```
WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 22, 2021
```

Ms. Spencer called the regular meeting of the White Lake Township Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:03 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called:

| ROLL CALL: | Josephine Spencer - Chairperson, present in White Lake, MI <br> Dave Walz - Vice Chair, present in White Lake, MI <br> Debby Dehart, present in White Lake, MI <br> Nik Schillack, present in White Lake, MI <br> Mike Powell, present in White Lake, MI |
| :--- | :--- |
| Also Present: | Justin Quagliata, Staff Planner <br> Hannah Micallef, Recording Secretary |
| Visitors: | 0 |

## APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Mr. Walz MOTIONED to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Schillack SUPPORTED. All in favor.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting of March 25, 2021.
Mr. Walz MOTIONED to approve the regular meeting minutes of March 25, 2021 as presented. Mr. Schillack SUPPORTED. All in favor.

## NEW BUSINESS

a. Applicant: James Kovach

3700 Jackson Boulevard
White Lake, MI 48386
Location: 3700 Jackson Boulevard
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-07-158-013
Request: The applicant requests to construct a house, requiring a variance from
Article 3.1.5.E, R1-C Single Family Residential Front-Yard Setback

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 26 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

James Kovach was present to speak on his case. He said he resubmitted drawings from his architect that showed a clearer view of the roof overhangs.

Mr. Quagliata said the applicant needed to revise his plot plan for the Building Department with the updated overhangs if the requested variance was approved.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 7:11 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 7:11 P.M.

Mr. Schillack MOVED to approve the variance requested by James Kovach from Article 3.1.5.E of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-07-158-013, identified as 3700 Jackson Boulevard, in order to construct a new house that would encroach 22 feet into the required west front yard setback. This approval will have the following conditions:

- The applicant's plot plan shall be updated and presented to the Building Official prior to obtaining permits from the Building Department.
- The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 of the ClearZoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was MET

- Chairperson Spencer said a practical difficulty was demonstrated due to the right-of-way of Jackson Boulevard and the property's two front yard setbacks.
- Mr. Powell said a practical difficulty was demonstrated due to the lot's lack of depth.
B. Unique Situation was MET
- Mr. Schillack said the unique situation was the Jackson Boulevard right-of-way. Ms. Dehart agreed.
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was MET
- Mr. Walz said the situation was pre-existing and the applicant had no control over it.
- Mr. Powell said the lot was part of the original plat.
D. Substantial Justice was MET
- Mr. Schillack said the variance would grant substantial justice as the variance would allow the applicant to build a house more consistent with the houses in the neighborhood, and could not see the proposed plans causing any discomfort or danger to the neighbors. Chairperson Spencer agreed.
- Mr. Powell said the variance allowed the applicant the only way to improve his property.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was MET
- Chairperson Spencer said the applicant did not request an excessive variance.
- Mr. Schillack added nothing more had been requested from the applicant due to the right-of-way.

Mr. Powell SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote ( 5 yes votes). (Spencer/yes, Powell/yes, Dehart/yes, Schillack/yes, Walz/yes)
b. Applicant: David Nellist

301 South Silvery Lane
Dearborn, MI 48124
Location: 10697 Castlewood Drive
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-34-151-004
Request: The applicant requests to construct a single-family house, requiring variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Side-Yard Setback and Article 3.11.Q, Water Features Setback due to the proposed buildings setbacks from the water's edge. Variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Minimum Lot Area and Minimum Lot Width are also required.

Ms. Spencer noted for the record that 11 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.
Mr. Schillack asked staff when the applicant purchased the property. Staff Planner Quagliata said 2019.
Mr. Schillack asked staff if the ordinances affecting development of the subject property had changed since 2019. Staff Planner Quagliata said no.

Mr. Schillack asked staff if the parcel had been split. Staff Planner Quagliata said no, it was an original un-platted parcel from the 1960's.

Mr. Schillack asked staff if fill was brought into the property. Staff Planner Quagliata said fill was brought into the property at some point. He stated in 1963, there was a structure on the parcel and the western portion of the land wasn't as filled. Sometime between 1974 and 1980, fill was brought in as shown on Oakland County's aerial photos. The previous structure on the property was demolished in 2006.

Mr. Schillack asked staff about the soil investigation report. Staff Planner Quagliata said there were engineering concerns with pile vibrations shaking other homes off their foundations. There were many geotechnical concerns with the site, and not many houses in the Township were built on piles. The applicant would have to be mindful of helical piles, and a larger shaft diameter would likely have to be used to prevent buckling of the piles. The site was challenging to build.

Ms. Dehart asked staff if the applicant would have to get permission from the parcel to the north to extend the road to their parcel. Staff Planner Quagliata said it would be an Oakland County Road Commission determination.

Mr. David Nellist, applicant, and his architect, James Nellist, 1331 Cornell Drive, Grand Rapids, were present to speak on the case. Mr. James Nellist said a new survey was done since the last time this case was before the Board. A seawall was also staked out, and was waiting on EGLE approval. Lopez Engineering would be assisting with the design and installation of the helical piles. The carport was moved to the east to get farther from the softer soils on the west side of the property, pending their engineer's opinion. A well company came out, and the well would be below the deck on the south side.

