CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS AGENDA
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2022 - 7:00 PM
ORION TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL COMPLEX BOARD ROOM
2323 JOSLYN ROAD
LAKE ORION, MI 48360

1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 11/14/2022, ZBA Meeting Minutes
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. ZBA BUSINESS
   A. AB-2022-48, Jonathan Stine, 2025 Bald Mountain Rd., 09-24-100-008
      The petitioner is seeking 3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1
      Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2)
      1. A 40-ft. front property line setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft.
         from the intersection of the front and side property lines (west).
      2. A 10-ft. side property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft.
         from the side property line (west).
      3. A 10-ft. rear property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft.
         from the intersection of the rear and side property lines (west).
   B. AB-2022-49, Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd., 09-30-200-037
      The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF
      Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8) Buildings, Structures, and Uses
      1. A 556-sq. ft. variance above the allowed 852-sq. ft. (75% of the principal structure) for an
         attached accessory structure to be 1,408-sq. ft.
6. PUBLIC COMMENTS
7. COMMUNICATIONS
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, November 14, 2022, at 7:00 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
Tony Cook, Vice-Chairman

**ZBA MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**CONSULTANT PRESENT:**
David Goodloe, Building Official

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
Steve Oja Nicole Oja Joe Carrier
Herb Owens Deena Nguyen Andy Pham
Mark Stec CCutt Gabrien

1. **OPEN MEETING**
Chairman Durham called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **MINUTES**
A. 10-24-22, ZBA Regular Meeting Minutes

Board member Dunaskiss moved, seconded by Trustee Flood, to approve the 10-24-2022 minutes as presented.

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

4. **AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Board member Walker, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion carried 5-0

5. **ZBA BUSINESS**
A. **AB-2022-44, Deena Nguyen, 184 W. Clarkston Rd., 09-11-455-004**

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3
Article VI, Section 6.04

1. A 9-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a carport to be 1-ft. from the property line (west).

Mr. Herbert Owens introduced himself and summarized the variance request for a side yard variance for 20’ X 20’ carport along the side of the house.

Chairman Durham confirmed that the carport would have a roof only.

Trustee Flood commented that this is an open air carport. He visited the property and noticed that the property drops off considerably and currently there is no garage on the property.

Mr. Owens stated that he will be the person that constructs it.

Board member Dunaskiss asked if they had had conversations with the adjoining property owners.

Ms. Nguyen stated that she only spoke to one neighbor who was fine with the request; this is Susan and Jack Stone.

Chairman Durham asked how the petitioner gets out of the driveway safety.

Ms. Nguyen commented on how she exits her driveway.

Trustee Flood read the letter from Susan and Jack Stone, neighbors two doors down from Ms. Nguyen and dated received October 31, 2022 which stated that they are not opposed to the variance request.

Board member Dunaskiss moved, seconded by Trustee Flood, that in the matter of ZBA case #AB-2022-44, Deena Nguyen, 184 W. Clarkston Rd., 09-11-455-004 that the petitioner’s request for 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3, Article VI, Section 6.04 for a 9-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a carport to be 1-ft. from the property line (west) be granted per plans date stamped received September 29, 2022, 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 did demonstrate a practical difficulty: the property has a very steep incline behind the house and there is no way to construct a garage where the driveway and parking area is and an open-air carport seems like a reasonable solution for the parking of cars.

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 including the incline and the fact that the property is on a very busy road and that care needs to be taken when parking cars and when pulling out of the driveway.

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: other homes in the area have garages.

4. Granting the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located.

5. Granting this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties, and it would not unusually increase congestion on public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire - the Fire Marshal provided an email dated October 26, 2022 that he has no concerns regarding the case at this time. It is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property
values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect, impair public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

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

B. AB-2022-45, Steven Oja, Vacant Parcel, #09-03-278-026, South of 576 Cushing St.

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking to extend the expiration date for the approved AB-2021-56 ZBA case variances.

Mr. Steve Oja and Ms. Nicole Oja introduced themselves to the Board. Mr. Steve Oja stated that he would like to extend the variance granted in October of 2021 because they are not ready to start building yet since their children attend South Lyon schools and they wish to let their three boys graduate from South Lyon schools. They are about four years out before they are ready to start building. The Township advised him to extend the variance before it expires.

