

CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

*REPORT OF MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 20TH, 2020*

PARTICIPATING: Michael Deyak, Vice-Chairperson
Robert M. Campbell, Secretary
Ronald DiBartolomeo
David Merrill
Thomas Mill
Kenneth Pearl

ABSENT: Francis Marella, Chairperson (Excused)

STAFF: Bruce Thompson, AICP, Director
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by remote participation via teleconference. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Campbell requested the following addition to the agenda, due to the fact that at their last meeting on March 18th, there were only three people at that meeting who had been at the February meeting, which did not constitute enough votes for approval, so that needs to be added to tonight's agenda:

Item #6A – Report of Meeting – Approval of February 19, 2020 Report

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Mill, to approve the agenda as amended, with the addition of Item #6A – Approval of February 19, 2020 Report. Motion carried.

Mr. Deyak explained that the Board of Appeals functions as a quasi-judicial body with specific powers and limitations, as outlined in various sections of the Zoning Ordinance and state statutes. He noted the Zoning Ordinance sets the standards the Board of Appeals must use in any decision, and once the decision of the Board of Appeals becomes final, only the courts can modify or reverse that decision. He stated his board is not empowered to change the terms or intent of an ordinance. Anyone who wants to amend an ordinance must petition the Township Board of Trustees.

Mr. Deyak explained that before a variance can be granted, certain requirements must be satisfied: 1) Practical difficulty must be demonstrated; 2) Whether strict compliance with area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for permitted purpose or would render conformity unnecessary and burdensome; 3) Whether a variance would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district or whether a lesser relaxation would give substantial relief and more consistent with justice to others; and 4) The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances of the property.

Mr. Deyak reviewed how the public hearing will be conducted. He further explained that, as stipulated in the Township Ordinances, all variances granted by the Board of Appeals are subject to several standard conditions as follows: 1) The petitioner must comply with all applicable requirements of Township ordinances; 2) The project work requiring the variance must be completed within two years of the date that the variance was granted; 3) The project work must be completed substantially in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board of Appeals; and 4) The variance is valid only for the useful life of any structure(s) on the property for which variance is granted.

**LOT 162, CLINTON OAKS SUBDIVISION, LOCATED NORTH OF SOUTH OAK,
WEST OF ROMEO PLANK ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 18773 SOUTH OAK (PARCEL
#16-11-17-228-026)**

**- APPEAL: SFR – SOUTH OAK, 18773
FILE #20-6929: PETITIONED BY MR. ROBERT KALMANEK**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated April 30th, 2020 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 36 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. There was one written reply received via email from Francis Wisniewski, which has been distributed to all members of the Zoning Board of Appeals, expressing support of the variance request. He noted that the Planning Department made a couple of attempts to find out his address, but their requests were unanswered. He added that Assessing's records reflect that person lives at 40812 Oakwood, which appears to be immediately behind the petitioner's house.

Mr. Robert Kalmanek, 18773 South Oak Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, stated he would like to tear his old garage down and rebuild a new one to provide more storage. He indicated he would be paying the same price, regardless of whether it measures 27 or 28 feet in depth. He added the 28 feet in depth would result in 22 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted size.

There were no participants from the GoToMeeting audience who indicated they would like to speak on this issue.

Mr. Campbell questioned whether Mr. Wisniewski is the petitioner's neighbor immediately behind the garage and swimming pool.

Mr. Kalmanek replied Mr. Wisniewski does not live directly behind but two doors down on the street behind his home.

Mr. Campbell questioned whether Mr. Kalmanek had an opportunity to talk to the neighbor who would be most affected by this larger garage.

Mr. Kalmanek replied affirmatively, noting she and a couple of other neighbors came over because they did not know what he was proposing. He explained the Notice of Public Hearing referred to "structure", so he explained his plans to them. He assured that once they realized it was a garage, they had no objections.

Mr. Merrill noted that a garage 27 feet in depth would meet ordinance requirements, yet Mr. Kalmanek indicated he is requesting 28 feet in depth because it would cost the same. He questioned as to whether this is the reason for the variance.

Mr. Kalmanek replied that is according to the quote he received from the lumber company.

Mr. Campbell clarified that a variance cannot be granted based on financial difficulty, he felt the important part represented by the petitioner is the fact that he is looking for additional storage space. He pointed out that with the swimming pool, he believed the additional storage would be necessary for the pool equipment.

