1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 4-10-2023, ZBA Meeting Minutes
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. ZBA BUSINESS
   A. AB-2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr., 09-16-229-039
      The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2
      Article VI, Section 6.04
      1. A 4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 6-ft. for a shed to be 2-ft. from the property
         line to the west.
      Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8)
      2. A 112-sq. ft. variance above the allowed 750-sq. ft. Maximum floor Area of Detached
         Accessory Buildings to construct a 112-sq. ft. shed.
6. PUBLIC COMMENTS
7. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Memo from Planning & Zoning Specialist Regarding MSU Extension Self-Paced Training
8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
9. MEMBER COMMENTS
10. ADJOURNMENT

In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact Penny S. Shults, Clerk, at (248) 391-0304, ext. 4001, at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting to request accommodations.
The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals held a regular meeting on Monday, April 10, 2023, at 7:01 pm at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

ZBA MEMBERS PRESENT:
Dan Durham, Chairman
Mike Flood, BOT Rep to ZBA
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Diane Dunaskiss, Board Member
JoAnn VanTassel, Alternate Board Member

ZBA MEMBERS ABSENT:
Tony Cook, Vice-Chairman

CONSULTANT PRESENT:
David Goodloe, Building Official

OTHERS PRESENT:
Jessica Austin
Shamik Tripami
Phil McPeek
John Callahan
Kinzie Austin
David Lagerquist
Kiel Vanderhovel
Ron Haag
Mario Iazzi
Mo Zaitouna
Dan Cieslak
Marti Fujitz

1. **OPEN MEETING**
Chairman Durham called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **MINUTES**
   A. 03-13-23, ZBA Regular Meeting Minutes

   Board Member Flood moved, seconded by Board Member Walker, to approve the 03-13-23 minutes as presented.

   Motion Carried (5-0)

4. **AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**

   Board Member Dunaskiss moved, seconded by Board Member VanTassel, to approve the agenda as presented.

   Motion Carried (5-0)

5. **ZBA BUSINESS**
   A. AB-2023-02, David Lagerquist, 2377 Cedar Key Drive, 09-21-127-012

   Chairman Durham read the petitioners request as follows:
The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2 Article VI, Section 6.04
1. A 3.5-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for deck stairs to be 6.5-ft. from the property line to the south.
2. A 1% lot coverage variance from the allowed 25% for a total lot coverage of 26%.

Mr. David Lagerquist introduced himself and summarized the variance request. The practical difficulty is based on the design of the forty-year-old home, the placement of the original deck and the steep topography of the property down to the lake. They also have an existing lot coverage variance from the original design and construction of the home and added that the proposed improvements would increase the lot coverage percentage by 0.1%. They are trying to increase the safety and functionality of the existing deck with some new stairs. The Homeowners Association approves of the new design and there will be no further obstruction of views for the surrounding neighbors.

Trustee Flood commented on the excellent presentation of the petitioner. The Fire Marshall has no concerns with this application. He confirmed that there were also three letters in the Board packet. They received one from the neighbor on the north side and on the other side as well; both do not have any issues with the request. They also received a letter from a neighbor across the lake, Barbara Schalk, who does not approve of the request because they do not approve of all of the lakes in the County being overdeveloped. Trustee Flood commented that these negative comments seem to be mixed up because the petitioner is only replacing stairs for his existing deck.

Mr. Lagerquist confirmed that they are increasing the lot coverage with the new design by 0.1%.

Board Member Dunaskiss confirmed through her visit the steep incline of the property. She understands the need to conform to the topography and where the original deck was placed. She also understands the need to be safe and to construct a staircase that is safe.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment on this case.

No public comment was heard.

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Board Member Dunaskiss, that in the Case of AB-2023-02, David Lagerquist, 2377 Cedar Key Drive, 09-21-127-012 date stamped received February 1, 2023 for 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2 Article VI, Section 6.04 including a 3.5-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for deck stairs to be 6.5-ft. from the property line to the south and a 1% lot coverage variance from the allowed 25% for a total lot coverage of 26% be approved because the petitioner did demonstrate the following standards for variances have been met in this case and that they set forth facts that show:

1. The petitioner does demonstrate the following practical difficulty: due to the unique characteristic of this property along the edge of the lake and the condition of the original 40 year old stairs that are deteriorating and the petitioner is wanting to redo the stairs to put a 90 degree angle in order to put a landing so he doesn’t have a 45 degree straight drop to the patio.

2. The petitioner did demonstrate unique or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zone: This is the lake property and the petitioner is curtailed by how far he can put the stairs on. The property is more steeply sloped than the properties to the north or south.

3. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by others in the same zone or vicinity based on the following facts: petitioner has a second story doorwall and must have access out of it. Many of the homes in the area have similar decks and stairs.
4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the fact that it is consistent with what others in the neighborhood have done with their properties and this is property that has existed like this for 40 years.

5. Granting of this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties. Both properties to the north and south of the petitioner have no issue with the variances. Also, the Homeowners Association has approved the request. The variances would not unusually increase congestion on public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, the granting of the variance would increase safety by having the new stairs and the Fire Marshall has no concerns with the request. It is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect, impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

Normally the Board does not grant a variance for a property that already has a variance on it. The existing variance was created by the builder when the home was built 28 years ago. This is not self-created.

Roll call vote was as follows: Dunaskiss, yes; VanTassel, yes; Walker, yes; Flood, yes; Durham, yes. Motion Carried 5-0.

B. AB-2023-04, Paul Smith, 4212 Mill Lake Road, 09-18-426-005

Chairman Durham read the petitioners request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF Article V, Section 5.02 (C)(1)

1. A 63-ft. property line setback variance from the required 70-ft. for an existing private stable to be 7-ft. from the property line to the north.

