacks and lot coverage standards were met, a new garage could be constructed.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

A. Practical Difficulty

- Chairperson Spencer said she did not see a practical difficulty as there was no principal structure on the site.
- Member Schillack said it seemed there would be room for a new garage, and the garage was reconstructed without a permit, making the request post-construction. The ZBA did not have the authority to approve roof overhangs within 5 feet of the lot lines.

- B. Unique Situation
 - Chairperson Spencer said she did not see a unique situation because there was no practical difficulty.
- C. Not Self-Created
 - Member Dehart said there was a self-created hardship as the garage height was raised without a permit.
- D. Substantial Justice
 - Chairperson Spencer said a house and garage could be built within the required setbacks.
 - Member Powell said removing the garage would improve the standard for the entire street.
- E. Minimum Variance Necessary
 - Chairperson Spencer said she didn't find a practical difficulty, so this standard didn't apply.

Member Schillack MOVED to deny the post-construction variance requested by Roger Lewis for Parcel Number 12-26-126-035, identified as 9 Danforth Drive, due to the following reason(s): failure to meet the standards listed in Article 7, Section 37 of the ClearZoning Ordinance. Furthermore, the garage shall be demolished or legally moved by November 8, 2021.

Member Dehart SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (4 yes votes) (Schillack/yes, Dehart/yes, Powell/yes, Spencer/yes)

- C. Applicant: Brian McNamara
1801 Bogie Lake Road
White Lake, MI 48386
- Location: **1801 Bogie Lake Road**
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-33-201-005
- Request: The applicant, under Article 7.36, Powers of Zoning Board of Appeals Concerning Administrative Review and Variances, is appealing a determination made by Township officials in the enforcement of Article 5.12 for fence height and setbacks.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 21 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 0 letters were received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Powell asked staff what the definition of front yard setback. Staff Planner Quagliata said the setback was measured from the road right-of-way line, and for the subject parcel's zoning, R1-C, the setback was 35 feet. Member Powell asked staff if the accessory structures were in compliance with the zoning ordinance. Staff Planner Quagliata said the northerly accessory structure was nonconforming.

Brian McNamara, the appellant, and his wife, Sharon, were present to speak on their case. Sharon said they had replaced an older chain link fence, and since they bought the house, they had been working to improve the property. She added the neighbors were supportive of the fence, and had asked the surrounding neighbors before replacing the fence. Brian McNamara said he bought the property last year, and said he came into Township Hall to discuss the fence several times.

Staff Planner Quagliata stated the applicant removed a four-foot chain link fence and erected a six-foot slat wood privacy fence.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 10:04 P.M.

Eric Shotwell, 11516 Cedar Island Road, spoke in support of the applicant's request.

Frank Bell, 11476 Cedar Island Road, spoke in support of the applicant's request.

Tom Gaddis, 11548 Cedar Island Road, spoke in support of the applicant's request.

Dan Malek, 11485 Cedar Island Road, spoke in support of the applicant's request.

Chairperson Spencer closed the public hearing at 10:11 P.M.

Member Dehart asked staff if the house was not on a corner lot, would the applicant be able to have a 6-foot fence in the side yard. Staff Planner Quagliata said they would be able to have 6-foot fence in a side yard, but they would still only be allowed a 4-foot fence in the front yard.

Member Powell asked staff what the difference of location would be in regards to a 4-foot fence versus a 6-foot fence. Staff Planner Quagliata said a fence in the front yard could not exceed 4 feet in height and would need to meet the front yard setback.

Member Dehart asked staff if the parcel was platted or metes and bounds. Staff Planner Quagliata said it was metes and bounds.

Member Dehart asked staff if a landscape screen would have been an issue. Staff Planner Quagliata said no. He added the applicants replaced a nonconforming fence with a more nonconforming fence; the replacement was not like for like.