Mr. Kalmanek replied that is correct.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pearl, with reference to File #20-6929 and application from Mr. Robert Kalmanek, 18773 South Oak Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1298.01-(b), Accessory Buildings (Including Garages), concerning Lot 162, Clinton Oaks Subdivision, located fronting the north line of South Oak, west of Romeo Plank Road, addressed as 18773 South Oak Drive (Parcel #16-11-17-228-026), that variance be granted to permit the construction of a 672-square-foot accessory structure for a single-family residence in the R-5 One-Family Residential District, which is 22 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 650 square feet permitted; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty of having to provide storage for household belongings as well as equipment to maintain the inground swimming pool; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances.

Mr. Thompson stated no emails were received from the public.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Pearl, DiBartolomeo, Merrill, Mill, Deyak. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Motion carried.

LOT 37, MARTIN SUBDIVISION, LOCATED FRONTING THE NORTH SIDE OF MORAVIAN DRIVE, EAST OF GARFIELD, ADDRESSED AS 36711 MORAVIAN (PARCEL #16-11-29-102-016)

**- APPEAL: SFR – MORAVIAN, 36711
FILE #20-6930: PETITIONED BY MR. JONATHON GRUBER**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated March 20th, 2020 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 21 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 2 of those returned as undeliverable. There were no written replies received in response to the mailing.

Mr. Jonathon Gruber, 36711 Moravian Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated he is requesting a variance for this garage because his current one-car attached garage is not allowing for sufficient storage, especially when he has to park his larger vehicle inside in the winter. He commented that several of his neighbors have similar structures so he was hoping to be approved for this structure.

There were no participants from the GoToMeeting audience who indicated they would like to speak on this issue.

Mr. Campbell looked at the material turned in by the petitioner, and he noted the petitioner did a lot of research on the sizes of garages in his area. He felt, however, that is not a sufficient practical difficulty. He understood that the need for additional storage is a reasonable argument but pointed out this is a very large garage. He suggested this be postponed to give the petitioner an opportunity to submit a fairly detailed list of the items he proposes to store in order to provide support to justify why he needs such a large garage. He indicated the approval should be based upon what is needed for safety or security of his property, and not based on the sizes of garages other property owners have been granted.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether the petitioner, at this time, can provide a list of what he intends to store in the garage.

Mr. Gruber replied to inquiry that he has a 26-foot boat on a trailer, two (2) Silverado 1500 trucks, a Mustang, and a few dirt bikes. He stated he measured what he would like to store and included room for extra box storage on the side and room to walk around, then he drafted it on AutoCAD. He replied to inquiry he is proposing to construct this structure in his rear yard.

Mr. Merrill questioned whether Mr. Gruber talked with his neighbor to the east.

Mr. Gruber replied to inquiry that he talked with his neighbor, Mr. Schmitz, and he seemed to be ok with it, additionally offering to help him during construction.

Mr. Thompson stated the plot plan submitted by the petitioner indicates the proposed garage would be located 55 feet behind the rear building line of the home.

Mr. Campbell questioned as to the purpose of the existing additional 192-square-foot structure.

Mr. Gruber replied that is a shed in his backyard, which was there when he moved in. He added that he keeps his lawnmowers in that shed.

Mr. Mill questioned whether the two Silverado trucks referred to by the petitioner are company trucks or personal trucks. He expressed concern about running a business out of a single-family home.

Mr. Gruber replied one of the trucks is his personal truck, and the other truck belongs to his girlfriend and is her personal truck.

Mr. DiBartolomeo recalled they have had these types of requests come before them, and they were granted in the past. He stated he does not have an issue with this request, and felt it is better than having the homeowner keeping things all over his yard. He commented that if the petitioner is willing to spend the money and preserve the things he purchases by keeping them in the garage, he does not have an objection to it.

Mr. Merrill concurred with Mr. DiBartolomeo.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Merrill, with reference to File #20-6930 and application from Mr. Jonathon Gruber, 36711 Moravian Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1298.01-(b), Accessory Structures (Including Garages), concerning Lot 37, Martin Subdivision, located fronting the north line of Moravian Drive, east of Garfield Road, addressed as 36711 Moravian Drive (Parcel #16-11-29-102-016), that variance be granted to permit the construction of a 1,300-square-foot accessory structure (garage) for a single-family residence in the R-3 One-Family Residential District which, in addition to the existing 192-square-foot accessory structure, totals 1,492 square feet, being 790 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 702 square feet allowed (based on 2% of the total lot size of 0.806 acre); further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty being the necessity of safely and securely storing personal property, vehicles, additional dirt bikes and a boat and trailer; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances.

There were no additional comments or emails received from the public.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Merrill, DiBartolomeo, Mill, Pearl, Deyak. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Motion carried.

