

P.O. Box 157
10405 Merrill Road
Hamburg, Michigan 48139-0157

(810) 231-1000 Office
(810) 231-4295 Fax



Supervisor: Pat Hohl
Clerk: Mike Dolan
Treasurer: Jason Negri
Trustees: Bill Hahn
Annette Koeble
Chuck Menzies
Patricia Hughes

**Hamburg Township
Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Wednesday, February 10, 2021
Virtual Meeting using GoToMeeting platform
7:00 P.M.**

1. Call to order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Priebe at 7:00 p.m.

2. Pledge to the Flag:

3. Roll call of the Board:

Present: Auxier, calling in from Hamburg Township, Livingston County
Negri, calling in from Hamburg Township, Livingston County
Priebe, calling in from Hamburg Township, Livingston County
Rill, calling in from Hamburg Township Livingston County,
Watson, calling in from Hamburg Township, Livingston County

Absent: None

Also Present: Amy Steffens, Planning & Zoning Administrator & Brittany Stein, Zoning Coordinator

4. Correspondence: None

5. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Negri, supported by Auxier

To approve the agenda as presented

Voice vote: Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED

6. Call to the public:

Chairperson Priebe opened the hearing to the public for any item not on the agenda. There was no response. The call was closed.

7. Variance requests:

a) ZBA 2020-0012

Owner: Heather and Paul Gowette

Location: 4203 Shoreview Lane, Whitmore Lake, MI 48189

Parcel ID: 15-33-110-243

Request: Variance application to permit the construction of a two and a half story, 2,754 square foot dwelling and an attached 990-square foot garage. The dwelling will have a 12-foot north front yard setback (25-foot front yard setback required, Section 7.6.1.).

Heather Gowette, applicant, stated that they listened to what the Board had to say at the last meeting, and they have re-drawn their request. It did eliminate the request for the setback from the lake leaving just the one variance request. They removed eight feet from the length of the structure and reduced the square footage by eliminating a bedroom. It is more compliant and keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Amy Steffens, Planning & Zoning Administrator, stated that this is the second time this applicant is appearing before the Board. On October 14, 2020, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing for a proposed project a little larger than what is before us tonight. The previous request did include an additional setback variance request that is not before us now. After taking testimony, the ZBA allowed the applicant more time to revise the plan to bring the request into closer compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. What is being requested currently is the construction of a 2 ½ story 2,688 square foot dwelling with an attached 990 square foot garage. The dwelling will have a 12 foot front yard setback where 25 feet is required. She described the existing dwelling including an awning that projects into the required setback. Awnings are allowed to project into the setback up to 24 inches. In the case, the house is already 10 feet into the setback. The ZBA could approve the house without the awning as well or approve or deny the entire project. Since October, the applicant has reduced both the footprint of the proposed structure and reduced the length of the structure. They have also brought the elevated deck that was on the water side into compliance.

Steffens discussed the findings of fact. The subject site is 5,270 square feet in size, which is a typical sized waterfront lot. The zoning ordinance has undergone multiple zoning text amendments to relax setback requirements to allow for greater development potential. She discussed the proposed setbacks and stated that the garage can have a setback of 15 feet, but the house has to meet the 25 foot setback. She further discussed the square footage, indicating that 400 square feet of structure, which includes vertical space above grade to the top floor, would be constructed within the required 25-foot front yard setback. Staff finds that this could be an acceptable deviation from the zoning ordinance. The proposed dwelling would sit forward of the dwelling to the east. The dwelling to the east takes views of the lake to the south, so the proposed dwelling on the subject site would not impede water views of either parcel to the east or west. Granting this variance request is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity as a smaller structure could be built on the subject site without the requirement of a variance to the setback regulations. However, the nominal bulk of the structure within the setback could be considered a minor deviation from the ordinance. She stated that this is a typical waterfront lot, and again, given the small amount of square footage within the setback, this may be an acceptable deviation. One of the goals of the 2020 master plan is to "Protect, preserve, and enhance whenever possible, the unique and desirable natural amenities of Hamburg Township and maintaining the existing character of parcels along lakes. The required setback regulations are designed to help maintain the character for the area. The lot size of the subject site is small. However, the entire Cornwell Acres Subdivision was developed with small lots. The lot is relatively flat. It does not appear that there is a condition or situation of the subject property that is not of a general or recurrent nature. The site is zoned for single-family dwellings and the proposed project is a single-family dwelling. There is a buildable area outside of the required setback which would allow an adequately sized home to be built that would permit the reasonable use of the land. However, staff finds that the nominal amount of square footage proposed in the required setback could be considered an acceptable deviation from the ordinance. Finally, this is in a state regulated floodplain and the state floodplain requirements will apply.

