

# Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting <br> March 14, 2024-7:00PM <br> 102 Butler St, Saugatuck, MI <br> In person meeting 

## 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

## 2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes:
A. January 11, 2024 Regular Meeting Pg. 2
4. Public Comments
5. Unfinished Business: None
6. New Business:
A. 184 Park - Setback Variance Pg. 7

## 7. Communications:

8. ZBA Member Comments
9. Public Comments

## 10.Adjourn (Voice Vote)

## Public Hearing Procedure

A. Hearing is called to order by the Chair
B. Summary by the Zoning Administrator
C. Presentation by the Applicant
D. Public comment regarding the application

- Participants shall identify themselves by name and address
- Comments/Questions shall be addressed to the Chair
- Comments/Questions shall be limited to five minutes

1. Supporting comments (audience and letters)
2. Opposing comments (audience and letters)
3. General comments (audience and letters)
4. Repeat comment opportunity (Supporting, Opposing, General)
E. Public comment portion closed by the Chair
F. Commission Deliberation
G. Commission Action


# Saugatuck Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting - Proposed January 11, 2024, Minutes 

The Saugatuck Zoning Board of Appeals Met in regular session at 7:00 p.m. City Hall, 102 Butler Street, Saugatuck, Michigan.

1. Call to Order by Vice Chairman Bouck at 7:00 p.m.

Attendance:
Present: Vice Chairman Bouck, Board Members Barna, Crawford, \& McPolin.
Absent: Chairman Kubasiak, Board member Bont.
Others Present: Deputy Clerk Sara Williams, City Attorney Jacob Witte, and Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Cummins.
2. Agenda Changes/Approval of Agenda: Approved.

Motion by Barna, second by McPolin to approve the agenda for January 11, 2024, meeting as presented. Upon voice vote, motion carried 4-0.
3. Approval of Minutes: Approved as amended.

Motion by Bouck, second by McPolin, to approve the minutes from November 9, 2023, as amended - Meeting was called to order by Kubasiak. Upon voice vote, motion carried 4-0.
4. Public Comments: None.
5. Unfinished Business: None.

## 6. New Business:

A. Election of Officers.

Motion by McPolin, second by Barna to nominate Chairman Kubasiak to remain the Chair for the Zoning Board of Appeals for the 2024 calendar year. Upon roll call vote, motion carried 4-0.

Motion by Crawford, second by McPolin to nominate Board Member Bouck as ViceChairman for the Zoning Board of Appeals for the 2024 calendar year. Upon roll call vote, motion carried 4-0.

1. The Public Hearing was called to order by the Chair at 7:04 p.m.
2. Summary by Director of Planning, Zoning \& Project Management Ryan Cummins.

The applicant requests a variance to construct a new two-story detached garage at 145 Grant Street with 676 square feet of lot coverage. The variance request relates to the total lot coverage requirement noted in Section 154.026(D) of the Zoning Ordinance:

| Lot Coverage | Requirement | Requested | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum for all buildings | $30 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

The property is located in the R-1 Community Residential District (R-1 CR). The corner lot is 54 feet wide along Grant Street and 157 deep along Elizabeth Street ( 8,497 square feet in area). The lot does not conform to the minimum lot area requirement ( 8,712 square feet) and the minimum lot width requirement ( 66 feet). The ZBA previously denied variances related to the proposed detached garage in November but approved variances for the renovation and expansion of the principal dwelling.

While the property is a corner lot, Elizabeth Street, abutting the property, has a dirt/gravel surface, which eventually ends before the right-of-way reaches Simonson Street. There is no further development potential along Elizabeth Street, as the parcel across the street narrows considerably to its south boundary, and the rest of the property to the east is City-owned. Due to its nonconforming nature and location along terminating street, the lot is somewhat unique. However, the ZBA must determine if the lot is unique in relation to the lot coverage requirement.