Mr. Powell asked the applicant why the garage was proposed to be closer to the road. Mr. James Nellist said several configurations were considered. One configuration was considered lengthwise east to west, but that would have blocked the front door. He added he didn't want to place the garage too close to the lake because of the softer soils. He said it made more sense to align it with the roof and to have room between the house and the garage.

Ms. Dehart asked the applicant if the piles would have fill on top, and how that would affect the neighbors. Mr. James Nellist said that would be a discussion with their engineer, but the idea was for the least amount of footprint in terms of weight; he would like to avoid fill as much as possible. The crawl space may be eliminated and the elevation of the house would be above the floodplain. Staff Planner Quagliata said bringing fill to the site could cause instability and be problematic. Mr. David Nellist said he hoped to only use a minimum amount of fill by having the house sit on piles instead of a concrete foundation.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 8:05 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 8:06 P.M.

Ms. Dehart asked staff if the lot was not platted, how did it come into existence. Staff Planner Quagliata said the lot was a metes and bounds parcel created by a land division.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 of the ClearZoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was MET

- Mr. Powell said a practical difficulty was demonstrated due to the water to the west and lot being narrower than normal.
- Mr. Walz said the applicant did not take shortcuts and did their appropriate due diligence.
B. Unique Situation was MET
- Mr. Schillack said the unique situation was the lot was different from the others to the east due to the water features surrounding the lot.
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was MET
- Ms. Dehart said the water feature caused a greater side yard setback.
D. Substantial Justice was MET
- Mr. Schillack said the lot was not the same as the lot to the east.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was MET
- Mr. Powell said if the deck was made into a patio, the requested Natural Features Setback variance would not be as great.

Mr. Powell MOVED to approve the following variances for David Nellist from Articles 3.1.6.E and 3.11.Q of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-34-151-004, identified as 10697 Castlewood Drive, in order to construct a new house that would encroach 14 feet into the required natural features setback and 3 feet into the required east side yard setback. This approval will have the following conditions:

- The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department
- Subject to the placement of the seawall as proposed on the drawing, and on the issuance of an EGLE permit.

Mr. Powell added the $14^{\prime}$ encroachment into the natural feature setbacks was the minimum variance necessary to accomplish what the applicant desired.

Ms. Dehart SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote (4 yes votes). (Powell/yes, Dehart/yes, Spencer/yes, Walz/yes, Schillack/no)
c. Applicant: Rob Pope

75 Jesswood Lane
White Lake, MI 48386
Location: 7755 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383 identified as 12-21-276-023
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 11 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.
Chairperson Spencer asked staff if a sign permit had been applied for or obtained. Staff Planner Quagliata said no, permits were pending the outcome of the variance request.

Mr. Schillack asked staff if the underground utilities affected the proposed sign location. Staff Planner Quagliata said the sign couldn't be moved further south due to the MDOT right-of-way. If the sign were moved too far north, it would be in the parking lot.

Ms. Dehart asked staff if the proposed placement of the sign would restrict ingress/egress vision from Highland Road (M-59). Staff Planner Quagliata said the sign would be in a clear vision triangle.

Mr. Pope was present to speak on his case. He said he dug the hole for the sign because he had rental equipment available. He stated the ingress/egress from the road had clear vision on both sides. He said due to underground work and setbacks from utilities, the proposed location was the only place for the sign. The right-of-way line was right up to the road, and he gave up some property on the east side due to where the line was. He said he couldn't move the sign to the north because he was concerned with large vehicles crossing over the curb and hitting the sign.

Chairperson Spencer asked staff about Mr. Pope's concerns with the sign being damaged if moved further north, and if a monument sign could be built to collapse upon impact. Staff Planner Quagliata said the proposed sign would not break away upon impact, but there were some signs that were constructed to break away upon impact.

Mr. Walz asked staff where the 6' sign height was measured from. Staff Planner Quagliata said for measuring sign height, grade meant the ground where the sign was installed, which must be generally level with the surrounding property as measured within a 10 -foot radius from the base of the sign. The sign was being measured $6^{\prime}$ from the base of the sign to the top of the sign.

Mr. Powell asked staff if the site had more parking spaces than the ordinance required. Staff Planner Quagliata said the site provided the minimum number of required parking spaces.

Mr. Powell asked the applicant why the sign couldn't be moved further north. Mr. Pope said he was concerned with the cross traffic. Mr. Powell asked the applicant if he knew of traffic that cut the curb. Mr. Pope confirmed.

Mr. Powell asked staff if the applicant was planning on any wall signs. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed, each tenant would have around a 40 square foot wall sign.

Ms. Dehart asked the applicant if the sign was lighted. Mr. Pope said yes, it would be internally lit and double sided.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 9:19 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 9:19 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 from the Clear Zoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was NOT met

- Mr. Schillack said he did not see a practical difficulty, and there were ways to protect the sign and lives of drivers travelling down the road.
- Mr. Powell said he did not see a practical difficulty in regards to the setback or the oversized sign being requested.
B. Unique Situation was NOT met because Practical Difficulty was NOT met
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was NOT met
D. Substantial Justice was NOT met
- Mr. Powell said the proposed location would be a problem for the sign.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was NOT met because Practical Difficulty was NOT met

Ms. Dehart MOVED to deny the variances requested by Rob Pope for Parcel Number 12-21-276-023, identified as 7755 Highland Road, due to failure to meet items A, B, C, D, E from Article 7.37 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Walz SUPPORTED and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote ( 5 yes votes) (Dehart/yes, Walz/yes, Powell/yes, Schillack/yes, Spencer/yes)