Member Powell asked staff if a nonconforming structure could be maintained, but not replaced. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

A. Practical Difficulty

- Member Powell said if the Township held the fence to the ordinance, it would diminish the applicant's use of their yard, and it would be a hardship for the applicant. Member Dehart agreed.
- Chairperson Spencer did not see a practical difficulty.

B. Unique Situation

C. Not Self-Created

- Chairperson Spencer said the erection of the fence in violation of the ordinance was self-created.

D. Substantial Justice

- Member Powell said other homeowners on Cedar Island Road had backyards they could enjoy.

E. Minimum Variance Necessary

The ZBA recessed at 10:43 P.M. to attend to technological issues. The ZBA returned from recess at 11:01 P.M.

Member Powell stated he could entertain allowing the existing fence to remain to the east end of the accessory building, and all fencing east of the existing building must be removed, as well as any new fencing meeting ordinance requirements. Staff Planner Quagliata said a survey was not provided to show property lines or setbacks.

Member Dehart asked staff if a fence permit was required. Staff Planner Quagliata said not for residential zoning.

Member Schillack asked staff if a permit would have been needed for the gate. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Member Powell MOVED to reverse the decision of the Building Official and approve a modified order for Brian McNamara for Parcel Number 12-33-201-005, identified as 1801 Bogie Lake Road, due to the following reason(s): there was a non-self-imposed hardship and a practical difficulty in maintaining privacy and use of their yard and accessory buildings. The order is modified to allow a section of the existing fence to remain as constructed as long as a certified survey proves the fence is located outside of the road right-of-way from a line extended westerly from the easterly most accessory building that parallels Cedar Island Road. All fencing east of the east face of said accessory building shall be removed and only fencing that meets ordinance requirements shall be installed east of that point.

Member Dehart SUPPORTED, and the motion with CARRIED with a roll call vote (3 yes votes):

(Spencer/no, Schillack/yes, Dehart/yes, Powell/yes)

D. Applicant: Gardner Signs Inc.
1087 Naughton Road
Troy, MI 48083

Location: **3671 Highland Road**
White Lake, MI 48383 identified as 12-19-101-037

Request: The applicant requests to install a monument sign within the setback from the road right-of-way and exceeding the allowed size, requiring variances from Article 5.9.J.i.a and Article 5.9.J.i.b.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 18 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 0 letters were received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Schillack asked staff if the lumens of the proposed sign was increased on the revised drawings. Staff Planner Quagliata said no.

Member Powell asked staff if the ordinance required reduction of light output in the evening. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Mia Asta was present to speak on behalf of the applicant's case. The new sign would be replaced with something similar to what was previously there. If the sign was placed in compliance with the setbacks, it would be in the parking lot. There was no signage on the building. There would be an emergency shut-off switch on the outside of the sign.

Member Schillack asked the applicant if the sign had a breakaway feature if it were to be struck by a vehicle. Ms. Asta said the faux brick on the base would come apart and dent a vehicle. The sign would be engineered for wind load. It would collapse, but it would not crumble.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 11:46 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 11:47 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

A. Practical Difficulty

- Chairperson Spencer said she saw a practical difficulty in regards to the temporary sign; without a sign there was no indication Genisys was a financial institution. In regards to the permanent sign, she saw a practical difficulty as a sign was needed, and it would be farther from the road right-of-way than the previous sign.
- Member Powell said moving the sign any further north would make the sign a traffic impediment internally on the site.

B. Unique Situation

- Member Powell said the Highland Road right-of-way was very wide in this area, and to put the sign out of the road right-of-way necessitated an increase of the sign size.

C. Not Self-Created

- The applicant did not design the Highland Road right-of-way.

D. Substantial Justice

- Member Schillack said customers needed to be able to see the sign.

E. Minimum Variance Necessary

- Chairperson Spencer said the new sign would be farther from the road right-of-way than the previous sign.

Staff Planner Quagliata said he spoke to the applicants, and they would need the temporary sign for three months.