Board member Dunaskiss stated that this property is located on the street where she lives but she has no interest in the property.

Board members agreed to allow Board member Dunaskiss to participate in this case.

Chairman Durham asked if the variances are expired.

Mr. Oja stated that the expiration date was October 12, 2022 but when he called the Planning & Zoning Department, they advised him to send in the money for the permit before it expires and he will get on the next meeting agenda.

Chairperson Durham asked if Mr. Oja wanted to extend this four years out.

Mr. Oja agreed.

Chairperson Durham asked about the time frame of the extension.

Building Official Goodloe replied that they are working on administrative approval of variance extensions.

Chairman Durham stated that the Board in the past has extended for a year out but the Board has never extended out four years. There may be some rule changes possibly within a year so if the applicant feels it is in his best interest to change the request for the length of the postponement that would be up to the applicant.

Mr. Oja stated that if he gets the one year extension, then he can come back in a year to see if anything has changed. He confirmed that he is asking for a year extension.

Trustee Flood stated that Ordinance #78 is being updated currently and he provided details of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Oja commented that if he can get a one year extension, then perhaps within the one year, the ordinance will change. He reiterated the reason for the delay of construction.

Chairman Durham stated that he appreciates the petitioner’s honesty about his timeline.

Trustee Flood stated that the petitioner did make his application with the Planning and Zoning Department on October 4, 2022 so it was before the expiration.
Chairman Durham asked if the petitioner was asking for the same variances.

Mr. Oja replied yes.

Chairman Durham asked for public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Board member Walker, that in the matter of ZBA case AB-2022-45, Steven Oja, Vacant Parcel, #09-03-278-026, South of 576 Cushing St. application date stamped October 4, 2022, the petitioner is seeking to extend the expiration date for the approved AB-2021-56 ZBA case variances to extend his request for a one-year extension which will expire on October 11, 2023.

Vote was as follows: Cook, no; Dunaskiss, yes; Walker, yes; Walker, yes; Durham, yes; Flood, yes. Motion passes 4-1.


Chairman Durham read the petitioner's request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3

Article VI, Section 6.04
1. A 12.7-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for an attached, side-entry, garage to be 17.3-ft. from the front property line.
2. A 17.4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for an attached, side-entry, garage to be 12.6-ft. from the side property line (north).

Mr. Joel Carrier introduced himself to the Board and summarized the variance request for a garage with additional living space.

Chairman Durham asked about the storage of the additional items like boats, etc.

Mr. Carrier replied that the pontoon boat is in storage and he is hoping that he can store it along the garage in the future. He is planning on storing the jet ski in the garage or in front of the house. The little boat is not being kept. He confirmed that the garage that he is building is for his two cars.

Vice-chairman Cook asked if the fence was on the property line.

Mr. Carrier replied that the fence was on the property line. The back fence line corner is in the neighbor's driveway.

Vice-chairman Cook asked if the fence was being removed.

Mr. Carrier replied that the fence would be the back wall of the addition.

Vice-chairman Cook asked how they would get to the back yard.

Mr. Carrier answered that he would put a gate in the fence to access the back yard and he explained.

Trustee Flood stated that the front of the new garage will be at the same distance as the existing garage.

Mr. Carrier stated that this was the original plan, but since the property is at an angle, he couldn't increase the current setback, so the addition has to sit back a foot and a half. He is not going any further forward.
Trustee Flood stated that the current home is nonconforming for front yard setback because it is 17.3 feet from the front property line. He confirmed the variance requests that are being asked for.

Mr. Carrier confirmed the variance requests for side setbacks.

Trustee Flood reiterated that the house is nonconforming, and the applicant is not increasing the nonconformity.

Mr. Carrier concurred.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard in this case.

Trustee Flood stated that the petitioner meets all other setbacks except the ones that he is seeking variances for.

Vice-chairman Cook moved, seconded by Trustee Flood, that in the matter of ZBA case AB-2022-46, Joel Carrier, 1143 S. Long Lake Blvd., 09-01-264-011 that the petitioner's request for 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3, Article VI, Section 6.04 including: 1. A 12.7-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for an attached, side-entry, garage to be 17.3-ft. from the front property line, 2. A 17.4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 30-ft. for an attached, side-entry, garage to be 12.6-ft. from the side property line (north) be granted 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 did demonstrate the following practical difficulty: they complied with not making the structures more nonconforming by adjusting the position of the proposed addition. In terms of meeting the allowances for the size of the lot, the petitioner has made adjustments and resubmitted his plans.