## A 7-minute recess was taken at 9:28 P.M. The ZBA returned from recess at 9:35 P.M.

d. Applicant: VFW Post 4156 (Gary Schultz)

635 Andrews Street
Commerce Township, MI 48382
Location: 321 Union Lake Road
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-26-276-001
Request: The applicant requests to install a monument sign in a residential zoning district, requiring variances from Article 5.9.I.iii for the size and number of signs. The applicant, under Article 7.36, Powers of Zoning Board of Appeals Concerning Administrative Review and Variances, is also appealing a determination of the Staff Planner to deny a sign permit application to install an electronic message board sign in a residential zoning district.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 56 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Mr. Schillack asked staff the difference between residential and agricultural zoning. Staff Planner Quagliata said Agricultural was residential zoning. Mr. Schillack asked staff about the zoning of the properties around the site. Staff Planner Quagliata said the properties to the east and west were zoned Local Business. Mr. Schillack asked staff if a different zoning would allow for less variances. Staff Planner Quagliata said if the property was zoned Local Business, an electronic sign would be allowed by right.

Chairperson Spencer asked staff if the additional wall sign and temporary sign were placed on the property with permits. Staff Planner Quagliata said there was no sign permit history for the property.

Chairperson Spencer asked staff if the sign requested wasn't allowed for a residentially zoned property. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Staff Planner Quagliata said when he reviewed the zoning ordinance, the ordinance stated electronic display signs are only permitted as an accessory use in non-residential districts.

Mr. Powell asked staff what the site was master planned for. Staff Planner Quagliata said the property fell into the Public and Quasi-Public category, and there were no future plans for the property outside of its current or similar uses.

Mr. Schultz was present to speak on his case. He said he wasn't sure about the current nonconforming signs, he thought they obtained the proper permits. He said the existing signs did not draw attention to what the VFW was trying to do. Their membership was decreasing, and the electronic sign could help.

Scott Glouger, VFW Post Commander, said the VFW was community oriented, and they helped the youth. A new sign could help share their services and bring more attention to their causes.

Dave Shockling, VFW Quartermaster, said if the new sign was allowed, the two nonconforming ground signs would be removed and the VFW would comply with all setbacks.

Mr. Schillack asked the applicant if they had thought about rezoning. Mr. Schultz said he wasn't sure; rezoning may cause them legal problems.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 10:01 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 10:01 P.M.

Ms. Dehart asked staff if the property was spot zoned. Staff Planner Quagliata said no.
Ms. Dehart asked staff if the applicant would consider a non-electronic monument sign. Staff Planner Quagliata said such a sign could be permitted if the VFW removed some or all of the nonconforming signage.

Mr. Powell asked staff if a monument sign where letters could be changed would be allowed. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 from the Clear Zoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was NOT met
a. Ms. Dehart said the perceived practical difficulty was the zoning, but the use was unaffected.
B. Unique Situation was NOT met because Practical Difficulty was NOT met
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was NOT met
a. Mr. Powell said the ZBA provided the applicant with options for signs that would be more conforming to the zoning ordinance.
D. Substantial Justice was NOT met
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was NOT met because a Practical Difficulty was NOT demonstrated

Mr. Walz MOVED move to affirm the decision of the Staff Planner and deny the variances requested by Gary Schultz (VFW) for Parcel Number 12-26-276-001, identified as 321 Union Lake Road, due to failure to meet items A, B, C, D, E from Article 7.37 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Powell SUPPORTED, and the motion carried with a roll call vote ( 5 yes votes): (Walz/yes, Powell/yes, Dehart/yes, Spencer/yes, Schillack/yes)
e. Applicant: Ken and Karen Pilarski

8315 Cooley Beach Drive White Lake, MI 48386
Location: 8315 Cooley Beach Drive
White Lake, MI 48386 identified as 12-36-452-016
Request: The applicant requests to construct an addition to a single-family house, requiring variances from Article 3.1.6.E, R1-D Single Family Residential Side-Yard Setback and Minimum Lot Width. A variance from Article 7.28.A, Repairs and Maintenance to Nonconforming Structures will be required due to both the value of improvements and the increase in cubic content.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 25 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Chairperson Spencer asked staff where the houses adjacent to the applicant's house were. Staff Planner Quagliata said the houses northwest and northeast of the applicant's house were setback closer to the road on their respective lots.

Mr. Schillack asked staff if the current house was remaining. Staff Planner Quagliata confirmed.

Mr. Powell said he spoke with the applicant during his site visit, and the applicant was willing to reduce the roof overhangs over the existing structure to be more compliant with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. and Mrs. Pilarski were present to speak on their case. He said the reason for the attached garage was due to their age and the need for more storage. The existing foundation would be kept, and the roof overhangs would be reduced by half. He added the houses northwest and northeast of his were staggered, so the neighbor's views of the lake would not be affected. The electrical in the house would be upgraded to bring that up to code as well.

Staff Planner Quagliata asked the applicants where the HVAC was going to be. Mr. Pilarski said they would be moved to the street side of the house, in the basement area. The A/C unit was going to be put on the east side of the house. Staff Planner Quagliata said the $A / C$ would need to be moved to an alternative location as mechanical units could not encroach within $5^{\prime}$ of a lot line.