Mr. John Little, attorney, introduced himself as representing Mr. Paul Smith and he explained the variance request. The impetus for the variance was a complaint received from a neighbor. This property is unique because the entire north side is adjacent to vacant unimproved County property. Without the variance, Mr. Smith will not be able to maintain horses on the property which is what they want to do with the property.

Chairman Durham commented on the need for practical difficulty in each Zoning Board of Appeals case. He asked Mr. Little what the practical difficulty was in this case because it can be moved.

Mr. Little stated that it cannot be moved because it has a cement foundation which was existing in 2021. This was not something that the petitioner built, it was on the property when he purchased it and was not self-created.

Board Member VanTassel asked about the property to the north, 09-17-351-015. She stated that this property is part of Oakland County Orion Oaks Park and gave a brief historical background summary of the property. It has never been developed and she doesn’t think it will ever be developed. She is familiar with Mill Lake Road and provided some historical comments regarding property surrounding this road. The homes immediately south of this subject property have a lot of items in the back yard. The property to the west has a barn and she is not sure if it meets setbacks. She cannot imagine anyone wanting to move horses closer to where they live then where they are right now.

Chairman Durham stated that the problem here is that the previous owner did not use it as a stable and now that it is being used as a stable, it falls under regulations for stables and this makes where it sits too close to the property line.

Building Official Goodloe stated that this structure was built between 2002 and 2005. Prior to this structure being there, it was a significant wetland area. It looks like in 2005, it was some type of stable structure. This
area is considered a wetland and was abated between 2002 and 2005 but he could not find documentation about the abatement.

Chairman Durham asked Building Official Goodloe that the reasoning for moving it away would be because of the wetland immediately behind it.

Building Official Goodloe replied yes. The location of animals might necessitate the testing of the waters to make sure that nothing was getting into the wetland resource.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

Kiel Vanderhovel stated that the previous owners of the subject property were using the building to store lawn equipment. Since the petitioner moved it, the family has been using the building as a stable and put up the fence going around. He expressed concerns regarding the wetlands since the petitioner is not taking care of the fecal matter and he is concerned that it is leeching into the wetlands. His other concern is that he has heard the animals were moved to Georgia.

Chairman Durham asked about the existence of the hay.

Mr. Vanderhovel stated that this hay was moved in by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Kinzie Austin stated that he has lived there since 2013 and the previous owner of the subject property used the structure as a garage. When the Smiths moved in, they modified the building adding stalls and a fence around it. He has had two complaints filed with the Township regarding the manure and the number of horses. He summarized those complaints. He asked the homeowner about the removal of the manure and was told that they never removed the manure and had no plans to so there is now eighteen months’ worth of manure sitting on the property. He is concerned about this so he had water samples pulled from Orion Oaks Park and from his own property so he could get an assessment. The lab results came back as the runoff going into Orion Oaks is 20 times the fecal coliforms for water that is in the surrounding area. This creates a tremendous risk for health and welfare in the area. It attracts flies and is an ordinance violation. The subject property is regularly flooded and is a wetland area. He doesn’t see anywhere on the property that you could build a stable area in which runoff would not be a concern. The raising of these types of animals needs to be done in an area where it is not detrimental to public health and safety. He is requesting that the Zoning Board of Appeals not approve this variance or any building of a stable on this property and that it address the existing complaint that they have regarding the manure.

Chairman Durham stated that the Board is looking tonight at allowing the stable structure to stay where it is. He asked when Mr. Austin collected the water samples.

Mr. Austin replied last week. The horses left in the last week but there are 18 months of manure still on the property.

Ms. Jessica Austin introduced herself and expressed her concerns about the variance request. The two properties that are referenced in the packet are very different from the subject property because they did not have standing water and do not have livestock on them. She offered pictures of the property showing encroachments and previous use of the property and she explained the pictures as she described them. She expressed concern about the manure going into the wetlands. The 70 foot setback is to provide a natural filter before the manure goes into runoff or wetlands and that is not being provided in this case. If we allow this variance, we have eliminated the natural filter. She expressed concern about the contamination of Orion Oaks. This property needs to be rectified because it is contamination.

Chairman Durham stated that there are different issues here. The Board tonight is only dealing with the setback variance request.
Ms. Austin stated that she understands that. But, the 70 foot setback has a purpose in farming and that is to filter the manure before it reaches water and if they eliminate that, they are continuing to allow this type of contamination.

Building Official Goodloe stated that this is built inside a wetland and he would like it permitted. One reason is that the fittings are in the wetland and he considers these to be compromised and it would not be a safe structure. Also, they have a setback for wetlands and looking at the property, this building is located right inside the wetlands. Before the house was built, a large portion of the property was wetland. At some point, they abated the wetland but he does not find anything at the local level.

Mr. Dan Cieslak explained where he lives in Mill Creek Village. He concurred with Mr. Goodloe’s concerns. The variance request should be denied because they failed to provide the burden of truth on it. The petitioner has not hit a substantial burden. He commented on the access to the property and the No Trespassing signs that are posted. The Board does have the ability to deny the variance and stop it from going any further.

Trustee Flood read the ordinance section regarding private stables. He commented on the 63 foot variance requested and the existence of the State land. Financial burden is not a practical difficulty. This property is 300 feet wide and there is plenty of room for 70 feet. The variance being requested is excessive and 90% of the ordinance allowed amount.

Board Member Walker stated that the Board should consider the runoff. He knows they only have one scientific side but they should consider it.

Chairman Durham asked Building Official Goodloe if he has enough to move forward on the complaint through the Township

Building Official Goodloe replied yes. He believes that it was built on wetlands.

Board Member Dunaskiss stated that the primary reason for granting a variance is a demonstrated practical difficulty that is related to the property itself. The structure was designed for storage of equipment and now that the owner wants to use it as a stable, it must follow the ordinance.

Board Member VanTassel asked for verification of the livestock being moved off the property. She asked if Mr. Smith planned to live there.