THE NORTH 60 FEET OF LOT 61, AND ALL OF LOT 62, GROESBECK-NUNNELEY SUBDIVISION, BEING 1.369 ACRES FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GROESBECK HIGHWAY, SOUTH OF METRO PARKWAY, ADDRESSED AS 36401 GROESBECK (PARCEL #16-11-28-253-002)

**- APPEAL: ELITE ROAD SERVICE & RECOVERY LLC
FILE #20-6931: PETITIONED BY MR. VITO DIGAETANO,
ELITE ROAD SERVICE & RECOVERY, LLC
REPRESENTED BY MR. BENJAMIN J. ALOIA, ESQ.**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated March 20th, 2020 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 53 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. There was one written extensive email received from Mr. Sam Buschell, and that was distributed all members of the Zoning Board.

Mr. Benjamin Aloia, on behalf of the petitioner, stated that Mr. Mark Deldin is also participating in tonight's meeting on behalf of the petitioner. He added that Mr. Vito Digaetano, petitioner, is also on the line this evening but is listening. Mr. Aloia explained the use they have submitted for, which is open storage of vehicles, is permitted within the I-2 General Industrial District. He specified Chapter 1298.09-(b) of the Ordinance, which defines open storage as equipment, boats, airplanes and other natural and manmade materials, shall be permitted in the I-2 General Industrial District, subject to regulations unless otherwise provided in the Zoning Code. He clarified they are not requesting a variance to allow open vehicle storage, but his client owns a towing company and the main issue specifies that open storage shall only be in a side or rear yard and shall be screened from public view, from public rights-of-way, and front yards of adjoining residential districts by an enclosure consisting of obscuring masonry wall, six feet in height. Mr. Aloia explained this is an existing business which had similar outdoor vehicles in the rear yard, and they are attempting to start the business here. It has an existing chain-link fence. He stressed they respectfully disagree with the Township Planner's decision saying that they need a masonry wall around the entire storage yard because they need to obscure the view. He felt it is not needed and a masonry wall would only be necessary to obscure from public view, from public rights-of-way and front yards of adjoining residential districts. He pointed out if this site was looked at on Google, the north side of the property from Groesbeck is the drive into the rear storage yard. The south side of the property has a chain-link fence but it leads to the grass yard. He pointed out that the storage yard is obscured by a row of high bushes so there is no view of the storage yard from Groesbeck. Mr. Aloia stated on either side of this property are commercial/industrial type businesses, one being an auto business and the other side having a carpet store and hydroponics store. He claimed the auto business has vehicles lined up and down the side where the existing chain link fence is located. He stated the rear of the subject property is the railroad track, with trees between their yard and the tracks. He did not feel their rear yard is visible beyond their existing fence and tree line. They are requesting that this Board

determine either that the Planner did not make the appropriate denial because they do not need to obscure from view, but rather only public view, and he explained their definition of “public view”. If this Board agrees with the Planner that a masonry wall is required, then he indicated they are requesting a variance from that requirement to allow the chain link fence for the reasons stated in their application. He claimed their practical difficulty is that the chain link fence is existing and the installation of a masonry wall would upset the drainage, especially in the rear yard where the grade rises. He felt a masonry wall would impede the natural flow of water between properties. He offered to answer questions.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for public comments, but there were no participants from the GoToMeeting audience who indicated they would like to speak on this issue.

Mr. Pearl stated he has reviewed this extensively, and he felt the drainage problem can be resolved even if a masonry wall is required. He also reminded that they cannot consider financial reasons as a practical difficulty, so the fact that they already have a fence in place cannot be considered as a practical difficulty. He conferred with the Township attorney, and Mr. Thompson has stated that “public view is public view”. He looked at it slightly different and felt that possibly the Township Board can look at changing the ordinance. He looked at “public view” as to an area where public is invited but does not count employees. He felt the petitioner is correct that to the north, there is a parking area. To the south, it does not appear as those are the entrances to the industrial buildings, but it is driveway parking, possibly used to leave vehicles that they are working on. He felt that in the rear of the property, there is a clear view during the winter months of the apartments on the other side of the railroad tracks. He felt that will need to be screened but could not recall where they have required masonry walls in the past. He recalled that vinyl slats were permitted in the existing fencing along the back of property north of 15 Mile Road, north of McDonald’s.

Mr. Thompson recalled a variance being granted for property to the north of 15 Mile Road, although he could not recall the type of screening, but he cannot speak to the history of this as he has only been with the Township for a year-and-a-half. He stated he does not know what has been done in the past but can only apply the ordinances on the books at this time.