Mr. Schillack asked the applicant the status of the existing detached garage. Mr. Pilarski said the existing garage would remain.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 10:48 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 10:49 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 from the Clear Zoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was MET

- Mr. Powell found a practical difficulty with the existing structure, it was nonconforming, and without the requested variances there would be no way to improve or maintain the quality of the structure.
B. Unique Situation was MET
- Ms. Dehart said the lot was platted long ago, and was now smaller than the current standards for lots.
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was MET
- Chairperson Spencer said the lot was platted years ago and was no fault of the applicant.
D. Substantial Justice was MET
- Mr. Powell said the neighboring properties would not be adversely impacted.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was MET
- Chairperson Spencer said the minimum variances necessary were demonstrated, and the applicant offered to reduce the nonconformity of the existing roof overhangs.

Mr. Powell MOVED to approve the variances requested by Ken and Karen Pilarski from Article 3.1.6.E and Article 7.28.A of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-36-452-016, identified as 8315 Cooley Beach Drive, in order to construct an addition and attached garage that would encroach 4 feet into the required east side yard setback and 2.7 feet into the required west side yard setback, and exceed the allowed value of improvements to a nonconforming structure by $\mathbf{8 1 8 \%}$. A 30 -foot variance
from the required lot width 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.
- An as-built survey shall be required to verify the roof overhang setback from the side lot lines.
- The outside mechanical units shall not be closer than $5^{\prime}$ to the side yard property lines.

Mr. Schillack SUPPORTED, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote ( 5 yes votes): (Powell/yes, Schillack/yes, Dehart/yes, Walz/yes, Spencer/yes)

Other Business
There was no other business.

Adjournment: Mr. Schillack MOTIONED to adjourn the meeting at 11:01 P.M. Ms. Dehart SUPPORTED. All in favor.

Next Meeting Date: April 29, 2021

## WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP <br> ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS VIRTUAL SPECIAL MEETING <br> APRIL 29, 2021

Chairperson Spencer called the special meeting of the White Lake Township Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 6:00 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called:

```
ROLL CALL: Josephine Spencer - Chairperson, present in White Lake, MI
    Dave Walz - Vice Chair, present in White Lake, MI
    Mike Powell, present in White Lake, MI
    Nik Schillack, present in White Lake, MI
    Debby Dehart, present in White Lake, MI
Also Present: Justin Quagliata, Staff Planner
    Hannah Micallef, Recording Secretary
Visitors: 0
```


## APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Member Dehart MOTIONED to approve the agenda as presented. Member Walz SUPPORTED. All in favor.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

There were no minutes ready for approval.

## NEW BUSINESS

| a. | Applicant: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Creative Custom Builders <br>  <br> 7655 Highland Road, Ste 202 <br> Waterford, MI 48327 |
|  | Location: |
|  | 4398 Clare Lane |
|  | White Lake, MI 48383 identified as 12-08-251-027 |
|  | The applicant requests to construct a single-family house, <br> requiring a variance from Article 3.11.J, Minimum Floor |
|  | Area to construct a house that does not meet the minimum <br> living space requirement. |

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 3 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.
Member Powell asked staff about the minimum floor area requirements. Staff Planner Quagliata said the Township Board recently adopted changes to the Zoning Ordinance that reduced the minimum floor area requirements for all single-family zoning districts.

Member Schillack asked staff if any building permits had been issued for the other lots of Clare Lane. Staff Planner Quagliata said no.

Member Dehart asked staff if the developer of the property created any deed restrictions on the lots. Staff Planner Quagliata said the Township did not enforce deed restrictions.

Jim Veilleux, Creative Custom Builders, was present to speak on his case. He said the house plan was redesigned to extend the roof out $5^{\prime}$, and the deck would be completely covered by the roof structure. As designed the house would not be able to stand without the deck. The deck would be wrap around and used as egress and ingress to the house. The house would be setback off the road and tucked into the trees. He stated due to the pandemic, construction costs had gone up and his client was spending more on this house than originally intended.

Member Powell asked the applicant about adding an addition to bring the house into compliance with the minimum standards. Mr. Veilleux said it was considered, but it would be a financial strain on his client.

Mr. Wagner, 1268 Pinecrest Drive, White Lake, the property owner, said he would finish the basement for his son to be able to live with him.

Member Schillack asked staff what would have to be done to the deck to have it considered a part of the house's square footage. Staff Planner Quagliata said the porch would have to be enclosed and heated.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 6:33 P.M.
Staff Planner Quagliata read a letter of opposition into the record.

Chairperson Spencer closed the public hearing at 6:36 P.M.
Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 of the ClearZoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was NOT met

- Chairperson Spencer said since financial hardship was not something the ZBA could take into consideration, there was no practical difficulty demonstrated.
- Member Powell said the site was two (2) acres, and there was no practical difficulty presented.
B. Unique Situation was NOT met
- Member Dehart said since there was no practical difficulty, a unique situation was not demonstrated.
- Member Powell said the unique situation was personal to the applicant, but not due to the location, lot, or area.
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was NOT met
- Member Walz said the applicant could build a house with a larger ground floor area, and it was a self-created hardship.
- Member Schillack said the ZBA could not consider economic hardships.
D. Substantial Justice was NOT met
- Member Powell said the property did not prevent the applicant from meeting the requirements found in the Zoning Ordinance.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was NOT met
- Chairperson Spencer said there was no practical difficulty.