Mr. Little stated that Mr. Smith’s decision to live there is predicated on what they can use the property for. There was a complaint and they knew they couldn’t keep the animals on the subject property so they bought another property and moved the animals. They have not listed the subject property for sale.

Board Member Walker moved, seconded by Trustee Flood, that in the matter of ZBA Case #AB-2023-04, Paul Smith, 4212 Mill Lake Road, 09-18-426-005 for 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF Article V, Section 5.02 (C) for a 63-ft. property line setback variance from the required 70-ft. for an existing private stable to be 7-ft. from the property line to the north be denied for plans date stamped March 8, 2023 because the petitioner did not demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met:

1. The petitioner does not show practical difficulty. Due to the uniqueness of this particular property not related to the general conditions in the area.

2. The granting of the variance or modification will be materially detrimental to the public welfare, materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the fact that by granting this variance and allowing it to be moved, this has been placed in the middle of wetlands and even though there may have been an abatement for the wetlands, the Township is not sure of that. From the testimony of the neighbors, who are not scientists, they have had some tests done and the Board’s concern is the welfare of the citizens of
Orion Township. It is possible that this would impair the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

Roll Call Vote was as follows: VanTassel, yes; Walker, yes; Flood, yes; Dunaskiss, yes; Durham; yes. Motion Carried (to deny) 5-0.

C. AB-2023-05, Southfield Sign & Lighting (for Joyology), 4898 Bald Mountain Rd., 09-35-477-003

Chairman Durham read the petitioners request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Sign Ordinance #153 Section 7 – Permitted Ground and Wall Signs – Zoned IP

1. A variance for 1 wall sign above the allowed 1 wall sign for a total of 2 wall signs totaling 133.34-sq. ft. (east elevation).

Mr. Moe Zaitouna introduced himself as representing the petitioner and summarized the variance request.

Chairman Durham asked if this new sign would replace the current banner sign.

Mr. Zaitouna replied yes.

Board Member VanTassel commented on the placement of the sign in comparison to the road names indicating that the road names were incorrect on application.

Trustee Flood asked if the second sign would be the “#2” indicated on the overhead.

Mr. Zaitouna replied yes.

Trustee Flood commented that it would be on the south side of the building facing Dutton Road. He asked Building Official Goodloe if it were going to have to be published again since the advertisement said east and it should have been south.

Building Official Goodloe replied no.

Board Members discussed where the current signs are located and where the proposed sign is intended to go.

Mr. Zaitouna answered that he is positive that the first sign is on the west side, labeled #1 on the aerial. The second sign will go where it is labeled #2 on the aerial, the south side.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Board Member VanTassel asked if there were other buildings in this area that have two exterior signs on their building. She asked the Planning Department and did not receive a response.

Mr. Zaitouna stated that they communicated with the two businesses next door and since they are not retail, they do not have the need for two signs.

Board Member VanTassel commented that it is up to the petitioner to provide this information.

Trustee Flood stated that this business is on a corner lot.
Chairman Durham asked if the business planned on keeping the exterior lights.

Mr. Zaitouna answered that they removed one section.

Building Official Goodloe commented that since the side of the building was incorrect, they would have to re-advertise. He suggested that the petitioner postpone for a date certain to May 22, 2023.

Chairman Durham asked if the petitioner could keep the existing banner sign.

Building Official Goodloe replied no. There is no need to punish a new business in the area. They don’t want it up for an extended period of time. He suggested that the petitioner contact Lynn Harrison at the Township and determine if any further documents are needed.

Board Member Dunaskiss moved, seconded by Board Member VanTassel, that in the matter of ZBA Case #2023-005, Southfield Sign & Lighting (for Joyology), 4898 Bald Mountain Rd., 09-35-477-003, that the petitioner’s request for one variance from Sign Ordinance #153, Section 7 – Permitted Ground and Wall Signs – Zoned IP for a variance for 1 wall sign above the allowed wall sign for a total of 2 wall signs totaling 133.34-sq. ft. (east elevation) be postponed for the plans date stamped March 9, 2023 because of an error in the directionality of the proposed sign and this matter be taken up at the May 22, 2023 ZBA meeting.

Roll Call Vote was as follows: VanTassel, yes; Flood, yes; Dunaskiss, yes; Walker, yes; Durham; yes. Motion Carried (to postpone) 5-0.

D. AB-2023-06, Wioletta Bilan, 2209 Indianwood Road, 09-04-300-002

Chairman Durham read the petitioners request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF

Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8)

1. A 2,185.16-sq. ft. variance above the allowed Maximum Floor Area of Detached Accessory Buildings of 1,000-sq. ft. for existing sheds totaling 916.91-sq. ft, an existing 448-sq. ft. gazebo, an existing 1,057-sq. ft. barn, and an existing 763.25-sq. ft. carport.

2. A 1,685.16-sq. ft. variance above the allowed Total Maximum Floor Area of All Accessory Buildings of 1,500-sq. ft. for existing sheds totaling 916.91-sq. ft, an existing 448-sq. ft. gazebo, an existing 1,057-sq. ft. barn, and an existing 763.25-sq. ft. carport.

Ms. Wioletta Bilan introduced herself and summarized the variance request.

Chairman Durham asked about the comment regarding bringing in more buildings and losing storage space. If the over building had been caught at the permit stage, it probably would not have gotten to this stage.

Ms. Bilan explained that she was told with the first structure that they did not need to have a permit because it is under 200 square feet and the structure was 196 square feet. They did not ask for a permit for the existing gazebo. Her husband called the Township but she doesn’t know what his understanding was. For the carport, they understood that the Amish would pull the permit. When they found out that a permit was not pulled, they were in the middle of it and they just went with it.

Chairman Durham stated that the homeowner is responsible if the contractor does not pull the permit.
Ms. Bilan replied she understood and that is the reason she is here because the Township wanted her to permit the carport.