Member Negri stated that in the October 2020 minutes, the applicant indicates that there is a slope to the property that reduces the buildable area. He asked how relevant that is to the applicant's ability to build a more suitable size home on that parcel. Steffens stated that she does not find that argument compelling, especially given the fact that they are proposing a considerable amount of fill to bring the building envelope out of the floodplain. She further discussed the drop-off in the rear of the property as well as the fill and floodplain. She stated that the grade change is not so great that it could not be overcome with a different design.

Member Negri asked Steffens if she feels that the 400 square foot intrusion into the setback is nominal. Steffens stated that for this site, she feels that it is. She further discussed the surrounding properties.

Chairperson Priebe discussed the configuration of the lots. She further stated that she appreciates the applicant's efforts to bring this more into compliance.

Chairperson Priebe opened the hearing to the public. Hearing no response, the call was closed.

Chairperson Priebe stated that we received an anonymous email in opposition to the request. Steffens stated that this was the only response we received after the legal notice for this hearing.

Discussion was held on the applicants' efforts to change the plans.

Motion by Auxier, supported by Rill

Motion to approve variance application ZBA 20-012 to permit the construction of a two and a half story, 2,688 square foot dwelling and an attached 990-square foot garage. The dwelling will have a 12-foot north front yard setback (25-foot front yard setback required, Section 7.6.1.). The variance does meet variance standards one through seven of Section 6.5 of the Hamburg Township Zoning Ordinance, and a practical difficulty exists on the subject site when strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards is applied, as discussed at the meeting this evening and as presented in this staff report.

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - Yes
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson - Yes

MOTION CARRIED

b) ZBA 2020-0022

Owner: Lewis and Nancy Walker

Location: 9020 Rushside Drive, Pinckney MI 48169

Parcel ID: 15-17-402-126

Request: Variance application to permit the construction of 13-foot by 13-foot enclosed sunroom. The sunroom will have a 19-foot south front yard setback (25-foot front yard setback required, Section 7.6.1.), and a 41-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark of Rush Lake (50-foot setback from the OHM required, Section 7.6.1. fn. 3). Variance application to permit an elevated deck on the north façade with a 7-foot setback from the OHM (44-foot setback required, Section 8.18.2).

Mr. Robert Clark of Four Seasons Rooms, representing the applicant, stated that the home itself is non-compliant. They are building in the middle of the home, no further back toward the lake. The front yard setback is one of their largest issues. He discussed the vacated Higgins Drive and stated that if they had vacated the entire lot, they would not need a front yard variance. They are proposing this room over an existing room below and will not be going any further than the existing building envelope. Mr. Walker did extend the deck himself not realizing that going seven feet out would cause an issue. If the Board approves the variance, Mr. Walker will follow up with Livingston County for inspection.

Brittany Stein, Zoning Coordinator, stated that the subject parcel is approximately 21,000-square foot in size. The property fronts onto Rushside Drive to the south and Rush Lake to the north. The property is a platted lot and is accessed at the end of Rushside Drive. A small section of a platted road, Higgins Drive, was vacated where the driveway of the house is located. However, a section of Higgins Drive on the property, just south of the house was never vacated. If approved, the variance request would allow for the construction of 13-foot by 13-foot enclosed sunroom. The sunroom will have a 19-foot south front yard setback where a 25-foot front yard setback is required from the vacated Higgins Drive. There is no road there. The addition would also have a 41-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark of Rush Lake where a 50-foot setback from the OHM is required. This was previously noticed for the January meeting, however after visiting the site, it was discovered that the sunroom would not meet the 50 setback from the OHM. The house is non-conforming, but anything new would have to meet the ordinance. Also, it was also noticed that there is a deck off the back that had previously been a balcony. It was clear that it had been expanded and there was no record of any permit. Additionally, based on FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), a portion of the site lies within the 100- year floodplain. According to the maps, the deck may be within the floodplain. If the deck

is found to be in the floodplain and is attached to the house, an elevation certificate will be required for the house to ensure the house and all attached appurtenances meet the required 1-foot freeboard above the base flood elevation. A LOMA was issued for the home in 2011, however that did not include the deck nor would it include the proposed sunroom therefore this LOMA is now null and void. If the project is within the floodplain, we will make sure it is done in compliance and request an elevation certificate.