## 3. Presentation by the Applicant: Jim Smitt

4. Public comment regarding the application:
a. Supporting comments: None.
b. Opposing comments (audience and letters):

- Mark \& Deidre Levine (1005 Elizabeth) - Opposed to project.
c. General comments (audience and letters): None.
d. Repeat comment opportunity (Supporting, Opposing, General): None.

5. Public comment portion closed by the Chair at 7:17 p.m.
6. Commission deliberation:

The board went into deliberation, and they discussed the applicants request for a variance to construct a new two-story detached garage at 145 Grant Street with 676
square feet of lot coverage. The variance request relates to the total lot coverage requirement noted in Section 154.026(D) of the Zoning Ordinance.

## ZBA Findings of Fact: Note: Applicant must show practical difficulty by demonstrating that all four standards are met.

Standard 1: "That strict compliance with area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome." § 154.155(B)(1). Barna, Bouck, Crawford, \& McPolin found this standard has NOT been met because:

While the shape and orientation of the lot do not impact the ability to comply with lot coverage, the lot is approximately 215 square feet less than the minimum lot size for the zoning district. The previous request for a three-stall detached garage was considered excessive for a lot of this size, especially considering the proposed increase in the size of the principal dwelling.

The owner would need to reduce the size of the proposed garage footprint by 301 square feet for a total of 375 square feet to comply with the ordinance, which would not adequately accommodate two vehicles. It could be argued that preventing a detached two-car garage on a lot that is only slightly smaller than a conforming lot could be unreasonable. However, one could counter that the applicant previously proposed an attached garage space on the principal dwelling. Hence, the inside storage of two vehicles in a compliant manner is possible with different variations of attached or detached garage space.

Commission member Crawford said that the owner previously proposed and has been accepted for attached garage space in the principal dwelling. Thus, he could build an accessory building garage with, for example, one car that would still give him the two cars without needing a relaxation. He believes that his requirements for a garage could be met within the allotted space without a relaxation.

Vice-Chair Bouck stated that the standard is not met because the applicant is not unreasonably prevented from using the property for a permitted purpose and that conformity is not unnecessarily burdensome.

Standard 2: "That a variance would do substantial justice to the owner as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation would give substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others." § 154.155(B)(2). Barna, Bouck, Crawford, \& McPolin found this standard has NOT been met because:

Relaxation of the lot coverage for additional garage space may give the owner rights unavailable to owners of similar-sized lots. However, the request is not particularly excessive, as four percent of the lot is just over 300 square feet.

Standard 3: "That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances of the property and not to general neighborhood conditions." § 154.155(B)(3). Barna, Bouck, Crawford, \& McPolin found this standard has NOT been met because:

The shape and orientation of the lot are unique, but these factors do not directly relate to the lot coverage requirement. The lot is 215 square feet less than required by the district, and while not the smallest lot in the area, the size falls on the smaller end of the range compared to neighboring properties.

Vice-Chair Bouck said that it is a smaller lot, but it is not unique or due to general neighborhood conditions. He doesn't see that the plight of the owner is due to the unique circumstances of this property. They are not so unique as to make this unnecessarily burdensome. The standard has not been satisfied.

McPolin added that she agrees due the plight of the owner is not due to the circumstances of the property so much as a desire to have a larger garage.

Standard 4: "That the problem is not self-created or based on personal financial circumstances." § 154.155(B)(4). Barna, Bouck, Crawford, \& McPolin found this standard has NOT been met because:

One could argue that the size of the proposed principal dwelling and attached garage space has limited the ability of the owner to construct a detached garage with 676 square feet of coverage and that various compliance scenarios could have been presented. However, the ZBA may wish to consider the redevelopment and renovation project on a nonconforming lot, which may present challenges beyond what would be created by the development of a vacant lot.

Vice-Chair Bouck said that it is self-created, but it is not based on personal financial circumstances.