Chairman Durham stated that Ms. Bilan spoke about how the neighbors felt about her property. He stated that when he saw the property approaching from the west, he first thought about what had happened here. There are vehicles all over the property and he was shocked with the overall view of the property. He was also shocked by the total overall number of variances that she is requesting because he has never seen those numbers.

Ms. Bilan stated that she provided a table in the application.

Board Members confirmed that they received the table with the amounts of square footage in their packets.

Board Member VanTassel explained the jurisdiction of the Road Commission and the obtaining of the easement that exists on Indianwood Road. She provided history and background of the roads surrounding the subject property.

Board Member Dunaskiss asked if the barn and shed that are on the property are going to stand time or are they deteriorating because of moisture.

Ms. Bilan stated that when they first moved in, they were in terrible shape. They put a roof on the barn and they painted it. They sealed the holes and since it has been 20 years, it is time to do something. There is now water coming north towards them and will find its way to the barn. They are only keeping it because it has history. If the Township wants them to remove it, they will, but it also provides a buffer between them and the new houses. No one knows about the shed and if the Township wants them to remove it, they will.

Board Member Walker asked how many cars are housed on the subject property.

Ms. Bilan replied that her husband was a mechanic but they do not have a place to hide them. She has a car and her husband has a car and they also have a pickup truck, car, and a car for towing. She believes that there have been times when it did not look very nice. They would like to build a three car garage to hide the vehicles. They also have a backhoe. They now have four cars. There is one in the carport. They have two carports with a little bit of storage in between. They have wood and equipment stored in the other carport.

Board Member Walker asked if they ran a business out of this residence.

Ms. Bilan replied no.

Chairman Durham asked if there was a Township ordinance requiring all vehicles to be plated.

Building Official Goodloe replied yes.

Ms. Bilan commented that all the vehicles are plated. The west side is the worst looking section but she and her husband try really hard by putting up a wooden fence. Her husband used to have a trucking business but he doesn’t run this business anymore. On the south side, the Township installed a buffer for privacy because the petitioner complained about the subdivision being built there. The neighbor that moved in removed the fence and this allows the subdivision kids to play in their backyard.

Chairman Durham commented on the role of the Board regarding this case. He stated that what the surrounding people think, they are not dealing with it here. He cannot support the variances requested. He added that the Board cannot make decisions about removing the barn, etc. during the meeting tonight. This should be determined by the petitioner as to what they can offer to accomplish the least variance possible.
Board Member Walker suggested that if they took down the barn and the carport, they would not even be here. The Board is here to decide on the variances requested. He explained the role of the Zoning Board of Appeals in granting variances.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

Mr. Doug Broque commented that there is no structured way to park the cars on the subject lot. He has no objections to the cars on the property. He stated that the petitioner has done an excellent job of maintaining the property. He has no objection to the property or their buildings and he pointed out that it is a unique property. There is some drainage from surrounding properties causing damage to the petitioner’s property.

The resident who lives across the street stated that she has no objection to the property and approached the Board with pictures of the surrounding properties which she explained. She explained how the petitioner has used the barn in the past and they cannot use it now because of the water drainage issues they have on the property.

Chris Broque commented that if the subject property is viewed right now, this is a really bad time. The cedar fence on the subject property was knocked down by a snowplow. She commented on the drainage issues that they have on the subject property caused by the new subdivision in the area. The petitioner is a great neighbor and she has no problem with the variance requests.

Board Member VanTassel asked whose children play by the gazebo.

Ms. Bilan replied the neighborhood children.

Board Member VanTassel asked about the new development.

Ms. Bilan replied that it was the old Indianwood golf course. She commented on the increase of square footage for storage. Ms. Bilan stated that she would like the Board to grant the square footage of 2,360 square feet which was the square footage of accessory when they purchased the property.

Trustee Flood stated that all Suburban Farms (SF) zoned property is in the same category and have to abide by the same ordinance. All the Board is using to evaluate the request is the numbers provided by the Planning and Zoning Department and in the notice. He suggested that the petitioner go back to the Planning and Zoning Department and make adjustments that they can make to the plan to reduce the variance request. He commented that everyone must abide by the rules. He agreed with the other Board Members as to the large variances requested. He is hoping the petitioner can reduce the variance request and he would be happy to look at it again.

Chairman Durham concurred. The petitioner can postpone and come back with a reduced request that would be better received.

Board Member Dunaskiss stated that they are asking for large variances and she would have difficulty granting variances for buildings that are not usable. She loves historical buildings but when they deteriorate, they are no longer usable.

Board Member VanTassel stated that she has always understood that when they talk about lot coverage, they are only talking about the ground floor. She sees that this request includes a loft area too. She would like to get an attorney’s opinion on this.

Trustee Flood stated that the Planning and Zoning Department has that on their chart.

Board Member VanTassel stated that she asked to have a drawing from the Assessing Department too. She suggested that they postpone to get consistent numbers from the Assessing Department and for the petitioner to consider the square footage amounts given.
Building Official Goodloe stated that when they talk about lot coverage, they are talking about the ground floor of the structure. When they talk about the maximum floor area square footage, that does include loft areas or second floors. There is no lot coverage request in this variance. They usually go by what the Assessing Department has, but when the petitioner has larger numbers, they use the numbers from the petitioner.

Chairman Durham stated that it appears the petitioner is going to make substantial changes to reduce the variances requested.

Ms. Bilan requested a postponement.

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Chairman Durham, that in the matter of ZBA Case AB-2023-06, Wioletta Bilan, 2209 Indianwood Road, 09-04-300-002, application date stamped March 10, 2023, at the petitioner's request to be postponed until May 22, 2023 so the petitioner can confer with the Township's Planning and Zoning Department to make any further adjustments to the application.

Roll call vote was as follows: Dunaskiss, yes; VanTassel, yes; Walker, yes; Flood, yes; Durham, yes. Motion Carried (to postpone) 5-0.