Stein discussed the findings of fact. She stated that the property is nearly half an acre in size with frontage on Rush Lake. The existing house is built into the hillside with an existing elevated deck on the lake side and west side of the house. The deck on the west where the sunroom is proposed, covers a portion of the lower level of the home. The proposed sunroom addition is 19 feet from the front right of way of Higgins Drive. Although there may be other space among the property to construct a sunroom addition, this is the least impactful location for it. The same property owners own lot 15, a vacant lot connecting to Junior Dr. Because it is proposed to be constructed over an existing structure, there is no visual impact from neighboring properties. There are exceptional or extraordinary conditions and circumstances of the property which do not generally apply to other properties in the waterfront residential district. With regard to the variance request for the elevated deck on the rear of the house, there is greater impact. The house is an existing nonconforming, being only 15 feet to the water's edge of Rush Lake. An existing 3-foot wide balcony, the full length of the house on the lake side, was expanded without permits. The zoning ordinance allows for an elevated deck or balcony to project into the required yard setback 6 feet or at least 44 feet from the ordinary high water mark of Rush Lake. However, the chosen design of the elevated deck is by personal preference and is not necessarily a reasonable deviation from the zoning ordinance. An elevated deck has a visual, aesthetic, and privacy impact such that the township adopted a zoning text amendment in 2016 to address these concerns. A substantial property right is not preserved based on granting a variance for a particular architectural design. The enclosed sunroom addition and the elevated deck on the rear of the dwelling are personal preferences of the applicant and are the factors that necessitate the variance request. These appurtenances are not necessary to develop or use the site for single-family residential purposes, as evidenced by its existing use for single family home. The proposed sunroom will have minimal impact to the public welfare and will not be materially injurious to the property nor other surrounding properties. The elevated deck on the rear of the dwelling could potentially be detrimental to the property or improvements in the zone in which the property is located. The setback from the OHM is intended to provide an open vista along waterfront properties and protect off-site views of the water. The reduced OHM setback and the elevated deck, taken together, could negatively impact adjacent properties. The subject site is a waterfront lot on Rush Lake. Parcels in this area are primarily residential and zoned in the waterfront residential district. The master plan recommends setback standards be preserved on waterfront lots. Given the short distance between the existing house and unimproved platted road right of way, there is a special condition of the property that is not of so general or recurrent a nature to grant the sunroom addition variance. Hamburg Township adopted a zoning text amendment in 2016 that defined a deck and an elevated deck, with associated standards for each. A deck that is less than 24 inches above grade has a less restrictive setback than an elevated deck more than 24 inches above grade and has no greater impact than a lawn in its natural state, but an elevated deck is visually impactful, particularly with a reduced setback to the OHM, and presents privacy concerns for adjacent properties. The use of the site is single-family residential and the proposed variance would not change the use. Although a sunroom is not the minimum necessary to permit reasonable use of the land, there will be minimal impact to surrounding properties. However, the elevated deck variance is not the minimum necessary to permit reasonable use of the land and should be denied and the deck brought back into compliance.

Discussion was held on the deck that was expanded. Stein explained that the deck was 3 feet wide in the same location. The deck is now eight feet wide. The required setback is 44 feet.

Chairperson Priebe opened the hearing to the public. Hearing no response, the call was closed.

Member Auxier stated that he feels that the sunroom is acceptable with little to no impact. The lot does have some difficulties. He further discussed the deck and its relation to the water. Member Negri stated that he does not necessarily have a problem with the sunroom, but he does have a problem with the deck. It was already into the setback, and he is not inclined to approve an expansion of that for the reasons mentioned in the report. Member Rill concurred.

Chairperson Priebe stated that it is a unique site. She does not have a problem with the sunroom, but the deck is an issue.