2. The following are 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 a property with lake front area, many of these homes were originally cottages so by today's standards, they are falling into the “noncompliance arena”.

3. The variances are 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: there are several homes in the area that have garages so the petitioner is trying to do that while staying compliant with the current zoning rules and laws.

4. Granting the variances or modifications will not be materially detrimental to public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located.

5. Granting these variances would not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties, it would not unusually increase congestion on public streets, in fact it will improve upon it because they are going to have additional parking space. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, it is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect, impair public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township. The variances granted are for plans date stamped received on October 10, 2022.

Roll call vote: Walker, yes; Flood, yes; Dunaskiss, yes; Cook, yes; Durham, yes. Motion passes 5-0.
Chairman Durham read the petitioner's request as follows:

The petitioner is seeking 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1

Article VI, Section 6.04
1. A 20-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a home addition to be 20-ft. from the front property line.

Mr. Mark Stec introduced himself and summarized the variance request.

Chairman Durham asked how many square feet is the current home.

Mr. Stec replied 1,500 square feet. This addition would give them 48 square feet more.

Trustee Flood commented that all of the homes in that area have the same setback and provided some historical details. He stated that there are 2.5 acres there.

Mr. Stec replied yes, it is long and narrow with a large dip in the back. He explained some grade issues that exist on the property which this addition will help with and he explained.

Chairman Durham read a letter into the record from four of Mr. Stec's neighbors supporting the variance request. The Fire Marshall also provided a review indicating that he has no issue with what is proposed.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Board member Walker moved, seconded by Trustee Flood, that in the matter of ZBA case AB-2022-47, Mark Stec, 3084 Judah Rd., 09-32-126-024 for the petitioner's request for 1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1, Article VI, Section 6.04 for a 20-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a home addition to be 20-ft. from the front property line be granted for plans date stamped received October 12, 2022, 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 did demonstrate the following practical difficulty: due to the unique characteristics of the property including the narrow, very long lot with the home placed at the very front of the property. The request is not related to any general conditions of the property but specifically to the placement of the petitioner's home.

2. The following are 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 a nonconforming structure because the house was built in 1940 before the current Zoning Ordinance. The petitioner is not intending to increase the "nonconformity", he is adding 6 to 8 square feet onto one corner of the house to make a bedroom a little bit bigger.

3. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by others in the same zone or vicinity.

4. Granting of the variances or modifications will not be materially detrimental to public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located.

5. Granting the variance would not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties and it would not unusually increase congestion on public streets. There is also not going to be an
increase of fire. Granting of this variance will not reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect, impair public health, safety, comfort, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

Roll call vote: Dunaskiss, yes; Cook, yes; Walker, yes; Flood, yes; Durham, yes. Motion passes 5-0.

E. 2023 ZBA Meeting Dates

Chairman Durham reviewed the memo provided to the Board members from the Zoning Department regarding the meeting dates in 2023.

Board members discussed the proposed 2023 dates.

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Board member Dunaskiss to approve the 2023 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting dates as presented and to forward the Resolution to the Board of Trustees for adoption.

Motion carried 5-0

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Scott Gabriel commented on the attendance at the Zoning Board of Appeals and his recent involvement in hurricane relief.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

Chairman Durham reviewed a memo provided to the Board members from the Zoning Department regarding the upcoming review of criteria for motions.

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

9. MEMBER COMMENTS

Trustee Flood wished the Board a Happy Thanksgiving and he commented on the upcoming deer hunting season.

Board member Walker commented on the hard work done by the employees for the recent election.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Chairman Durham, seconded by Board member Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 pm.

Motion carried 5-0

Respectfully submitted,

Erin A. Mattice
Recording Secretary
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
DATE: November 17, 2022
RE: Case location for ZBA Meeting 11/28/2022

Below are the locations of the ZBA cases for the November 28, 2022 meeting.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
DATE: November 16, 2022

The applicant is proposing to add a 6-ft. fence part of the way along the west property line.