Member Powell said the ZBA could not grant a variance if the five items from Article 7.37 were not met.
Member Dehart said she was at the Planning Commission meeting when the reduction for the minimum floor area requirements was considered, and the pandemic was taken into account when that change was discussed.

Member Walz MOVED to deny the variances requested by Creative Custom Builders for Parcel Number 12-08-251-027, identified as 4398 Clare Lane, due to the following reason(s): failure to meet the standards A, B, C, D, E from Article 7.37 of the zoning ordinance.

## Member Schillack SUPPORTED and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote ( 5 yes votes):

 Walz/yes, Schillack/yes, Spencer/yes, Powell/yes, Dehart/yesb.

Applicant:

Location:

Request:

Michael Lemon 4400 McKeachie Road White Lake, MI 48383 4400 McKeachie Road White Lake, MI 48383 identified as 12-08-251-003
The applicant requests to install a residential swimming pool, requiring variance from Article 5.10, Swimming Pools to install the pool in the front yard.

Chairperson Spencer noted for the record that 11 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 US Postal Service.

Staff Planner Quagliata gave his staff report.

Member Schillack asked staff how soon the building permit was rescinded after issuance. Staff Planner Quagliata said there was a five-day period before the permit was rescinded.

Michael Lemon, 4400 McKeachie Road, was present to speak on his case. He said he called the Township four months ago and was verbally told it would be okay to put the pool in the front yard. He said he would have liked the pool in the rear yard, but there was no room and his well was in the rear yard. The pool would be far off McKeachie Road and not be seen from the road. He said he wanted the pool for his grandchildren.

Member Powell asked the applicant if the circle on his plans between the shop and the house was the well. Mr. Lemon confirmed, and said there was not room for the pool north or south due to the driveway configuration.

Member Powell asked the applicant if there was a basement in the house. Mr. Lemon confirmed.
Member Powell asked the applicant how deep the pool would be in its deepest end. Mr. Lemon said $8^{\prime}$.
Member Powell asked the applicant if he built the house. Mr. Lemon said no.

Chairperson Spencer opened the public hearing at 7:09 P.M. Seeing no public comment, she closed the public hearing at 7:09 P.M.

Staff Planner Quagliata went through the standards from Article 7.37 of the ClearZoning Ordinance:
A. Practical Difficulty was MET

- Member Schillack said knowing the well was behind the house, he could not see how the pool could be constructed between the house and the shop.
B. Unique Situation was MET
- Member Dehart said the site was different because the house sat far back.
C. Not a Self-Created Hardship was MET
- Member Schillack said there was not a self-created hardship because the applicant did not build the house.
D. Substantial Justice was MET
- Member Dehart said the pool would not have a negative impact on the surrounding properties.
- Member Powell said the area chosen was the only logical place to construct the pool.
E. Minimum Variance Necessary was MET
- Member Powell said the terrain prevented the pool from being located closer to the house.

Member Dehart MOVED to approve the variance requested by Michael Lemon from Article 5.10 of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-08-251-003, identified as 4400 McKeachie Road, in order to install a swimming pool that would project 124 feet in front of the rear line of the house. This approval will have the following conditions:

- The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.
- A site plan drawn to an engineer's scale shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Member Schillack SUPPORTED and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: ( 5 yes votes): Dehart/yes, Schillack/yes, Walz/yes, Powell/yes, Spencer/yes

## Other Business

There was no other business.

Adjournment: Member Dehart MOTIONED to adjourn the meeting at 7:24 P.M. Member Walz SUPPORTED. All in favor.

Next Meeting Date: May 27, 2021

## WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

## REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

| TO: | Zoning Board of Appeals |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Justin Quagliata, Staff Planner |
| DATE: | May 27, 2021 |

Agenda item: 6a

Appeal Date: $\quad$ May 27, 2021

Applicant: McComb Construction

Address: 1871 Austin Street
Troy, MI 48083

Zoning: R1-D Single Family Residential

Location: 9562 Mandon Road
White Lake, MI 48386

## Property Description

The approximately 0.683 -acre ( $29,751.48$ square feet) parcel identified as 9562 Mandon Road is located on Cedar Island Lake and zoned R1-D (Single Family Residential). The existing house on the property (approximately 1,700 square feet in size) utilizes a private well for potable water and a private septic system for sanitation.

## Applicant's Proposal

McComb Construction, the applicant, on behalf of property owner Michael Mack, is proposing to demolish the existing house and construct a new house.

## Planner's Report

The existing house was built in 1925 (two additions in the 1970s) and is nonconforming because it does not meet the east side yard setback (approximately 6.5 feet). A minimum 10 -foot side yard setback is required in the R1-D zoning district. The parcel is also nonconforming due a 27-foot deficiency in lot width ( 53 feet in width); in the R1-D zoning district the minimum lot width requirement is 80 feet.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing house to construct an approximately 3,408 square foot two-story house with an attached two-car garage. The proposed house would be located 7.23 feet from the west property line and 6 feet from the east property line; therefore, a 2.77 -foot variance is being requested to encroach into the west side yard setback and a 4 -foot variance is being requested to encroach into the east side yard setback. Additionally, the proposed building height is 27.25 feet, which is 2.25 feet beyond the 25 -foot maximum building height allowed in the R1-D zoning district. For informational purposes, the roof peak is 35.25 feet in height.