Motion by Negri, supported by Watson

To approve variance application ZBA 20-0022 at parcel 15-17-402-126 to allow for the construction of a 13-foot by 13-foot enclosed sunroom. The sunroom will have a 19-foot south front yard setback (25-foot front yard setback required, Section 7.6.1.), and a 41-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark of Rush Lake (50-foot setback from the OHM required, Section 7.6.1. fn. 3). The variance does meet standards one through seven of Section 6.5. of the Township Ordinance and a practical difficulty does exist on the subject site when the strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards are applied as discussed at tonight's meeting and as presented in the staff report.

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - Yes
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson - Yes

MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Negri, supported by Rill

To deny variance application ZBA 20-0022 at parcel 15-17-402-126 to permit an elevated deck on the north façade with a 7-foot setback from the OHM (44-foot setback required, Section 8.18.2). The variance does not meet variance standards one, two, three, five, or seven of Section 6.5. of the Township Ordinance and a practical difficulty does not exist on the subject site when the strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards are applied as discussed at tonight's hearing and as presented in the staff report.

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - Yes
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson - Yes

MOTION CARRIED

c) ZBA 2021-0001

Owner: Tom and Kristine Carlson

Location: 11981 Yankee Ln. Pinckney MI 48169

Parcel ID: 15-31-300-011

Request: Variance application to permit the vertical height expansion of a non-conforming second story of an existing dwelling. The expansion will have a 3.1-foot north side yard setback (10-foot side yard setback required, Section 7.6.1).

Amy Steffens, Planning & Zoning Administrator stated that the subject site is a 0.56-acre site that fronts onto Yankee Lane to the west and Base Line Lake to the east. Single-family dwellings are located to the north, south, and west. The site is improved with an existing 1,638-square foot dwelling and a 572-square foot detached garage. If approved, the variance request would permit a vertical height expansion of a non-conforming second story of the existing dwelling. The expansion would have a 3.1-foot north side yard setback where 10-foot setback is required. The plans are somewhat difficult to interpret. She discussed the pitch of the roof and what is being proposed. She stated that they are not adding a second story where one does not exist. Instead, they are proposing a vertical expansion to allow the portion of the existing second story that does not meet building code to be more useful and give them a safer landing and stairs up to the second story. We are not talking about an overall height increase. They are pivoting the exterior wall of the second story.

Steffens discussed the findings of fact stating that according to assessor's records the dwelling was constructed in 1906, 62 years before Hamburg Township first adopted a zoning ordinance. The existing dwelling is non-confirming to the current setback requirement of ten-foot setback from each side yard lot line. Because the dwelling is non-confirming, we have to look at Article 11 which requires variance approval for the change in bulk within the required setback. The proposed vertical extension is to make the second story compliant with building code for headroom. Sheet A-5 of the applicant's construction plans shows the area of existing roof to be removed and the proposed new roof pitch. There is 60 square feet of bulk within the ten-foot setback. Granting this variance request is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity. However, the nominal height increase within the setback could be considered a minor deviation from the ordinance. Again, the overall height of the building is not changing, and they are not proposing to remove any exterior walls. One of the goals of the 2020 master plan is to "Protect, preserve, and enhance whenever possible the unique and desirable natural amenities of Hamburg Township". The Master Plan discusses preserving and maintaining the existing character of parcels along lakes. The required setback regulations are designed to help maintain the character of the area. Again, the dwelling was constructed in 1906 with headroom that does not meet current building code. While the dwelling has been in use with the deficient headroom since 1906, the proposed vertical addition will make the dwelling more compliant and more usable. The overall height of the dwelling will not change. The peak will remain the same height above grade. The site is zoned for single-family dwellings and related appurtenances. The proposed project is a single-family dwelling. Approval of the variance request would not permit the establishment of a use not permitted by right within the district. Staff believes that the nominal amount of square footage proposed in the required setback could be considered an acceptable deviation from the ordinance and thus would be the minimum necessary to permit reasonable use of the land.

Mike Hagen of MBK Constructors discussed the raising of the ceiling heights in the two existing bedrooms. They are also proposing to move the stairway, which currently has no landing and is a hazard. They are not proposing to go any higher than the existing ridge.

Chairperson Priebe opened the hearing to the public. Hearing no response, the call was closed.