**E. AB-2023-07, Stadium Ridge Apartments, 101 Stadium Drive, 09-14-400-025**

Chairman Durham read the petitioners request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned RM

Article VII, Section 7.04 (E)(1)(a)

1. A 12.83-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 100-ft. for Building 13 to be 87.17-ft. from Stadium Drive.
2. A 12.83-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 100-ft. for Building 14 to be 87.17-ft. from Stadium Drive.

Mr. Mario Izzi introduced himself as representing the petitioner and summarized the variance requests. They are proposing rental units on the subject property. Because of the unique shape of the property, they are unable to build the buildings without variances. They do have a recommendation from the Planning Commission for site plan approval and they are trying to move forward with a development that will be successful. Their hardships are the size and the shape of the property. In order to keep the product continuous throughout the project, they would like to build the same buildings throughout the site.

Board Member Walker summarized the Planning Commission’s conditional approval of the site plan.

Mr. Izzi stated that they added setback distance to the building off of Lapeer Road. They are asking for the relief off of Stadium Drive. They also added a berm for landscaping and considerable landscaping on Stadium Drive and Lapeer Road to help soften it.

Chairman Durham asked if these were apartment residential type rentals.

Mr. Izzi replied yes.

Chairman Durham asked who would own the units.

Mr. Izzi replied that they would own them and they would self-manage the units.
Board Member VanTassel stated that she asked for an elevation from both Stadium Drive and also from the larger parcel. She got the front elevation and side elevation. She wanted to see what is being built on the large parcel and does it duplicate what is being shown on Stadium Drive.

Mr. Izzi replied that he would be happy to supply the elevations.

Board Member VanTassel asked about the setbacks for the buildings on Beacon Way. The petitioner has a stronger case if the units off of Beacon Way are less than 100 feet off of Stadium Drive.

Mr. Izzi stated that they appear to be less than 100 feet but he would like to confirm that with the plan.

Trustee Flood stated that earlier they had an petitioner that wanted 90% lot variance. This petitioner is asking for 12% and he does not have a problem with the request.

Mr. Izzi reiterated the need for the variances and this was the simplest way to get to an approved plan.

Chairman Durham stated that it is obvious that the petitioner has tried to minimize the request.

Building Official Goodloe asked if Board Member VanTassel was looking for the rear elevation. He provided the drawings to the Board Members.

Board Members were shown the elevations for the proposed development and reviewed them.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Mr. Izzi provided photos for the Board Members review.

Board Member VanTassel moved, seconded by Board Member Walker, that in the matter of ZBA Case AB-2023-07, Stadium Ridge Apartments, 101 Stadium Drive, 09-14-400-025 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned RM, Article VII, Section 7.04 (E)(1)(a) including a 12.83-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 100-ft. for Building 13 to be 87.17-ft. from Stadium Drive and a 12.83-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 100-ft. for Building 14 to be 87.17-ft. from Stadium Drive be approved because the petitioner did demonstrate the follow standards for variances have been met in this case and that they set forth facts that show:

1. The petitioner does demonstrate the following practical difficulty due to unique characteristics of the property and not related to general conditions: the property is somewhat shallow and for the project to be built using the basic design of the property, it is necessary for variances from the 100 foot required setback to be made so that the product remains harmonious and contemporary with what is being built on the larger parcel adjacent to the subject parcel.

2. The petitioner did demonstrate unique or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that does not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zoning: the fact that the parcel in question is a rather shallow parcel in comparison to others in the general neighborhood.

3. The variances are necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right posed by others in the same zone or vicinity based on the following facts: the other parcels in this facility on either side north or south of Stadium Drive have a greater depth and have more room to provide for setbacks, the shallowness of this lot, and the product built will require the setbacks for the enjoyment of substantial property rights.

4. Granting of the variances or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the
property is located based on the fact that the buildings are limited in size and the amount of traffic will probably be less than what is enjoyed by the occupants of the buildings along Beacon Way to the south or those whether employed there or dropping students off at Stadium Drive have much more traffic.

5. The granting of these variances would not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties due to the fact that the property sits below the property to the north which is the King of Kings Lutheran Church and also the buildings are set a further distance back from Lapeer Road/M-24. The variances would not unusually increase congestion on public streets due to the limited size of the parcel and the buildings to be built. There is also not going to be an increase of fire or endanger public safety based on the comments of the Fire Marshall of the Orion Township Fire Department. It is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area due to the limited size of these buildings and it is something that fits into the character of the neighborhood and this property as it is zoned.

Board Member Van Tassel amended the motion, re-supported by Board Member Walter to add the approval is conditioned upon the Board of Trustee reverting the property back to Multiple Family-RM1.

Roll call vote was as follows: Flood, yes; Walker, yes; VanTassel, yes; Dunaskiss, yes; Durham, yes. Motion Carried (to approve) 5-0.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** - None

7. **COMMUNICATIONS**

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Chairman Durham to cancel the May 8, 2023 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting due to lack of agenda items.

Vote was as follows: Dunaskiss, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes; Durham; yes; VanTassel, yes. Motion passes 5-0.

8. **COMMITTEE REPORTS** - None

9. **MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Walker commented on Library meetings and events.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Chairman Durham, to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 pm.

Motion Carried (to approve) 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin A. Mattice
Recoding Secretary
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Specialist
DATE: April 13, 2023
RE: Case location for ZBA Meeting 4/24/2023

Below is the location of the ZBA case for the April 24, 2023, meeting.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals

FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Specialist

DATE: April 13, 2023

SUBJECT: Staff Report for AB-2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr.

The applicant would like to add an 8x14 (112-sq. ft.) shed to his property 2-ft. from the property line to the west. As the property is 50-ft. wide and considered a nonconforming lot, the required side yard setback is reduced from 10-ft. to 6-ft.