The requested variances are listed in the following table.

| Variance \# | Ordinance <br> Section | Subject | Standard | Requested <br> Variance | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Article 3.1.6.E | Side yard <br> setback | 10 feet | 2.77 feet (west) <br> 4 feet (east) | 7.23 feet (west) <br> 6 feet (east) |
| 2 | Article 3.1.6.E | Maximum <br> building height | 25 feet | 2.25 feet | 27.25 feet |
| 3 | Article 3.1.6.E | Minimum lot <br> width | 80 feet | 27 feet | 53 feet |

## Zoning Board of Appeals Options:


#### Abstract

Approval: I move to approve the variances requested by McComb Construction from Article 3.1.6.E of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-35-126-023, identified as 9562 Mandon Road, in order to construct a new house that would exceed the allowed building height by 2.25 feet and encroach 2.77 feet into the required west side yard setback and 4 feet into the required east side yard setback. A 27 -foot variance from the required lot width 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.


Denial: I move to deny the variances requested by McComb Construction for Parcel Number 12-35-126-023, identified as 9562 Mandon Road, due to the following reason(s):

Table: I move to table the variance requests of McComb Construction for Parcel Number 12-35-126-023, identified as 9562 Mandon Road, to consider comments stated during this public hearing.

## Attachments:

1. Variance application dated April 22, 2021.
2. Property Owner's written statement dated April 23, 2021.
3. Plot plan dated April 22, 2021.
4. House plans dated April 9, 2021.
5. Letter of denial from the Building Department dated April 26, 2021.

### 7.37 STANDARDS

General variances: The Zoning Board of Appeals may authorize a variance from the strict application of the area or dimensional standard of this Ordinance when the applicant demonstrates all of the following conditions "A - E" or condition F applies.
A. Practical difficulty: A practical difficulty exists on the subject site (such as exceptional narrowness, shallowness, shape or area; presence of floodplain; exceptional topographic conditions) and strict compliance with the zoning ordinance standards would unreasonably prevent the owner from using of the subject site for a permitted use or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome. Demonstration of a practical difficulty shall have a bearing on the subject site or use of the subject site, and not to the applicant personally. Economic hardship or optimum profit potential are not considerations for practical difficulty.
B. Unique situation: The demonstrated practical difficult results from exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the subject site at the time the Ordinance was adopted or amended which are different than typical properties in the same zoning district or the vicinity.
C. Not self created: The applicants problem is not self created.
D. Substantial justice: The variance would provide substantial justice by granting the property rights similar to those enjoyed by the majority of other properties in the vicinity, and other properties in the same zoning district. The decision shall not bestow upon the property special development rights not enjoyed by other properties in the same district, or which might result in substantial adverse impacts on properties in the vicinity (such as the supply of light and air, significant increases in traffic, increased odors, an increase in the danger of fire, or other activities which may endanger the public safety, comfort. morals or welfare).
E. Minimum variance necessary: The variance shall be the minimum necessary to grant relief created by the practical difficulty.
F. Compliance with other laws: The variance is the minimum necessary to comply with state or federal laws, including but not necessarily limited to:
i. The Michigan Right to Farm Act (P.A. 93 of 1981) and the farming activities the Act protects;
ii. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (as amended), and the needs of handicapped individuals the Act protects, including accessory facilities, building additions, building alterations, and site improvements which may not otherwise meet a strict application of the standards of this Ordinance.

Under no circumstances shall the Board of Appeals grant a variance to allow a use not permissible under the terms of this Ordinance in the district involved, or any use expressly or by implication prohibited by the terms of this Ordinance in said district.

## CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WHITE LAKE Zoning Board of Appeals APPLICATION

APPLICANTS NAME:
 PHONE:


ADDRESS:


APPLICANT'S EMAILADDRESS: $\qquad$ 187 16 APPLICANT'S INTEREST IN PROPERTY: $\square$ OWNER $\square$ BUILDER $\square$ OTHER: $\qquad$

ADDRESS OF AFFECTED PROPERTY: $\qquad$ PARCEL 12 -35-126-023 CURRENT ZONING: $\qquad$ PARCEL SIZE: $\qquad$

STATE REQUESTED VARIANCE AND ORDINANCE SECTION: $\qquad$

VALUE OF IMPROVEMENT: \$ $\qquad$ SUV OF EXISITING STRUCTURE: \$

STATE REASONS TO SUPPORT REQUEST: (ADDITIONALS SHEETS MAY BE ATTACHED)


APPLICATION FEE: 365 (CALCULATED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT)


DATE:


Michael John Mack

9562 Mandon Road
White Lake, MI 48386
269-598-6428

## RECEIVED

APR 222021
mmack84@yahoo.com

April 23, 2021

To whom it may concern:

My name is Michael Mack and I live at 9562 Mandon Road. I am married with two young children and two dogs. We love the neighborhood we live in and living on Cedar Island Lake. In our house currently we only have one bathroom and three bedrooms for four people. The house is an old lake cottage that has had two additions built onto it in the 1970s. The three different sections of the house have three different levels and these different levels make it more difficult for our kids as well as our aging parents to negotiate. The house has not had any significant work or updating done to it since the 1970s additions and is in dire need of extensive renovations and repairs.