The variances are unique as part of the west property line is considered a front property line as it abuts a road easement (see the survey dated November 1, 2022 in the packet). Therefore, there needs to be a variance for a front property line setback in that area – variance #1.

The remaining west property line then becomes a side property line – variance #2.

The rear property line is the property line to the south and because the 6-ft. fence is proposed to end at the intersection of the west property line and the south property line, a variance is needed for that intersection – variance #3.

If you decide to grant the variances – be sure to include that the variances are approved per the plans dated stamped November 1, 2022.

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: November 17, 2022


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-2022-48, Jonathan Stine, 2025 Bald Mountain Rd., 09-24-100-008, I would move that the petitioner’s request for:

3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1, Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2)

1. A 40-ft. front property line setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the intersection of the front and side property lines (west).
2. A 10-ft. side property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the side property line (west).
3. A 10-ft. rear property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the intersection of the rear and side property lines (west).

be granted 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-2022-48, Jonathan Stine, 2025 Bald Mountain Rd., 09-24-100-008, I would move that the petitioner’s request for:

3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1, Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2)

1. A 40-ft. front property line setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the intersection of the front and side property lines (west).
2. A 10-ft. side property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the side property line (west).
3. A 10-ft. rear property line setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 6-ft. fence to be 0-ft. from the intersection of the rear and side property lines (west).

be denied 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: JONATHAN STINE

Address: 2025 BALD MOUNTAIN ROAD City/State/Zip: ORION TOWNSHIP

Phone: 248.506.7806 Cell: 248.506.7806 Fax:

Email: ORBIT400@AOL.COM

PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Name(s): JONATHAN & RUTH ANN STINE

Address: 2025 BALD MOUNTAIN ROAD City/State/Zip: ORION TOWNSHIP

Phone: 248.506.7806 Cell: 248.506.7806 Fax:

Email: ORBIT400@AOL.COM

CONTACT PERSON FOR THIS REQUEST

Name: JONATHAN STINE Phone: 248.506.7806 Email: ORBIT400@AOL.COM

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Address: 2025 BALD MOUNTAIN ROAD Sidewell Number: 09-24-100-008 A-1

Total Acreage: .47 Length of Ownership by Current Property Owner: 1 Years, 5 Months

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

Zoning Ordinance
Allowance/Requirement Deviation requested

Version 1/4/2022
Page 2 of 4
Case #: __________________

RESIDENTIAL VARIANCE

1. Describe in detail the nature of the request. To extend an existing six foot privacy fence on the lot line in lieu of chain link (4') to maintain continuity. (West side only) visuals to come at meeting.

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. Septic field and large trees.

3. If the appeal is granted, please explain how the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or to other properties or improvements in the Township: This will not be an issue since no visual impairments will occur. Simply a fence between a back yard and my side yard.

4. Explain how the request is consistent with other properties in the immediate area, please cite examples if possible: This is consistent as it is to continue an existing six foot privacy fence by approx. 73 feet on the west side of my property only.

5. Describe how the alleged practical difficulty has not been self-created. It is self created to make a rather unattractive fence (chain link) into an attractive one (continuing the wooden one).

6. The topography of said land makes the setbacks impossible to meet because: It doesn't. We are simply trying to continue an existing, attractive wooden fence versus four foot chain link.

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. Following the 10 foot setback on the west side of my property would be visually odd as well as making 10 feet of my yard unusable.
Case #: ____________________

8. Have there been any previous appeals involving this property? If so, when?  NO

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:  10-17-2022
Print Name:  JONATHAN STINE

Signature of Property Owner:  ___________________________  Date:  10-17-2022
Print Name:  JONATHAN STINE

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: ___________________________
SKETCH OF EASEMENT

LEGEND:
- FOUND IRON
- SET IRON
- RECORD DISTANCE
- MEASURED DISTANCE

I HEREBY STATE THAT I HAVE SURVEYED AND MAPPED THE LAND PLATTED AND DESCRIBED ABOVE ON AUGUST 6TH AND THAT ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF PUBLIC ACT 132 OF 1970, AS AMENDED, HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH.