Motion by Crawford, second by McPolin to deny a variance to increase the maximum lot coverage from 30 percent to 34 percent for the construction of a two-story detached garage with 676 square feet of ground floor space base on the following findings: Standards 1, 2, 3, \& 4 have not been met. Motion was amended to include reasons stated in the staff report, in the packet, and in deliberations. Upon roll call vote, motion carried 4-0.

## C. 2023 ZBA Activity Report.

Motion by McPolin, second by Barna to approve the 2023 Zoning Board of Appeals cases as presented. Upon voice vote, motion carried 4-0.
7. Communications: None.

## 8. ZBA Comments: None.

9. Public Comments: None.
10. Adjournment.

Motion by Crawford, second by McPolin to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 pm by Vice-Chair Bouck.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sara Williams
City Deputy Clerk

BACKGROUND REPORT
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MARCH 14, 2024
184 PARK STREET 03-57-009-073-10

## SCHIPPER CONSTRUCTION/PATRICIA GALIEN

REQUEST: The applicant requests a dimensional variance to construct a new dwelling at 184 Park Street. The variance requires a reduced front setback of 15 feet instead of the minimum 25foot setback from the Vine Street right-of-way, a reduction of 10 feet.

The request relates to Section 154.036 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance, and the purpose of this report is to provide a review of the application and standards of approval.

BACKGROUND: The property is located in the Peninsula West R-1 zoning district. The corner lot is approximately 100 feet wide and 294 feet deep, and the property is just over one-half ( $1 / 2$ ) acre in size. The property is narrower toward the Park Street frontage due to a jog in the south side property line.

The ZBA previously granted variances for 15-foot setbacks in 2016, 2018, 2021, and 2023. While the first three have expired, the current plan has changed enough so that the 2023 variance no longer applies to the proposed building configuration.

The new proposed home placement is now parallel to Vine Street rather than diagonally, as proposed in 2023. In this scenario, a more significant portion of the home falls within 15 feet of the right-of-way instead of a corner of the home. As such, a request for a 15 -foot setback with this proposed building footprint is more significant than the previous request.

Concerning the plans, it should be noted that the submittal again incorrectly applies a 25 -foot setback to the southeast of the proposed dwelling. Although there is a jog in the south property boundary, it does not result in a 25 -foot front setback anywhere that does not abut road right-ofway. A 25 -foot front setback will only apply along the road rights-of-way (Park and Vine), and a 25 -foot rear setback will apply from the western rear property line. The entire southern boundary is subject to a 10 -foot side setback.

While the setback from the KLSWA property is 10 feet (and not 25 feet), the applicant desires to be as far away as possible from this parcel to reduce the pump station's impact on the residence.

While an uncovered deck is shown to the north of the building with 10 feet of separation from the right-of-way, no additional details have been provided, and no variance was requested for this building element. The uncovered deck and/or stairs must comply with all zoning requirements.

ZBA AUTHORITY: According to Section 154.155 (A), where there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of this chapter, the Board of Appeals may, in passing on appeals, vary or modify any of the rules or provisions of the Zoning Ordinance relating to the construction, or structural changes in, equipment, or alteration of buildings or structures, or the use of land, buildings or structures, so that the intent of the ordinance is observed, public safety secured, and substantial justice done. Variances should only be approved in limited cases with unique circumstances and extraordinary conditions.

DIMENSIONAL VARIANCE: Section 154.155 (B) provides the standards that must be met in order for the Board to grant a dimensional (non-use) variance:

1. That strict compliance with area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome.

Comment: The footprint of the home is 1,208 square feet, which is reasonable for a half $(1 / 2)$ acre lot. It should be noted that the footprint is the same as requested in 2023.

Although there is room to shift the home to the southeast and comply with the 10 -foot south side setback and Vine Street front setback, the location would be very close to a barbed wire fence and a city pump station. The applicant has also noted concern about the visual and audible impacts of the pump station after inspecting the staked location of the previously approved location in relation to the KLSWA land.