Having one bathroom for two adults and two young children makes bathroom needs or showering problematic. Frequently the young children cannot wait for their turn for someone to finish or they will have an accident. This also makes entertaining friends and family difficult because with only one bathroom for the aforementioned reasons.

The three bedrooms are spread out on the main level which presents some safety and security concerns for us. With the bedrooms being spread out we cannot always hear if one of the children has a problem. Additionally there are some security concerns as the bedrooms are easily accessible from outside via the windows.

In the main part of the house we do not have much space for the kids and dogs to play, as well as for the adults to have their space. Working as an Airline Pilot my job requires frequent studying and paperwork, not having a quiet and separate room away from the children and dogs makes this difficult. This will become more of an issue in the future when our children begin requiring room for their homework and computers.

Because of the sometimes frigid climate in Michigan, it can be a burden to get the kids bundled up to get in the car that is outside in the cold, covered in snow and ice. This is also a burden for me leaving very early in the morning for work and I have to drag my suitcases through the snow on the driveway. Additionally, since I frequently travel for work, our cars being in the garage would make it more difficult for someone with evil intentions to make note of our movements and who is home and when.

With all of these considerations and the need for extensive renovations we have determined it would be more feasible and more cost effective to build a new house that solves these problems. Building a new house solves this by moving all of the bedrooms upstairs for the aforementioned security reasons with 2 bathrooms upstairs for the kids and us to use. The new design provides for a half bath on the main level that can be used for entertaining. The new house would also have an attached two car garage and an office and separate play room in addition to the family room. We also think a walkout basement would provide an additional area in which my wife and I or the children could entertain friends or family as well as storage for belongings. The basement would also add an additional level of safety by providing a safe location for the family in the event of a tornado that while rare, can occur in Michigan.

With these considerations, we believe that building a new home on our existing property will help us with our growing family and allow us to stay in an area that we like that is also close to friends and family. We hope you will grant us the variances to accomplish this. Thank you.

Respectfully,
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## RE: Proposed Residential Structure

Based on the submitted plans, the proposed residential structure does not satisfy the White Lake Township Clear Zoning Ordinance for R1-D zoning district.

Article 3.1.6 of the White Lake Township Clear Zoning Ordinance: Requires a minimum side yard setback of 10 ft each side and total of 20 ft , minimum lot width of 80 ft , and maximum building height of 25 ft .

The existing lot is legal non-conforming with a width of 53 ft and road frontage of 75 ft . The proposed residential structure would have a side yard setback of 7.23 ft on the west side and 6.0 ft on the east side, for a combined total of 13.23 ft . As well, the proposed height of the midpoint roofline is 27.25 ft .

Approval of the building plans would be subject to a variance to the schedule of regulations, Article 7 of the White Lake Township Clear Zoning Ordinance. Application must be made to the White Lake Township Planning Department. The Planning Department can be reached at (248)698-3300, ext. 5

Sincerely,
Mahl- $\frac{+}{\square}$
Nick Spencer, Building Official
White Lake Township

## WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

## REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Justin Quagliata, Staff Planner
DATE: May 27, 2021

Agenda item: 6b

Appeal Date: $\quad$ May 27, 2021

Applicant: Metro Detroit Signs

Address: 11444 Kaltz Avenue
Warren, MI 48089

Zoning: GB General Business

Location: 6491 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48386

## Property Description

The approximately 1.31 -acre parcel identified as 6491 Highland Road is located on the north side of Highland Road, east of Bogie Lake Road, and zoned GB (General Business).

## Applicant's Proposal

Metro Detroit Signs, the applicant, on behalf of property owner Mark Pfau, is proposing to install an electronic message board monument sign and second wall sign.

## Planner's Report

The following two signs are proposed:

- 32.8 square foot wall sign on the east (side) elevation
- 38.3 square foot monument sign with an electronic message board

In accordance with Article 5, Section 9.J.ii.b, a maximum of one (1) wall sign is permitted for each principal building. The one permitted wall sign must be located flat against the building's front facade or parallel to the front facade on a canopy. The applicant was issued a permit to install a wall sign on the south (front) elevation. Any additional wall signage requires a variance. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance to install a second wall sign on the east (side) elevation of the building.

In accordance with Article 5, Section 9.J.i.a, freestanding signs must be setback a minimum of ten (10) feet from the existing right-of-way. For sign size, Article 5, Section 9.J.i.b states the sign area of a freestanding sign is dependent upon the sign's setback from the existing right-of-way and the zoning district within which the sign is proposed. For single-tenant buildings in the GB district, freestanding signs are permitted two (2) square feet for each one (1) foot of setback, up to a maximum of 50 square feet in area (with a 25 -foot setback). The existing freestanding sign is 20 feet in height and located 2 feet from the right-of-way line. The existing masonry base would be modified (reduced in height) and the proposed sign would be installed over the base ( 7 feet overall height). The new sign cabinet would project north and south over the base and be located 0 feet from the right-of-way line.