BASIS OF BEARING: WEST LINE OF SECTION 24 PER PREVIOUS DESCRIPTION. (N 03° 03' 50" W)

PREPARED FOR:
JON STINE
2025 BALD MOUNTAIN RD
LAKE ORION, MI 48360
248-506-7806

SHEET: 1 OF 1 BRADLEY GEORGE REICHERT P.S. #4001055923

REICHERT SURVEYING INC.
P 248.555.8592 F 248.555.7099
Net@ReichertSurveying.com
140 Flumefield Lane - Rochester, MI 48306

Scale: 1"=50'  Date: 8/6/21
Job No. 21-146  Drawn: G.H.R.

Date:  Rev. By:

Article XXVII  
General Provisions

27.01 Nonconformities

construction on the rebuilding project is begun and diligently carried on within a reasonable time after the excavation, demolition, or removal of the theretofore existing building.

K. Administrative Nonconformities.

A structure or use which is administratively nonconforming shall remain nonconforming until special approval has been granted pursuant to application submitted to the proper authority. Where special approval has been granted, such a structure or use shall be deemed conforming. However, where special approval has been denied, such structure or use shall be considered nonconforming on the basis for which the application for special approval was denied.

L. Change in Tenancy or Ownership.

In the event there is a change in tenancy, ownership or management of an existing nonconforming use or structure, such nonconforming use or structure shall be allowed to continue pursuant to the terms of this Ordinance regarding such nonconformities.

M. Special Exceptions.

Any use for which a special exception is permitted, as provided in this Ordinance, shall not be deemed a nonconformity.

Section 27.02 – Buildings, Structures, and Uses

A. Accessory Buildings, Structures and Uses. (amended 02.17.04)

1. An accessory building, structure or use shall not be located on a parcel unless there is a principal building, structure, or use already located on the same parcel of land.

2. An accessory building or structure shall not be constructed prior to the commencement of construction of the principal building or structure or the establishment of the principal use.

3. A building, structure or use which is accessory to a single-family dwelling and attached to it shall, for the purposes of location and setbacks, be considered part of the principal building.

4. A building, structure or use which is accessory to a single-family dwelling and detached from it shall meet the same front and side yard setback requirements as the principal structure, as set forth in the applicable zoning district of this Ordinance. However, the minimum rear yard setback shall be ten (10) feet for all detached accessory buildings. All accessory buildings and structures shall be included in the computation of total maximum area of all accessory buildings, and together with the principal building or structure shall not exceed the percentage of lot coverage requirements. (amended 07.16.18)

5. Detached accessory buildings or structures in non-residential districts shall conform to the height requirements for the principal building or structure, as set forth in the applicable zoning district, except as specifically permitted otherwise in this Ordinance. However, detached accessory buildings or structures in non-residential districts that exceed the height of the principal building or structure, as constructed, shall not be located in the front yard. (amended 07.16.18)

Detached accessory buildings or structures in residential districts shall not exceed the height of the principal building or structure as constructed. However, the height of a detached accessory building or structure may exceed the height of the principal building or structure, if said accessory building or structure is located at least one hundred fifty (150) feet distant and to the rear of the principal building or structure. In no case shall the height of a detached accessory building or structure exceed the maximum height requirement for the principal building or structure, as set forth in the applicable zoning district, except as specifically permitted otherwise in this Ordinance. (amended 07.16.18)
27.05 Landscaping, Fences and Walls

1. Location and Purpose. Entranceway structures shall be permitted in any required yard area for the purpose of indicating the entrance to a subdivision, multiple-family development, mobile home park, industrial park, office park, or similar planned development containing several buildings that are related in purpose.

   Entranceway structures shall be subject to the provisions concerning corner clearance, set forth in Section 27.03.

2. Construction and Design. Any entranceway structure shall be constructed of permanent, durable materials and shall be designed so as to be compatible with the architecture of surrounding development.

3. Site Plan. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any entranceway structure, a site plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and approval. The site plan shall include an elevation drawing and a cross-section of the proposed structure. The site plan shall show the relationship of the entranceway to the right-of-way of the intersecting roads and/or driveways.

H. Residential Fence and Wall Regulations.

Where permitted or required in this Ordinance, fences and walls in residential districts shall be subject to the provisions set forth in this section:

1. Lot Enclosures. Fences and walls used to enclose a lot shall be no higher than four (4) feet in height and shall be located on the lot line.

