

**GERRISH TOWNSHIP  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
February 12, 2007**

Meeting called to order by Chairperson, Bill Case, at 10:30 a.m. Tape recorder was activated and notice given.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Swenson, Terry Newton, Bill Case and Maggie Soltman.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Stan Cooke.

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. Batchelor, appellant, Bud Mann and Bob Yaske.

MINUTES: Minutes of Appeal 06.16, November 13, 2006, were reviewed and approved.

NEW BUSINESS: **APPEAL NUMBER 01.07:** Mr. Batchelor wishes to remove the present dwelling and build a new home on a lot deficient in size by 3,628 square feet; deficient in width by 15 feet, Ordinance 6.2 and 6.1(C); and garage setback deficient by 5 feet, Ordinance 6.4B.

YASKE'S letter of denial was read into the minutes by SWENSON.

CORRESPONDENCE:       Opposed:       Mr. and Mrs. Jack Emerson  
                                  In favor of:    Ms. Carolyn J. Smith

Discussion: Mr. Batchelor explained that he wishes to have the new dwelling as his year round home. After consulting with Mr. Yaske and Mr. Mann, Mr. Batchelor came up with the best plan that would be closest to the required ordinances. The home has been in the family since the 1950s and the size was not a problem at the time. Mr. Batchelor needs the garage for storage.

Mr. Batchelor consulted with neighbors and all seemed in favor of his proposed plans. He noted that several other structures are 19 feet or less from the road. Mr. Batchelor can not go to the South side because it would require a grade change which could adversely affect the neighbors' home by flooding her crawl space. The building could not be moved toward the lake because it would not be within the required sight line of adjoining properties.

CASE commented that depth and width are out of compliance, but at the time of purchase there were no ordinances. As you look through the area, many are do not meet the road setback.

SOLTMAN commented on address not readily visible.

Motion by NEWTON. Supported by SWENSON. That the Batchelor variance be approved as presented with the stipulation that the shed be removed.

Reason: Lot size is not a self imposed hardship and the setback variance is granted because of the unique terrain and lot depth.

Vote:

Swenson:	Yes	Newton:	Yes	
Case:	Yes	Soltman:	Yes	4-yes/0-no 1 absent. Variance granted.

Mr. Yaske commented on another appeal by the Bond family and its details. The proposed lot coverage is 24.8% with the shed being removed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m. Respectfully submitted by Maggie Soltman, Secretary.