Member Schillack MOVED to approve the variances requested by Gardner Signs Inc. from Article 5.9.J.i.a and 5.9.J.i.b of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-19-101-037, identified as 3671 Highland Road, in order to install a 46.67 square foot monument sign with a 0-foot setback from the Highland Road right-of-way line. The Building Department is also authorized to issue a permit for a temporary banner sign with a 0-foot setback from the Highland Road right-of-way line. This approval will have the following conditions:

- **The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.**

- **The permit for the temporary banner sign shall expire on January 1, 2022.**

**Member Dehart SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (4 yes votes)
(Schillack/yes, Dehart/yes, Spencer/yes, Powell/yes)**

The ZBA recessed at 11:58 P.M. The ZBA returned from recess at 12:02 A.M., September 24, 2021.

E. Applicant: Mark Johnson
150 Danforth Drive
White Lake, MI 48386
Location: **150 Danforth Street**
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-23-376-004
Request: The applicant requests to construct a garage, requiring variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Front-Yard Setback and Side-Yard Setback. A variance from Article 7.28.A, Repairs and Maintenance to Nonconforming Structures is required due to both the value of improvements and the increase in cubic content.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 23 owners within 300 feet were notified. 0 letters were received in favor, 0 letters were received in opposition, and 0 letters were returned undeliverable from the U.S. Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Powell asked staff if the subaqueous area on the north side of the house considered. Staff Planner Quagliata said he believed that was how the rear setback from the house was represented.

Member Schillack asked staff where the natural features setback would be. Staff Planner Quagliata said the setback was 30' from the boundary.

Mark Johnson, applicant, was present to speak on his case. He said when he originally put his plans together, he was under the impression the lot was larger. He was amiable to offset the addition on the westerly and easterly sides to meet setback requirements. He was in the process of purchasing the property to the east as well.

Member Schillack asked the applicant if he was planning on combining the properties. Mr. Johnson said no; the lot to the east would be an investment property.

Member Powell suggested a two-car garage as reducing the size would reduce the setback from the southern and western property lines.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 12:24 A.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 12:25 A.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7, Section 37 from the ClearZoning Ordinance:

- A. Practical Difficulty
 - Member Dehart said she saw practical difficulty due to the topography of the lot.
- B. Unique Situation
- C. Not Self-Created
 - Chairperson Spencer said reducing the size of the garage would eliminate some of the variances requested and be less self-created than what was currently proposed.
 - Member Powell suggested reducing the size of the car garage would reduce the setback from the southern and western property lines.
- D. Substantial Justice
 - Chairperson Spencer said reducing the garage would serve substantial justice.
- E. Minimum Variance Necessary

Member Powell MOVED to approve the variances requested by Mark Johnson from Article 3.1.6.E and Article 7.28.A of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-23-376-004, identified as 150 Danforth Drive, in order to construct an attached garage addition that would encroach 0 feet into the required west side yard setback and 7.6 feet into the required front yard setback, and exceed the allowed value of improvements to a nonconforming structure by 102%. This approval will have the following conditions:

- **The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.**
- **The Applicant shall reduce the size of the garage or house addition to comply with the lot coverage standard, or request a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.**
- **A foundation certificate shall be required prior to the backfill inspection by the Building Department.**
- **An as-built survey shall be required to verify the approved setbacks and lot coverage.**
- **No HVAC units including generators shall be placed in the side yard setbacks.**

Member Dehart SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (4 yes votes) (Powell/yes, Dehart/yes, Spencer/yes, Schillack/yes)

OTHER BUSINESS

Staff Planner Quagliata stated in-person meetings would resume beginning in October.

WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 23, 2021

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Member Schillack, SUPPORTED by Member Dehart to adjourn the meeting at 12:51 A.M., September 24, 2021. The motion CARRIED with a voice vote (4 yes votes).

NEXT MEETING DATE: October 28, 2021 Regular Meeting