2. Privacy or Decorative Fences and Walls. Fences and walls erected primarily for privacy or decoration shall not be located within any required yard setback area and shall not exceed six (6) feet in height.

3. Corner Clearance. No fences or walls shall be erected, established or maintained on any corner lot so as to obscure the view of drivers in vehicles approaching the intersection. All specifications concerning corner clearance as set forth in Section 27.03 shall be complied with.

4. Large Lots Excluded. Fences and walls shall be excluded from the provisions of this section if such lots have an area of more than two (2) acres, have frontage of at least two hundred (200) feet, and are not part of a recorded plat.

5. Fences Enclosing Public Areas. Fences, walls or other protective barriers that enclose parks, playgrounds, or other public landscaped areas shall not exceed ten (10) feet in height. The Planning Commission may authorize a fence, wall, or protective barrier of additional height, with or without barbed wire, where necessary, to protect public utility or municipal installations in a residential district.

6. Wall Specifications. Walls shall be erected on a concrete foundation which shall have a minimum depth of forty-two (42) inches below grade. The foundation shall be at least four (4) inches wider than the wall to be erected.

7. Fence Specifications. Fences constructed of chain link, wood, vinyl or other similar materials are permitted. Posts shall be sunk into the ground at least three (3) feet.

8. Barbed Wire Prohibited. Barbed wire, spikes, nails, or any other sharp-pointed intrusions shall be prohibited on top or on the sides of any fence, wall, or protective barrier, except that barbed wire cradles consisting of no more than three (3) strands of wire may be placed on top of fences enclosing public utility buildings.
09-24-100-008 Zoned R-1 , 462 acres 20,124.72
2590 = 5, 031.18 

Request for a 6' fence 73' along the
west property line

Front setback needs to be 40'
Side yards need to be 10' each
Rear yard needs to be 10' OK

Maximum Accessory Structure N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage N/A
Wetland Setback N/A
Deck Setback N/A
Height N/A
Not increasing a non-conformity

Variances granted:
10/24/16 - granted a 10' variance side yard for a 6' fence
to remain on the property line (North)
To whom it may concern,

Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the meeting in person, therefore I am writing to express my concerns about the requested variance.

1. I do not oppose to allowing a 6 Ft fence where it continues between said property and Round Tree subdivision. I would assume that the fence will be the same size and style of what is currently there for appearance.
2. All other fence lines should stay at the 4 Ft fence line to be consistent with the current Lake Orion Code.

It would not be fair to grant this person a 6 ft fence when his neighbor was denied. This would give an appearance of a compound minus a gate for this property as well.

It was my understanding that the fence between the 2 properties off of Bald Mountain was to be 4 ft. It appears that 2001 Bald Mountain did not cut all required fencing to the 4 Ft as was stated when he was in front of the board.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Also if you could send me the outcome of the hearing I would greatly appreciate it.

Phyllis Sleight
2013 Starlight Trail
Lake Orion, MI 48360
248-672-3472
sleightp@yahoo.com
The fire department has review to two cases and has no concerns at this time.

Jeffrey Williams, CFPS – Fire Marshal
Orion Township Fire Department - Fire Prevention
3365 Gregory Road Lake Orion, MI 48359
Fax: 248.309.6993

From: Courtney Keisman <ckelman@oriontownship.org>
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2022 10:30 AM
To: Jeffrey Williams <jwilliams@oriontownship.org>
Subject: ZBA Documents for the November 28, 2022 ZBA Meeting
Importance: High

Mr. Williams.

Hello Jeff. Attached is 2 ZBA cases that needs to be reviewed by you for the November 28, 2022 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
MEMORANDUM

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: Lynn Harrison, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
DATE: November 17, 2022
SUBJECT: Staff Report for AB-2022-49, Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd.

The applicant is proposing to attach a pole barn he is constructing to his home. The applicant received a variance earlier this year on 5/9/2022 for maximum square footage of all detached accessory structures for the addition of the pole barn.

By attaching the pole to the home will exceed the maximum allowed of 75% of an attached accessory structure to the size of the principal structure. The proposed breezeway of 72-sq. ft. is considered part of the house and not the pole barn and therefore increases the size of the house by 72-sq. ft.

