

**GERRISH TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
August 6, 2007**

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: List attached.

MINUTES: Minutes of July 23, 2007, were read and approved.

NEW BUSINESS: **APPEAL NUMBER 07.09:** Mr. Brand wishes to add to a non-conforming cottage and the lot front width is deficient by 15 feet, Gerrish Township Zoning Ordinances, Sections 6.2 and 5.3(A).

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

Correspondence:	Spence Family Trust (James A. Spence, III, Nancy Spence Kraus and Lynn Spence Sullivan)	Opposed
	David Kessell	Opposed
	Tony Barnard	In favor of
	Morley, Gudritz, Zachman Cottage Trust (John Morley) asked for	Negotiation

Discussion: Mr. Brand explained that he wishes to preserve the original cottage but would like to modernize without altering the front. He explained that the septic system near the Spence property needed access and was assured that there would be access space. He commented that there was a large yard with a shared driveway and parking area. Mr. Brand stated he tried to come up with a plan to meet all required setbacks except the lot width requirement.

CASE explained that when all setbacks are in conformance with the Ordinances, the Board policy has been to grant the variance. Board Members questioned the placement of buildings on adjoining property. There was a brief discussion about emergency access; CASE explained that it would have to be addressed by the Fire/EMS Department.

Mr. Brand explained that some trees would be removed and presented a photograph with a stump that will be removed giving clear access to all buildings.

CASE questioned whether the Association was consulted. Mr. Junod stated that Cottage Grove Association did not make any comments.

CASE asked for comments by those in attendance. Kris Smith had several objections; one being that the Brand Cottage has no driveway and shares the Spence driveway. CASE explained that there is not an Ordinance about driveways and parties must decide among themselves. Mr. Smith said that the Brand addition would block the path of residence to the

dining hall.

Motion by COOKE. Supported by NEWTON. Grant the variance as requested with the building meeting all Township Ordinances.

Reason: Lot width is not a self imposed hardship and cannot be changed.

Vote:

Swenson: Yes

Newton: Yes

Case: Yes

Cooke: Yes

Soltman: Yes

5-yes/0-no Variance granted.

NEW BUSINESS: **APPEAL NUMBER 07.10:** Mr. Barber representing Mr. Holland explained that NE and NW corners of the dwelling would be added on to enlarging the bedrooms and adding a bath.

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

Correspondence:	Josephine Strobel	In favor of
	Thomas Harvey	In favor of
	Lakeside Association (Carol Morley Beck)	In favor of
	Henry Holland	In favor of
	Constance Harvey	In favor of

Discussion: Septic and dry wells were installed in 1996. The two inch well will be removed and capped and a new 4 inch well will be installed. The only problem is the lot width.

YASKE stated that he reviewed the site plans and all are in conformance with the Ordinances.

Motion by NEWTON. Supported by SWENSON. The variance be granted as presented.

Reason: Lot size is not a self imposed hardship.

Vote:

Swenson: Yes

Newton: Yes

Case: Yes

Cooke: Yes

Soltman: Yes

5-yes/0-no Variance granted.

NEW BUSINESS: **APPEAL NUMBER 07.11:** Mr. Hooks wishes to verify that Lot 17 Daytona on the Lake would be buildable before he purchases it. The lot size is deficient by 1,636 square feet and deficient setback is proposed, Section 6.2(C) and 6.4(B).

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

Correspondence:	Harry Reinhold Peter and Cheryl Daellenbach	In favor of Questioning setbacks
-----------------	--	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Mr. Hooks has two (2) building plans to consider. YASKE stated front yard setback variance is not necessary. The minimum 30' setback can be met.

CASE questioned having the driveway on W. Higgins Lake Drive. The driveway would be more practical to have on Ethel Drive.

NEWTON questioned whether the decks were considered in the lot coverage. Mr. Hooks stated that there would be no decks.

Mr. Hooks had a land use evaluation which he will bring a copy to YASKE. YASKE stated that it is preferred to have a specific plan submitted. After brief discussion of aesthetics of the neighborhood, the Board Members said both plans would be acceptable.

Motion by MOTION. Supported by NEWTON. The variance be approved for either one of the house plans submitted with the condition that the driveway must access from Ethel Drive and an approved land use evaluation from the health department be submitted. The front yard deficiency is not needed or approved.

Reason: Lot size is not a self imposed hardship and cannot be changed.

Vote:

Swenson:	Yes
Newton:	Yes
Case:	Yes
Cooke:	Yes
Soltman:	Yes

5-yes/0-no Variance granted with conditions.

APPEAL 07.07: Discussion: Mr. Dombrowski does not want to add onto his existing dwelling but now wishes construct a new roof over the back portion. It was left up to YASKE to make a decision.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Maggie Soltman, Secretary.