Because of the proximity to the city pump station and the limitations of steeper slopes on the site, requiring a compliant home could be considered unreasonably burdensome.
2. That a variance would do substantial justice to the owner as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation would give substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others.

Comment: As mentioned earlier, the variance request is more significant than approved in 2023 based on the proposed building placement. Although 15 -foot setbacks have been approved on multiple occasions, more of the building is located up to 15 feet from the right-of-way than previously approved.

Although lesser relaxation would allow a home to be built, the ZBA must consider the impact of the proposed home site against nearby property owners and the impact of being closer to
the KLSWA site. However, the request appears moderate and is enough to construct a reasonable-sized home on the property. As such, a variance may give substantial relief to the applicant and allow for justice for neighboring property owners.
3. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances of the property and not to general neighborhood conditions.

Comment: The ZBA has recognized unique and exceptional circumstances on multiple occasions. The site is unique based on a combination of factors: the corner lot requires two (2) front setbacks; the buildable area is constricted by steeper slopes to the southwest and northeast of the site; a pump station and barbed wire fence exist to the southeast; and the southern boundary of the lot jogs inward for a narrower width for approximately one-third $(1 / 3)$ of the site. These characteristics are not general neighborhood conditions, so this standard is met.
4. That the problem is not self-created or based on personal financial circumstances.

Comment: One could argue that the problem is self-created as a variance was already approved in 2023, and plans have now changed for a more significant request. However, the unique circumstances of the land and the lot have stayed the same. The overall problems related to the site are not self-created, and the owner is seeking the most reasonable way to design the placement of a new home. Additionally, the variance request has no relationship to the project cost.

FINDINGS OF FACT: Please note that any motion supporting or against the variance requests must specifically reference the ZBA's findings concerning all applicable standards. The ZBA must provide its own findings on why the request meets or does not meet the applicable standards.

The comments in this report may be used as a basis for the ZBA's positive findings and referenced in their entirety. Regardless of the decision, the minutes and written record of the decision must document the ZBA's findings and conclusions. As such, it is essential for findings to be read aloud or referenced from this report during the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: Pursuant to Section 154.155 (B), if the applicant is not able to meet all the required standards noted above, the Board must deny the request. If the Board finds that the practical difficulty is not unique but common to several properties in the area, the finding shall be transmitted by the Board to the Planning Commission, who will determine whether to initiate an amendment to the Zoning Code, per Section 154.156 (C).

Based on a strict review of the city's variance standards, the requested variance appears to be justified, and compliance with the 25 -foot front setback could be considered unnecessarily burdensome.

## Possible motion:

I move to approve a variance to reduce the northern front setback from the Vine Street right-ofway from 25 feet to 15 feet for the construction of a new dwelling at 184 Park Street based on the positive findings documented in the staff memo provided to the ZBA for its March 14, 2024 meeting, as well as the following:
1.
2. $\qquad$ .
3. $\qquad$ .
4. $\qquad$ .

This approval is contingent upon the construction of the dwelling being in substantial conformance with the location, design, and size as proposed and included in the 2024 ZBA variance applicant materials.

## Zoning Board of Appeals Application

## LOCATION INFORMATION

## APPLICATION NUMBER

Parcel Number 50-009-073-10

APPLICANTS INFORMATION
 Interest In Project Contractor
Signature


E-Mail Kevin@schippersconstruction.com
Date 2/2/2024

## OWNERS INFORMATION (IF DIFFERENT FROM APPLICANTS)

Name Patrica Galien
Address / PO Box

## 226 N Clinton st, Apt 620

City Chicago
E-Mail
PGalien@hotmail.com
hereby authorize that the applicant as listed above is authorized to make this application for proposed work as my agent and we agree to conform to all applicable laws and regulations of the City of Saugatuck. I additionally grant City of Saugatuck staff or authorized representatives thereof access to the property to inspect conditions, before, during, and after the proposed work is completed or to gather further information related to this request.