All required setbacks will be met; lot coverage will not be exceeded; and because of the previous variance received, maximum size of all accessory structures will also not be exceeded.

If you decide to grant the variance – be sure to include that the variance is approved per plans date stamped October 27, 2022.

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: November 17, 2022

RE: AB-2022-49, Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd., 09-30-200-027

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-2022-49, Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd., 09-30-200-027, I would move that the petitioner’s request for:

1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF - Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8) Buildings, Structures, and Uses

1. A 556-sq. ft. variance above the allowed 852-sq. ft. (75% of the principal structure) for an attached accessory structure to be 1,408-sq. ft.

be granted 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-2022-49, Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd., 09-30-200-027, I would move that the petitioner’s request for:

1 variance from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned SF - Article XXVII, Section 27.02 (A)(8)
Buildings, Structures, and Uses

1. A 556-sq. ft. variance above the allowed 852-sq. ft. (75% of the principal structure) for an attached accessory structure to be 1,408-sq. ft.

be denied 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: Jeff Hanson
Address: 3936 Maybee Rd City/State/Zip: ________________
Phone: 248-770-3604 Cell: ________________ Fax: ________________
Email: jeff_hanson1969@gmail.com

PROPERTY OWNER(S)
Name (s): Same
Address: __________________________ City/State/Zip: ________________
Phone: __________________________ Cell: __________________________ Fax: ________________
Email: __________________________

CONTACT PERSON FOR THIS REQUEST
Name: Same Phone: __________________________ Email: __________________________

SUBJECT PROPERTY
Address: Same Sidwell Number: 09-30-200-037
Total Acreage: 4.06 Length of Ownership by Current Property Owner: 2 Years, 1 Months

Does the owner have control over any properties adjoining this site? No
Zoning Ordinance Allowance/Requirement Deviation requested 663 sq. ft.

Page 2 of 4
Case #: __________________

RESIDENTIAL VARIANCE

1. Describe in detail the nature of the request. Would like to connect house to pole barn with breezeway. Need variance of 663 sq. ft due to house being smaller than barn.

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. My pole barn is close enough to my house to allow this.

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: This will have no impact whatsoever on anyone in surrounding areas.

4. Explain how the request is/is not consistent with other properties in the immediate area, please site examples if possible: I believe other properties pole barns are much further from their house

5. Describe how the alleged practical difficulty has not been self-created.

6. The topography of said land makes the setbacks impossible to meet because: N/A

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. This ordinance does not allow me to have an attached garage
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:
(must be original ink signature) ________________ Date: ________________
Print Name: JEFF HANSON

Signature of Property Owner:
(must be original ink signature) ________________ Date: ________________
Print Name: JEFF HANSON

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: ________________
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 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 11/78.85):

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

* 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 11/78.85 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.
RECEIVED
Oct 27, 2022
Orion Township Planning & Zoning

22 x 64 = 1,408 ft

pole barn

9 ft

8 ft

proposed breezeway
Jeff Hanson, 3936 Maybee Rd, 09-30-200-037
4.058 176,766.48 20% = 35,353.30 Zoned SF

Lot Coverage:
House 1,064
Proposed Breezeway 72
Porch 12
Deck 468
Carport 468
Pole Barn / Garage 1,408

Received a variance of 476 for Accessory Structures on 5/19/2022

House 1064
Proposed Breezeway 72

Pole Barn = 1,408

75% of House = 873

852

Pole Barn = 536

75% of House = 873

852

Variance 663

556
The fire department has review to two cases and has no concerns at this time.

Jeffrey Williams, CFPS – Fire Marshal
Orion Township Fire Department - Fire Prevention
3365 Gregory Road Lake Orion, MI 48359
Fax: 248.309.8993

From: Courtney Keisman <ckeisman@oriontownship.org>
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2022 10:30 AM
To: Jeff Williams <jwilliams@oriontownship.org>
Subject: ZBA Documents for the November 28, 2022 ZBA Meeting
Importance: High

Mr. Williams.

Hello Jeff. Attached is 2 ZBA cases that needs to be reviewed by you for the November 28, 2022 ZBA Meeting.

Thank you,