Additionally, the applicant is seeking a 112-sq. ft. variance above the allowed 750-sq. ft. Maximum Floor Area of Detached Accessory Structures. The Applicant does have a detached garage that received a variance in 1996 to be larger than the allowed maximum floor area, therefore he only needs a variance for maximum floor area for the proposed shed.

If a motion is to approve, please add to the motion that approval is for plans date stamped March 24, 2023.

Please contact me if you have any questions.
MOTION OPTIONS

TO: Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Specialist
DATE: April 14, 2023
RE: AB-2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr., 09-16-229-039

I am providing motion options for the above-mentioned case.

Please consider and deliberate on each of the criteria listed which the applicant should meet in order for their request to be approved. These are known as the Findings of Fact and need to be included in a motion for either approval or denial. Any additional Findings of Facts should be added to the motion.

The variance language listed was verified by the petitioner/applicant and advertised to the public. As a reminder - due to the language being advertised, the ZBA may lessen the requested deviation(s) but cannot grant more than what was advertised.

If you have any questions regarding the case, please give me a call at the Township ext. 5001.
SAMPLE MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF A NON-USE VARIANCE

In the matter of ZBA case #AB-2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr., 09-16-229-039, I would move that the petitioner’s request for:

2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2, Article VI, Section 6.04

1. A 4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 6-ft. for a shed to be 2-ft. from the property line to the west.

Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8)


be granted for plans date stamped March 24, 2023 because the petitioner did demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met in this case in that they set forth facts which show that in this case:

1. The petitioner does show the following Practical Difficulty (Defined: Due to unique characteristics of the property and not related to general conditions in the area of the property):

2. The following are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in the same district or zone:

3. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone or vicinity based on the following facts:

4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following findings:
Further, based on the following findings of facts, the granting of this variance would not:

1. Impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property due to:
   
   
2. Unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets due to:
   
   
3. Increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety due to:
   
   
4. Unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area due to:
   
   
5. Or, In any other respect, impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township due to:
   
   

SAMPLE MOTION FOR
DENIAL OF A NON-USE VARIANCE

In the matter of ZBA case #AB-2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr., 09-16-229-039, I would move that petitioner’s request for:
2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2, Article VI, Section 6.04

1. A 4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 6-ft. for a shed to be 2-ft. from the property line to the west.

Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8)


be denied for plans date stamped March 24, 2023 because the petitioner did not demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met in this case in that they set forth facts which show that in this case:

1. The petitioner does not show Practical Difficulty due to (Defined: Due to unique characteristics of the property and not related to general conditions in the area of the property):

2. The following are not exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in the same district or zone:

3. The variance is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone or vicinity based on the following facts:

4. The granting of the variance or modification will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following findings:
Further, based on the following findings of facts, the granting of this variance would:

1. Impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property due to:

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

2. Unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets due to:

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

3. Increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety due to:

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

4. Unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area due to:

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

5. Or, In any other respect, impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township due to:

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals
Application for Appeal - Single Family Residential

NOTICE TO APPLICANT:
The following application must be completed and filed with the Township at least thirty days prior to a scheduled ZBA meeting in order to initiate an appeal. There is a non-refundable fee of $250.00 for a residential application.

Regular meetings of the ZBA are held on the second and fourth Mondays of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Hall, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360. A minimum of three cases are required in order to hold a meeting with a maximum of five. The applicant or a representative with written permission from the property owner must be present at the meeting.

PROOF OF OWNERSHIP MUST BE INCLUDED WITH THIS APPLICATION. Acceptable forms of documentation include: Warranty Deed, Quit Claim Deed, Land Contract, or Option to Purchase with a Copy of the Warranty Deed.

APPLICANT
Name: Barry M. Young
Address: 1301 Beach Dr. City/State/Zip: Lake Orion, MI 48360
Phone: 248-693-9401  Cell:  Fax: 
Email: Beemerman77@comcast.net

PROPERTY OWNER(S)
Name(s): Barry M. and Sandra L. Young
Address: 1301 Beach Dr. City/State/Zip: Lake Orion, MI 48360
Phone: 248-693-9401  Cell:  Fax: 
Email: 

CONTACT PERSON FOR THIS REQUEST
Name: Barry M. Young  Phone: 248-693-9401  Email: Beemerman77@comcast.net

SUBJECT PROPERTY
Address: 1301 Beach Dr. Lake Orion, MI 48360  Sidwell Number: 09-110-229-039
Total Acreage: 0.245 Length of Ownership by Current Property Owner: 30 Years, 7 Months

Does the owner have control over any properties adjoining this site? NO

Zoning Ordinance Allowance/Requirement Deviation requested

Page 2 of 4
Case #: ___________________

RESIDENTIAL VARIANCE

1. Describe in detail the nature of the request. **SIDEYARD SETBACK VARIANCE ON WEST SIDE** AND **A MAX. FLOOR AREA VARIANCE FOR MAX. SIZE.**

2. Describe how the request results from special or unique circumstances particular to the property, which are not applicable to other properties in the surrounding area. **I HAVE A RAISED SEPTIC BED THAT I WOULD LIKE TO AVOID IF POSSIBLE.**

3. If the appeal is granted, please explain how the variance will/will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or to other properties or improvements in the Township: **BY STORING SEASONAL ITEMS OUT OF SIGHT AND OUT OF THE WEATHER, I WOULD HOPE TO MAKE MY PROPERTY MORE APPEALING.**

4. Explain how the request is/is not consistent with other properties in the immediate area, please cite examples if possible: **SEVERAL OTHER HOME S HAVE SHEDS NEAR LAKE FOR SEASONAL LAKE ITEM STORAGE**

5. Describe how the alleged practical difficulty has not been self-created. **I CANT CHANGE LOCATION OF THE SEPTIC FIELD.**

6. The topography of said land makes the setbacks impossible to meet because: **OF SEPTIC FIELD**

7. Describe how strict compliance with the ordinance unreasonably prevents the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or to be unnecessarily burdensome. **MY LOT BEING ONLY 50' WIDE, I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP IT AS CLOSE TO THE LINE AS POSSIBLE.**
Case #: __________________________

8. Have there been any previous appeals involving this property? If so, when? ______________________________

9. Is this request the result of a Notice of Ordinance Violation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

I/We, the undersigned, do hereby request action by the ZBA on the variance or specified matter above, in accordance with Sections 30.06, 30.07, 30.08, 30.10, and 30.11 of the Zoning Ordinance. In support of this request the above facts are provided. I hereby certify that the information provided is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete. As the property owner (or having been granted permission to represent the owner as to this application), I hereby grant the Zoning Board of Appeals members permission to visit the property, without prior notification, as is deemed necessary.