Motion by Watson, supported by Auxier

To approve variance application ZBA 21-0001 to permit the vertical height expansion of a non-confirming second story of an existing dwelling. The expansion will have a 3.1-foot north side yard setback (10-foot side yard setback required, Section 7.6.1). The variances do meet variance standards one through seven of Section 6.5 of the Hamburg Township Zoning Ordinance, and a practical difficulty exists on the subject site when strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards is applied, as discussed at the meeting this evening and as presented in this staff report. ZBA members to state specific findings of fact in the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - Yes
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson - Yes

MOTION CARRIED

d) ZBA 2021-0002

Owner: Jeffrey Weiss

Location: Vacant on Baudine Road, Pinckney MI 48169

Parcel ID: 15-17-301-086

Request: Variance application to allow for the construction of a two-story 2,547-square foot dwelling with attached 1,177-square foot garage. The dwelling will have a 35-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark (OHM) of Rush Lake canal (50-foot OHM setback required, Section 7.6.1. fn.4) and a 22-foot west front setback (25-foot front setback required, Section 7.6.1.). An elevated deck on the east façade will have a 29-foot setback from the OHM of the canal (44-foot OHM setback required, Sections 7.6.1.fn 4 and 8.18.2.).

Mr. Jeffrey Weiss, applicant, stated that he appeared before the ZBA for case ZBA 19-0017 on October 9, 2019 for a rear yard setback variance for a front covered porch and a variance for an elevated deck all of which were approved. Since that time, they have added more living space above the garage and appeared before the ZBA November 12, 2020 for the additional 820 square foot living space. ZBA 19-0017 approval did expire so he is here now to request that again. He thought that as long as he applied for the land use permit, it would meet the time frame for the variance. At that time, he was informed that he would have to provide payment for the sewer connection prior to the land use permit. He did not have his loan documents complete at that time. It was suggested by the Zoning Department that he should now apply for all four variances all together. He is simply asking for the same variances that were approved. He and his builder have "tweaked" the floor plan and final details. If approved, they intend to break ground approximately mid-March.

Brittany Stein, Zoning Coordinator, stated that in October 2019, the applicant had similar house plans and the same footprint and design. He then came back to us in October 2020 for the additional living space over the garage. According to our ordinance, the applicant has 12 months to obtain permits and break ground. We did recently change the requirement from 6 months to 12 months. He was given a small grace period to get the permits because of the timing. She stated that the subject site is a 14,402-square foot parcel that fronts onto Baudine Road to the west and a Rush Lake canal to the east. Single-family dwellings are located to the north, south, and east, and the site is currently vacant and unimproved. If approved, the variance request would allow for the construction of a dwelling with an attached 3-car garage with a 22 west front setback, a 35-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark of Rush Lake canal, and a 72-square foot elevated deck on the east façade which will have a 29-foot setback from the OHM of the canal. She stated that a portion of the site lies within the 100-year floodplain and the existing grades of the building envelope are below the base flood elevation. The property owner has submitted an elevation certificate, however since that time, our ordinance has changed to require that mechanical equipment be at least one foot above the base flood elevation and the elevation certificate submitted will need to be revised before we can issue a land use permit. The Township has not yet received the sewer paperwork, easements and payment which will also have to be completed before a permit is issued. Stein reviewed the history of this project. She stated that the property is one-third of an acre and is constrained by the canal to the east and the shallow lot depth. At its deepest, the lot is 111 feet from the front property boundary to the canal and at its shallowest is 88 feet from the front property boundary to the canal. The required 50-foot setback from the OHM and the 25-foot front yard setback leaves a narrow, long building envelope. Given the configuration of the lot and the setback from the OHM, there does appear to be an exceptional circumstance on this lot that is not applicable to other properties in the same district or zone. Therefore, it could be reasonable to consider that the property deserves some relief from the terms of the zoning ordinance. However, the chosen design of the proposed structure, the covered front porch, and the elevated deck, are not necessarily reasonable deviations from the zoning ordinance. The design of the dwelling drives the need for the front yard setback for the covered porch to have a 22-foot setback, where a 25-foot setback is required, and an elevated deck with a 29-foot setback where a 44-foot setback would be required. The porch could be uncovered meeting the definition of a patio, and the home moved forward by five feet, thereby negating the need for the front yard setback and increasing the dwelling's OHM setback to 40 feet rather than the proposed 35 feet. Additionally, the elevated deck on the rear of the dwelling is entirely a personal preference. An elevated deck has a visual, aesthetic, and privacy impact such that the township adopted a zoning text amendment in 2016 to address these concerns. A substantial property right is not preserved based on granting a variance for a particular architectural design. These appurtenances are not necessary to develop or use the site for single-family residential purposes. The elevated deck on the rear of the dwelling could potentially be materially detrimental to the property or improvements in the zone in which the property is located. The setback from the OHM is intended to provide an open vista along waterfront properties and protect off-site views of the water. The reduced OHM setback and the elevated deck, taken together, could negatively impact adjacent properties. The subject site is a waterfront lot on Rush Lake in the Watson's Rush Lake Subdivision #1. Parcels in this area are primarily residential and zoned in the waterfront residential district. The proposed project would not adversely affect the objectives of the Master plan. Hamburg Township adopted a zoning text amendment in 2016 that defined a deck and an elevated deck, with associated standards for each. A deck that is less than 24 inches above grade has a less restrictive setback and has no greater impact than a lawn in its natural state but an elevated deck is visually impactful. There is no condition or situation of the subject site that is not of so general or recurrent a nature that the front porch should be covered or the elevated deck constructed on the rear of the dwelling. The site is zoned for single-family residential and the proposed variance would not permit the establishment of a use not permitted by right within the district. As stated, the property