Mr. Pearl felt the Board may have to look at this with regard to “public view”, adding that the public is not invited to the north and south of this building. He felt they may need to screen off the small greenbelt area to screen it from the vehicles traveling on Groesbeck. He pointed out there is a 60-foot area beyond the auto hospital that is open to the south, and that should possibly be screened with slats. He deferred to the other Board members for further discussion.

Mr. Aloia stated his client is willing to put slats in the fencing to obscure views, and he apologized for not mentioning that earlier.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether Mr. Aloia is referring to the rear view and any view open to the general public.

Mr. Aloia replied affirmatively.

Mr. DiBartolomeo recalled a lengthy discussion about the parcel along Groesbeck that was also visible to apartments. He recalled they agreed to grant the variance but to require the obscuring vinyl slats in the chain-link fence as opposed to the masonry wall. He felt this is the same situation, and he agreed with Mr. Pearl that is a part of the ordinance the Board may need to address in the future. He felt to stay consistent, the slats would work fine without requiring a masonry wall.

Mr. Campbell stated his recollection over many years is that the only property that has been granted a variance to allow the vinyl slats in the chain link fence in lieu of the required masonry wall was the property adjacent to McDonalds, located north of 15 Mile Road. He explained this was recently granted within the last year, but he could recall no other variances granted along the west side of Groesbeck. He agreed with Mr. Pearl that they have to be concerned with the residential properties on the other side of the railroad tracks. He commented some may think they are too far away to be affected, but he claimed a view of Google Earth reflects the property in question on Groesbeck is only about 175 feet from the closest residential property on the other side of the railroad tracks. He felt that is close enough to be a concern and the view from those properties should be protected. He stated he could go along with this only if the slats are required to be put into the fence to bring it to a height of six feet.

Mr. Deyak questioned the age and condition of the existing fence.

Mr. Aloia replied he does not know how long it has been in existence, but he added it is in fair condition.

Mr. Deyak questioned whether this Board required the planting of a row of Arborvitaes as well as the addition of the vinyl slats in the chain link fence.

Mr. Thompson replied it was different because they proposed screening of the site along the south lot line with a solid vinyl fence, and they requested a waiver along the back and north side. He noted the north side had existing trees that had been there for a number of years and served to screen the storage area from the industrial office buildings to the north. The landscape plan had Arborvitaes running across the entire front of the storage yard, even to the back of the proposed building.

Mr. Merrill questioned whether this will be more of an impound yard or whether it will be used more for vehicles being repaired.

Mr. Aloia replied it will be a towing and storage yard. He replied to further inquiry that there will be impounded vehicles stored in this yard.

Mr. Deyak inquired as to whether that will also involve repossessed vehicles.

Mr. Aloia asked Mr. Digaetano the question and reported back that they will not be dealing with repossessed cars. Mr. Aloia also reported that, while Mr. Digaetano does not know the age of the fence, he indicated it is “in decent shape”.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Campbell, with reference to File #20-6931 and application from Mr. Vito Digaetano, of Elite Road Service & Recovery LLC, 34345 Groesbeck, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, as represented by Mr. Benjamin J. Aloia, Esq., Aloia & Associates, P.C., 48 South Main, Suite 3, Mount Clemens, Michigan 48043, and Mr. Marc A. Deldin, of Deldin Law, 18720 Mack Avenue, Suite 270, Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan 48236, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1298.09-(b)-(1), Supplementary Regulations, Open Storage of Vehicles, Open Storage in the I-2 District, concerning the north 10 feet of Lot 61 and all of Lot 62, Groesbeck-Nunneley Subdivision, generally located fronting the west line of Groesbeck Highway, south of Metro Parkway, addressed as 36401 Groesbeck (Parcel #16-11-28-253-002), that variance be granted to permit the utilization of a site in the I-2 General Industrial District for a towing and recovery business (Elite Road Service & Recovery, LLC), with a six (6) foot high chain link fence around the perimeter of the proposed rear storage area in lieu of the required minimum six (6) foot high screening wall; further, this variance is granted with the condition that the petitioner has agreed to provide vinyl slats up to six (6) feet in height on the chain link fence along the rear of the property, along the chain link fence a distance extending sixty (60) feet on the south side beyond the neighboring building line, and along the front portion of the chain link fence south of the building to the lot line to screen the view of the property from the public; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty that area of public view is to the rear and a small area in the front, but the remainder is not in public view; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances.

There were no additional comments or emails received from the public.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Pearl, Campbell, DiBartolomeo, Merrill, Mill, Deyak. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Motion carried.