Signature $\qquad$ Date 2/2/2024

CONTRACTORS/ DEVELOPERS INFORMATION (UNLESS PROPOSED WORK IS TO BE DONE BY THE PROPERTY OWNER)
Name Schippers Construction Contact Name Kevin Roelofs
Address / PO Box 850 Maple ave City Holland
State MI Zip 49423 Phone 616-836-9277 Fax
E-Mail Kevin@schippersconstruction.com
License Number 2102201491
Expiration Date 5/27

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Depth ${ }^{255^{\prime}}$ Width 77' Size $\qquad$ Current Use $\qquad$
Check all that apply: Waterfront $\qquad$ Historic District $\qquad$ Dunes Vacant X
Application Type: Interpretation $\qquad$ Dimensional Variance X Use Variance $\qquad$

## REQUESTED VARIANCE AND DESCRIPTION (ATTACH MORE SHEETS IF NECESSARY)

Zoning Requirement 25' setback Proposed Variance 15 ' setback
Zoning Requirement $\qquad$ Proposed variance $\qquad$
Zoning Requirement $\qquad$ Proposed Variance $\qquad$

[^0]A site plan and survey showing the followng information shall be submitted with the coverpage of this application and other required information as outlined below. (Please note that not all will apply for minor waterfront construction)

## Y N NA



Dimensions of property of the total site area,
$\square \square \square$ Contours at 2-foot intervals


Locations of all buildings


Other structures on adjacent properties within 100 feet of the property, including those located across the street from the property

## $\square \square \square$ <br> Parking areas

$\square \square \square$ Driveways


Required and proposed building setbacks
Location of abutting streets and proposed alignment of streets, drives and easements serving the development, including existing rights-of-way and pavement widths;


Location, screening, dimensions and heights of proposed buildings and structures, such as trash receptacles, utility pads and the like, including accessory buildings and uses, and the intended uses thereof. Rooftop or outdoor appurtenances should also be indicated, including proposed methods of screening the equipment, where appropriate;
$\square \square \quad$ Location and dimensions of parking areas, including computations of parking requirements, typical parking space dimensions, including handicapped spaces, and aisle widths;
$\square \square \square$ Proposed water supply and wastewater systems locations and sizes;


Proposed finished grades and site drainage patterns, including necessary drainage structure. Where applicable, indicate the location and elevation of the 100-year floodplain;


Proposed common open spaces and recreational facilities, if applicable;


Proposed landscaping, including quantity, size at planting and botanical and common names of plant materials;
$\square \square \square$ Signs, including type, locations and sizes;


Location and dimensions of all access drives, including driveway dimensions, pavement markings, traffic-control signs or devices, and service drives;
$\square \square \square$ Exterior lighting showing area of illumination and indicating the type of fixture to be used.


Elevations of proposed buildings drawn to an appropriate scale shall include:

1. Front, side and rear views;
2. Heights at street level, basement floor level, top of main floor, top of building, and if applicable, height above water level; and
3. Exterior materials and colors to be used.
$\square \square \square$ Location, if any, of any views from public places to public places across the property;
$\square \square \square$ Location, height and type of fencing; and

## Zoning Board of Appeals Application

## LOCATION INFORMATION

APPLICATION NUMBER

Parcel Number 50-009-073-10

## APPLICANTS INFORMATION

Name Schippers Construction
$\qquad$ Address / PO Box 850 maple ave Interest In Project Contractor State MI Zip $49423 \quad$ Phone 616-298-4360 E-Mail Kevin@schippersconstruction.com Signature $\qquad$ Date 2/2/2024

## OWNERS INFORMATION (IF DIFFERENT FROM APPLICANTS)



I hereby authorize that the applicant as listed above is authorized to make this application for proposed work as my agent and we agree to conform to all applicable laws and regulations of the City of Saugatuck. I additionally grant City of Saugatuck staff or authorized representatives thereof access to the property to inspect conditions, before, during, and after the proposed work is completed or to gather further information related to this request.