The requested variances are listed in the following table.

| Variance \# | Ordinance <br> Section | Subject | Standard | Requested Variance | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Article 5.9.J.ii.b | Maximum <br> number of wall <br> signs | 1 wall sign | 1 wall sign | 2 wall signs |
| 2 | Article 5.9.J.i.a | Sign setback | 10 feet min. | 19.15 feet <br> $(38.3$ square foot sign) $)$ | 0 feet |
| 3 | Article 5.9.J.i.b | Maximum size <br> of signs | 50 square <br> feet max. | 38.3 square feet <br> (0-foot setback) | 38.3 square feet |

## Zoning Board of Appeals Options:

Approval: I move to approve the variances requested by Metro Detroit Signs from Article 5.9.J.i.a and 5.9.J.i.b of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel Number 12-20-276-020, identified as 6491 Highland Road, in order to install a 38.3 square foot monument sign that would be located 0 feet from the road right-of-way line and a second wall sign. This approval will have the following conditions:

- The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the White Lake Township Building Department.
- No additional signage shall be permitted on the building.
- Any future modification to signage on the building, except for eliminating signage, shall require approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Denial: I move to deny the variances requested by Metro Detroit Signs for Parcel Number 12-20-276-020, identified as 6491 Highland Road, due to the following reason(s):

Table: I move to table the variance requests of Metro Detroit Signs for Parcel Number 12-20-276-020, identified as 6491 Highland Road, to consider comments stated during this public hearing.

## Attachments:

1. Variance application dated April 22, 2021.
2. Applicant's written statement dated April 22, 2021.
3. Site plan.
4. Exterior elevations.

### 7.37 STANDARDS

General variances: The Zoning Board of Appeals may authorize a variance from the strict application of the area or dimensional standard of this Ordinance when the applicant demonstrates all of the following conditions "A - E" or condition F applies.
A. Practical difficulty: A practical difficulty exists on the subject site (such as exceptional narrowness, shallowness, shape or area; presence of floodplain; exceptional topographic conditions) and strict compliance with the zoning ordinance standards would unreasonably prevent the owner from using of the subject site for a permitted use or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome. Demonstration of a practical difficulty shall have a bearing on the subject site or use of the subject site, and not to the applicant personally. Economic hardship or optimum profit potential are not considerations for practical difficulty.
B. Unique situation: The demonstrated practical difficult results from exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the subject site at the time the Ordinance was adopted or amended which are different than typical properties in the same zoning district or the vicinity.
C. Not self created: The applicants problem is not self created.
D. Substantial justice: The variance would provide substantial justice by granting the property rights similar to those enjoyed by the majority of other properties in the vicinity, and other properties in the same zoning district. The decision shall not bestow upon the property special development rights not enjoyed by other properties in the same district, or which might result in substantial adverse impacts on properties in the vicinity (such as the supply of light and air, significant increases in traffic, increased odors, an increase in the danger of fire, or other activities which may endanger the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare).
E. Minimum variance necessary: The variance shall be the minimum necessary to grant relief created by the practical difficulty.
F. Compliance with other laws: The variance is the minimum necessary to comply with state or federal laws, including but not necessarily limited to:
i. The Michigan Right to Farm Act (P.A. 93 of 1981) and the farming activities the Act protects;
ii. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (as amended), and the needs of handicapped individuals the Act protects, including accessory facilities, building additions, building alterations, and site improvements which may not otherwise meet a strict application of the standards of this Ordinance.

Under no circumstances shall the Board of Appeals grant a variance to allow a use not permissible under the terms of this Ordinance in the district involved, or any use expressly or by implication prohibited by the terms of this Ordinance in said district.
$\qquad$

STATE REQUESTED VARIANCE AND ORDINANCE SECTION: $\qquad$
Please see the attached ZBA cover letter
 (CALCULATED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT) APPLICANTS SIGNATURE:
 DATE: $\quad 4 / 22 / 21$

#  <br> METRO SIGNS <br> - \&LIGHTING <br> 11444 Kaltz Ave. Warren, MI 48089 <br> P: (586)759-2700 F: (586)759-2703 <br> kdeters@metrodetroitsigns.com 

DATE: $\quad 4 / 22 / 21$
TO: White Lake Township ZBA
FROM: Kevin Deters
Metro Detroit Signs
RE: $\quad$ McDonald's signs at 6491 Highland Rd

## ZBA Cover Letter

We are applying for a variance for the following two signs as part of the McDonald's remodel:

- a 4' x 9'-7" monument sign with an electronic message board ( 38.3 sq feet) at $7^{\prime} \mathrm{OAH}$, centered on the existing brick base
- a 2' x 16'-5" (32.8 sq feet) McDonald's wall sign on the east (side) elevation

The only sign that is already approved is the south elevation arch wall sign ( 14 sq feet) facing Highland Rd. The rest of the signage requires a variance.

The monument sign at this location is unique in that, due to the existing water main easement, there is really no other place on the property to realistically and practically install a monument sign. Also, the proposed new monument sign is much smaller and aesthetically pleasing than the existing 20 ' high pylon that it will be replacing.

Since McDonald's is going from a $20^{\prime}$ tall sign to a 7 ' tall sign, they are requesting a wall sign on the east elevation. The additional wall signage is necessary for visibility for westbound traffic along Highland Rd. McDonald's is an impulse business, so the extra visibility is crucial on the east elevation, particularly since traffic on Highland Rd drives anywhere between $50-65 \mathrm{mph}$ and their ground sign will be much smaller.

Feel free to call me at (586)759-2700 if anything else is needed. Thank you for your assistance.

- RECEIVED


Existing 20' high ground sign to be removed and replaced


$$
t^{-2}
$$