Signature of Applicant: __________________________ Date: __________

Print Name: __________________________

Signature of Property Owner: __________________________ Date: __________

Print Name: __________________________

If applicable: I the property owner, hereby give permission to __________________________ to represent me at the meeting.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Zoning Classification of property: __________________ Adjacent Zoning: N. S. E. W.

Total Square Footage of Principal Structure: __________________ Total Square Footage of Accessory Structure(s): __________________

Description of variance(s):

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Date Filed: __________ Fee Paid: __________ Receipt Number: __________
AB - 2023-08, Barry Young, 1301 Beach Dr.
09-16-229-039, 2.45 acres, 10,672.20 sf

25% = 2,668.05 sf
Zoned R-2
Lot width 50', Non-Conforming

Front setback OK
Sideyard setback 6' (relaxed from 10' because of nonconformity)
   will be 2' - Need a 4' variance
Row yard setback 10' OK
From water's edge 25' OK

Lot Coverage:
House 820
Porch 184
Detached Garage 896 (received variance in 1996)
Proposed Shed 112

2,012 sf OK

Maximum floor area of detached accessory blds. 750 sf
Detached garage 896 - Received variance in 1996
Proposed Shed 112
   Variance needed 112 sf

Total maximum floor area of all accessory blds. 1,150 sf
Detached garage 896
Proposed Shed 112

1,008 sf OK
Article XXVII  General Provisions

27.01 Nonconformities

i. Nonconforming structures, other than buildings, such as signs, billboards, fences and other structures;

ii. Buildings not in conformance with dimensional requirements such as lot area, yards, lot coverage, and height;

iii. Buildings not in conformance with parking, loading, and/or landscaping requirements;

iv. All other nonconformities arising from failure to meet any of the requirements imposed by this Ordinance.

3. **Nonconforming Site or Lot.** A nonconforming site or lot is a site or lot or portion thereof existing on the effective date of this Ordinance, or amendments thereto, and which does not conform to the provisions of the Ordinance in the zoning district in which it is located.

4. **Administrative Nonconformity.** An administrative nonconformity is any building, structure or use which was in existence at the time of adoption of this Ordinance and which is required by this Ordinance to have special administrative approval such as special land use approval, cluster housing development approval, or Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

C. Nonconforming Lots.

The following regulations shall apply to any nonconforming lot of record or nonconforming lot described in a deed or land contract executed and delivered prior to the effective date of this Ordinance or an amendment thereto:

1. **Use of Nonconforming Lots.** Any nonconforming lot shall be used only for a use permitted in the district in which it is located. In any district in which single-family dwellings are permitted, notwithstanding limitations imposed by other provisions of this Ordinance, a single-family dwelling and customary accessory buildings may be erected on any single lot of record at the effective date of adoption or amendment of this Ordinance. This provision shall apply even though such lot fails to meet the requirements for area or width, or both, that are generally applicable in the district, provided that:

   a. The lot is at least fifty (50) feet in width.

   b. Side yard setbacks as set forth in the following chart are complied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Each Side Yard Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 feet</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 65 feet</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 69 feet</td>
<td>9 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. The lot is in conformance with all other applicable yard and lot requirements.

2. **Variance to Yard Requirements.** If the use of a nonconforming lot requires a variation of the front or rear setback or front or rear yard requirements, then such use shall be permitted only if a variance is granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals under the terms of this Ordinance.

3. **Nonconforming Contiguous Lots Under Same Ownership.** If two (2) or more lots or combination of lots with contiguous frontage in single ownership are of record at the time of passage or amendment of the Ordinance,
27.02 Buildings, Structures, and Uses

6. Household animal enclosures, dog runs, central air conditioning units, heat pumps, and other mechanical system components that could, or are likely to, produce noise, odor, or other nuisances shall not be located adjacent to an adjoining property owner's living or sleeping area where windows and/or doors would be exposed to the nuisance.

It is the intent of these provisions to place the responsibility of abating or controlling nuisances on the owner of the lot where the nuisances are produced, rather than on the adjoining neighbors.

7. Accessory buildings or structures are not to be used for commercial operations other than home occupations, as defined in Article II, Section 2.01.

8. The total area of all accessory buildings or structures in a single-family residentially zoned district or on a parcel used for a single-family dwelling, except as modified in Paragraph 9, shall not exceed the following (amended 11.28.85):

| LOT SIZE     | MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA OF DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS | MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA OF ATTACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS | TOTAL MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA OF ALL ACCESSORY BUILDINGS *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1/2 acre</td>
<td>750 sq. ft.</td>
<td>75% of the principal structure</td>
<td>1,150 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 to 1 acre</td>
<td>900 sq. ft.</td>
<td>75% of the principal structure</td>
<td>1,300 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2.5 acres</td>
<td>1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>75% of the principal structure</td>
<td>1,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2.5 acres</td>
<td>1,400 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes the combined floor area of each story of the structure.