Signature $\qquad$ Date 2/2/2024

CONTRACTORS/ DEVELOPERS INFORMATION (UNLESS PROPOSED WORK IS TO BE DONE BY THE PROPERTY OWNER)
Name Schippers Construction Contact Name Kevin Roelofs
Address / PO Box 850 Maple ave City Holland
State MI_ Zip $49423 \quad$ Phone 616-836-9277 Fax
E-Mail Kevin@schippersconstruction.com
License Number 2102201491
Expiration Date 5/27

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Depth ${ }^{255^{\prime}}$ Width $77^{\prime}$ Size $\qquad$ Current Use $\qquad$
Check all that apply: Waterfront $\qquad$ Historic District $\qquad$ Dunes Vacant $X$
Application Type: Interpretation $\qquad$ Dimensional Variance X Use Variance $\qquad$

## REQUESTED VARIANCE AND DESCRIPTION (ATTACH MORE SHEETS IF NECESSARY)

Zoning Requirement 25' setback Proposed Variance 15 ' setback
Zoning Requirement $\qquad$ Proposed variance
Zoning Requirement $\qquad$ Proposed Variance

[^1]$\qquad$ $-$ $-$

[^2]A site plan and survey showing the followng information shall be submitted with the coverpage of this application and other required information as outlined below. (Please note that not all will apply for minor waterfront construction)

Dimensions of property of the total site area,
Contours at 2-foot intervals
Locations of all buildings
Other structures on adjacent properties within 100 feet of the property, including those located across the street from the property
Parking areas
Driveways
Required and proposed building setbacks
Location of abutting streets and proposed alignment of streets, drives and easements serving the development, including existing rights-of-way and pavement widths;
Location, screening, dimensions and heights of proposed buildings and structures, such as
trash receptacles, utility pads and the like, including accessory buildings and uses, and the
intended uses thereof. Rooftop or outdoor appurtenances should also be indicated, including
proposed methods of screening the equipment, where appropriate;

X $\square \square$ Location and dimensions of parking areas, including computations of parking requirements,
X $\square \square$ Proposed water supply and wastewater systems locations and sizes;
Proposed finished grades and site drainage patterns, including necessary drainage structure. Where applicable, indicate the location and elevation of the 100-year floodplain;
Proposed common open spaces and recreational facilities, if applicable;
Proposed landscaping, including quantity, size at planting and botanical and common names of plant materials;
$\square \square$ Signs, including type, locations and sizes;
Location and dimensions of all access drives, including driveway dimensions, pavement markings, traffic-control signs or devices, and service drives;
$\square \searrow \square$ Exterior lighting showing area of illumination and indicating the type of fixture to be used.
Elevations of proposed buildings drawn to an appropriate scale shall include:

1. Front, side and rear views;
2. Heights at street level, basement floor level, top of main floor, top of building, and if applicable, height above water level; and
3. Exterior materials and colors to be used.

Location, if any, of any views from public places to public places across the property;
Location, height and type of fencing; and
$\qquad$ The name and address of the person and firm who drafted the plan, the seal of the professional responsible for the accuracy of the plan (licensed in the state) and the date on which the plan was prepareu.
ㄴ X Other information as requested bv the Zoning Administrator

## Dimensional Variance Request Standards per Section 154.155(B)

Please respond to each of the following questions. As part of your request to obtain a dimensional or nonwe variance, the owner must show a practical difficulty by demonstrating that all of the following standards are met:
(1) Explain how strict compliance with area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonabiy prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or would render coniormity unnecessarily burdensome;
to ta in compliance with the approved setback, it would put the house in line with the public sewer station oun front. This station can be noisy and an eye sore. even with putting up trees to block the noise and view will still cause a issue as we would be building the house
less than $35^{\prime}$ from station. one other worry was the smell off the house deck. that deck was approved only $20^{\prime}$ off the station. we worry this could be a issue it not now but at a late point
(2) Explain how a variance would do substantial justice to the owner as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation would give substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others,

(3) Explain how the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances of the property and not to general neignborhood conditions; and

* Issue with the property is it is located between 2 dunes. leaving the buildable area to a minimum. This house was designed to fit on this lot and was approved by Egle.