is constrained by size and OHM setbacks, and it could be reasonable to grant a deviation from the zoning ordinance. However, the covered porch and the elevated deck are not the minimum necessary to permit reasonable use of the land. She is recommending denial of the variances for the covered porch and elevated deck.

Mr. Weiss discussed the suggestion to move the home toward the road. He stated that he cannot go any further without going into that setback. Stein stated that proposed is a 15 foot setback for the garage, which is the minimum. Any living space must be 25 feet including anything covered or attached to the house. She is suggesting that the covering of the front porch be removed and move the house 5 feet closer to the road. That would reduce the setback request at the water. The garage would not move, but just the living space.

Member Auxier stated that we have now seen this proposal several times, and his position remains the same. It is a nice lot with practical difficulty because of the depth. He feels that they layout is appropriate, the covered porch has no impact and the garage will block the covered porch. The proposed deck is relatively small with no impact to the neighborhood. He would again support the request.

Chairperson Priebe stated that nothing could be built on this site without some kind of variance.

Chairperson Priebe opened the hearing to the public. Hearing no response, the call was closed.

Motion by Rill, supported by Auxier

To approve variance application ZBA 21-0002 at parcel 15-17-301-086 to allow for the construction of a two-story 2,547-square foot dwelling with attached 1,177-square foot garage. The dwelling will have a 35-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark (OHM) of Rush Lake canal (50-foot OHM setback required, Section 7.6.1. fn.4) and a 22-foot west front setback (25-foot front setback required, Section 7.6.1.). An elevated deck on the east façade will have a 29-foot setback from the OHM of the canal (44-foot OHM setback required, Sections 7.6.1.fn 4 and 8.18.2.). The variance does meet standards one through seven of Section 6.5 of the Township Ordinance and a practical difficulty does exist on the subject site when the strict compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards are applied as discussed at tonight's meeting and as presented in the staff report.

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - No
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson – Yes

MOTION CARRIED

New/Old business:

a) Approval of January 13, 2021 minutes

Motion by Auxier, supported by Rill

To approve the minutes of the January 13, 2021 meeting as written

Roll Call Vote: Auxier - Yes
Negri - Yes
Priebe - Yes
Rill - Yes
Watson – Yes

MOTION CARRIED

Steffens reminded the Board that the annual joint meeting will be on February 24, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. They are finalizing their staff reports and zoning text amendments for 2021. She further stated that everyone should have

received an email with a link to free training provided by MSU Extension on Code of Conduct on February 25th at 11:00 a.m. There will also be a link to watch the recording afterwards if you are not able to join. She further discussed education provided by MSU Extension.

Discussion was held on the joint meeting being a virtual meeting. Steffens discussed the need to hold this meeting because of the number of projects that need to be completed throughout the year.

Discussion was held on the ZBA hearing cases after a structure has been built. Steffens discussed the right of a property owner to request a variance. She further discussed appealing a decision of the ZBA. Further discussion was held on code enforcement of structures being built without permit. Discussion was held on fines for these issues.

8. Adjournment:

Motion by Rill, supported by Negri

To adjourn the meeting

Voice vote: Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Julie Durkin, Recording Secretary

The minutes were approved as presented/corrected: 5-9-21


Chairperson Priebe