9. The total area of all accessory buildings or structures on a single-family residentially zoned parcel shall not exceed the above noted area, except in the following cases after consideration and approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals (amended 11.28.85, 06.15.15):

a. On single-family residential lots, a variance may be sought to permit increased accessory building, structure or use, provided all of the following conditions are met:

i. The accessory building or structure is aesthetically compatible with, and constructed of the same color as the principal residential building or structure.

ii. The accessory building or structure, as well as the principal residential building or structure, can be accommodated on the parcel and together cover no more than twenty percent (20%) of the lot area in the Suburban Farms (SF), Suburban Estates (SE), or Suburban Ranch (SR) Zoning Districts or twenty-five percent (25%) of the lot area in the Residential 1, 2, or 3 (R-1, R-2, R-3) Zoning Districts.

iii. The principal residential building or structure contains at least the minimum floor area of living space as required for the specific zoning district and as set forth in the specific zoning district of this Zoning Ordinance. (amended 07.16.18)

iv. The accessory building or structure is used for the indoor storage of items that are permitted to be stored in a rear or side yard, but that could be unsightly if such were done.

b. On parcels of more than five (5) acres in size used for agricultural purposes, a variance may be sought from the Zoning Board of Appeals to permit additional accessory buildings or structures for the purpose of storing agricultural implements, equipment, products, livestock, and similar items.
The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed documentation and has no concerns at this time.

From: Courtney Keisman <ckisman@oriontownship.org>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 9:26 AM
To: Jeff Williams <jwilliams@oriontownship.org>
Subject: ZBA Documents for the April 24, 2023 ZBA Meeting

Mr. Williams.

Hello Jeff. Attached is a ZBA case that needs to be reviewed by you for the April 24, 2023 ZBA Meeting.

Thank you,

Courtney Keisman
Clerk III
Planning & Zoning
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 5003
W: www.oriontownship.org
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Date 4/6/23

JOHN D. CARSON
(Printed Name)

1291 BEACH DRIVE
(Address)

LACE ORION 48360

RECEIVED
APR 14 2023
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

Karen Childress
(Printed Name)

1325 Beach Dr.
(Address)

Lake Orion, MI 48360

Date 4/6/23

RECEIVED
APR 14 2023
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young's application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Date 4/6/2023

(Laura Sullivan)

(Printed Name)

1348 Beach Dr

(Address)

16 Orion Dr 48340

Orion Township Planning & Zoning

RECEIVED

APR 14 2023
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young's application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Date 4/6/23

GERALDINE R. FLETCHER
(Printed Name)

1285 BEACH DR.
(Address)

LAKE ORION MI 48360

RECEIVED
APR 14 2023
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Date 4-6-2023

ERIC T. MARSHALL
(Printed Name)

1286 Beach Drive
(Address)

Orion Twp. MI 48360

RECEIVED
APR 14 2023
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]  Date 4/13/23

Eric Bowers
(Printed Name)
1309 Beach Dr.
(Address)
Lake Orion, MI
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Date 4-6-23

[Printed Name]

1302 Beach Dr

(Address)

Lake Orion, MI 48360
Dear Members of Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to support Barry Young’s application for a variance for a shed on his property, located at 1301 Beach Dr. I have thoroughly reviewed his application and have no concerns regarding the proposed construction. I encourage you to grant the variance for this shed.

Kind Regards,

__________________________ Date 4-6-23
Kim Davis

(Please print your name)

1261 Beach Dr.

(Address)
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RECEIVED

APR 14 2023
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Specialist
DATE: April 13, 2023
RE: MSU Extension Self-Paced Training

Attached is a flyer for a “Self-Paced” ZBA Online course through MSU Extension. The flyer outlines what the course covers. To obtain more information go to http://extension.msu.edu/zbaonline. This is new course and I don’t know anything more about it except what’s on the flyer and available through the website listed above.

I am planning on taking it.

Please review the flyer and let me know if you want to sign up or wait a bit until I get into so that I can give you an idea what its all about. I can’t find a deadline for signing up or when the $75 introductory price expires.

I am just putting it out there for you to look at and if you do decide you want to take it, let me know and I will take care of registering you.

[Signature]

Lynn
A NEW MSU EXTENSION SELF-PACED TRAINING

The ZBA Online course is a unique and comprehensive Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) training designed to accommodate your schedule. The course includes six self-paced modules engaging the learner with videos, readings, and activities. Complete one module to meet a specific training need or take the full course to obtain a certificate. ZBA Online includes:

- Understanding Basic ZBA Roles & Responsibilities
- Effective Decisions and Ordinance Interpretations
- Hearing Appeals of Administrative Decisions
- Issuing Variances from Ordinance Standards
- Other Responsibilities of the ZBA: Nonconformities
- Circuit Court Review and Standards

**Introductory Price: $75 (Regularly $125)**

CRITICAL TRAINING FOR ZBA MEMBERS AND STAFF

The ZBA Online Certificate Course is designed for members of the local government ZBA, local government staff who work alongside the ZBA, and local government managers and attorneys.

The course is based in MSU's Desire to Learn (D2L) online learning platform and can be accessed 24/7 - individuals can do as much or as little at one time as fits their schedule. Connect with computer, tablet, or mobile.

The ZBA Online Certificate Course teaches the latest concepts on ZBA roles and responsibilities, effective decision-making, and protecting due process. The curriculum is based on the award-winning Citizen Planner Program and features ZBA-specific content, engaging activities, case studies, and the latest Michigan case law. Course completion includes an MSU Extension certificate.

To learn more or register, visit: [http://extension.msu.edu/zbaonline](http://extension.msu.edu/zbaonline)

Questions, contact the:
Citizen Planner Program
Email: cplanner@msu.edu
Phone: 517-353-6472

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer, committed to achieving excellence through a diverse workforce and inclusive culture that encourages all people to reach their full potential. Michigan State University Extension programs and materials are open to all without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, age, height, weight, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, veteran status. Issued in furtherance of MSU Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Quaatin Tyler, Director, MSU Extension, East Lansing, MI 48824. This information is for educational purposes only. Reference to commercial products or trade names does not imply endorsement by MSU Extension or bias against those not mentioned.