चother issue is the sewer station. which is right in the front part of the property limiting the buildable area. this area will need to have trees planted to cover the eyesore of the fence and equipment
(4) Explain how the problem is not self-created or based on personal financial circumstances.

The problem was created due to the layout of the property. being between 2 critical dunes it allows for only a small builiuna ares:
$\qquad$

- $\qquad$

UsE VARIANCE REQUEST STANDARDS PER SECTION 154.155(C)
Please respond to each of the following questions. As part of your request to obtain a use variance, the applicant must show an unnecessary hardship by demonstrating that all of the following standards are met:
(1) Please explain how the property in question cannot be used for any of the uses permitted in the district
in which it is located;
(2) Please explain how the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances of the property and not to general neighborhood conditions;
(3) Please explain how by granting the variance, the essential character of the neighborhood would not be altered; and
(4) Please explain how the problem is not self-created or based on personal financial circumstances.
$\qquad$

OFFICE USE ONLY:


Motion to Approve Deny

Findings of Fact:

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Vote |
| Chair Signature | Vote |
| Member Signature | Vote |
| Member Signature | Vote |
| Member Signature_rote_ | Vote |
| Member Signature |  |
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CUT/FILL VOL CALCULATION
OUTSIDE OF CRTICAL SLOPE: OUTSIDE OF CRITIC
CUT: 96.5 CYDS
FILL: 1010.4 CYOS
NET: 113.9 CYDS FILL

PROFILE
C-C
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## S.E.S.C. LEGEND

 MICHIGAN UNIFIED KEYING SYSTEM|  | neve cranom sos summ | ${ }^{-7}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 551 | s.reme |  |  |

SESC NOTES:
PROPOSED SLIT FENCE SHALL BE INSTALLED AS SHOWN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUFACTURES RECOMMENDATIONS 2. TEMPORARY SOIL STOCKPLLE SHALL BE SURROUNDED BY
FENCE AND PROTECTED FROM EROSION BY WIND $\&$ RAIN.
3. HOME SHALL HAVE GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS I ISTALLED A

THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION. ALL DOWNSPOUTS SHALL BE
DIRECTED TO LANDSCAPE STONE BEDS OR PERFORATED DRAIN
TILES TO PREVENT EROSION FROM ROOF RUNOFF.
THE SITE PLAN HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO DISPOSE OF
STORMWATER RUNOFF WITHOUT SERIOUS SOIL EROSION AND
STORMWATER RUNOFF WITHOUT SERIOUS SOIL EROSION AND
WITHOUT SEDIMENTATION OF ANY STREAM OR OTHER BODY O

(S51)
SILT FENCE

Filter fabric to be placed between topsoil and wall rock

(A1) SEGMENT BLOCK RETAINING WALL


25


[^0]:    :sumo company tiled for 15 setback in June of 2023 which was approved, homeowner dido? understand location of house until lot was clear and staked. House was placed only 35 ' off sewer station which was found to be noisy and in the way of any view out the front.
    :anal 25' setback in June only had one comer of the house up to the setback. we are looking at moving the house back in the lot to get away from the sewer station which would put the north side of the house touching the 15 ' setback

[^1]:    rxsummo company tiled for 15 'setback in June of 2023 which was approved, homeowner didst understand location of house until lot was clear and staked. House was placed only $35^{\prime}$ off sewer station which was found to be noisy and in the way of any view out the front.
    Tuna 23' setback in June only had one comer of the house up to the setback. we are looking at moving the house back in the lot to get away from the sewer station which would put the north side of the house touching the 15 ' setback

[^2]:    Site Plan Requirements (Section 154.061)