**0.902 ACRE OF LAND FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF HAYES ROAD, SOUTH OF
CANAL ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 42400 HAYES ROAD (PARCEL #16-11-07-151-022)
- APPEAL: CLEANVIEW AUTO WASH
FILE #20-6932: PETITIONED BY MR. FRANK TOMA,
CLEANVIEW AUTO WASH
REPRESENTED BY MR. JOE DAKHI, ONE-STOP SIGNS & LIGHTING**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated March 20th, 2020 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 64 owners and/or occupants of property

located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. There were no written replies received in response to the mailing.

Mr. Joseph Dakhi, 3731 Ravenswood, Marysville, Michigan 48040, representative, explained they are asking for an additional 30 square footage for their electronic message center. They did not feel that 20 square feet is adequate representation. He added that they cannot meet that size, and he felt the size of the building calls for the larger sign.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for public comments, but there were no participants from the GoToMeeting audience who indicated they would like to speak on this issue.

Mr. Campbell noted that 50 square feet for an electronic changeable copy message sign would tie McLaren Macomb as the largest changeable copy sign in Clinton Township. He indicated that is the only sign even close in size to what is being proposed, with the Parkway Auto's sign on Hall Road measuring 44.7 square feet. He felt in reviewing the size of the signs, there are a number of factors that are important, such as the width of the right-of-way. He added that there are a lot of larger signs on Hall Road, Gratiot, and Groesbeck for that reason. He noted that densely-populated business areas can also be a factor, and granting a larger sign is in the interest of making sure a property is visible. He explained they also have the factors of nearby residential property, and in this case, the location is not densely populated with businesses, there are some offices and small strip malls, and there is no question that a sign would be readily visible to traffic traveling both north and south. Mr. Campbell pointed out that across Hayes to the west, although it is in Sterling Heights, there is residentially-zoned property. He stated he is opposed to a sign of this size. He recalled approving signs in the past measuring 30 square feet, realizing the 20-square-foot maximum may be on the small side. He felt 50 square feet is excessive, not necessary, would be a detriment to the area, and he stated he is opposed to the request, adding he could go along with no more than 30 square feet.

Mr. Deyak questioned the height of the sign and whether it will be brought into compliance with the current sign ordinance.

Mr. Thompson replied he would have to look at it, but he does not believe it exceeds any other ordinance requirements according to the information received from the Building Department.

Mr. Merrill questioned whether they are proposing to replace a portion of their sign with an LED message center, and he further inquired as to whether the LED portion of the proposed sign will be a two-tone color display or multi-color display.

Mr. Dakhi replied it would be a full-color display. He replied to further inquiry that they are proposing to remove the "Power-Dry Vacuum" portion of the sign and retrofit the LED portion to put in that section.

Mr. Merrill questioned whether the existing “Power-Dry Vacuum” portion of the sign measures 5 feet by 10 feet., or whether the proposed LED is larger.

Mr. Dakhi replied the existing portion of that sign is not 5 feet by 10 feet. He explained the top portion actually measures 5 feet by 10 feet. He felt if they were permitted 30 square feet as suggested by Mr. Campbell, it would fit perfectly.

Mr. Deyak questioned the total square footage of the entire sign. He commented that it appears very large, and he noted that they have required other businesses on Garfield to bring their signs into compliance.

Mr. Pearl recalled that the ordinance has recently been changed.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that is correct.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pearl, with reference to File #20-6932 and application from Mr. Frank Toma, of Cleanview Auto Wash, 44640 Morley Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, as represented by Mr. Joe Dakhi, One Stop Signs and Lighting, 3731 Ravenswood, Marysville, Michigan 48040, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Chapter 1488.02-(d), Signs, “Changeable Copy”, concerning 0.902 acre of land fronting the east line of Hayes Road, south of Canal Road, addressed as 42400 Hayes Road (Parcel #16-11-07-151-022), that variance to permit the replacement of an existing portion of a sign for a commercial business in the B-2 Community Business District (Cleanview Auto Wash) with a **50-square-foot** electronic message center sign, be **denied**; however, that variance to permit the replacement of an existing portion of portion of the sign with a **30-square-foot** electronic message center, being 10 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 20-square-feet, be **approved**; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed undue hardship that typical electronic message center signs are typically about 30 square feet; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances.

There were no additional comments or emails received from the public.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes –Campbell, Pearl, DiBartolomeo, Merrill, Mill, Deyak. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for public comments, but there were no participants from the GoToMeeting audience who indicated they would like to speak.

Mr. Thompson confirmed there were no additional emails received from the public.

REPORTS OF MEETINGS

- **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 19TH, 2020 REPORT**
 - **APPROVAL OF MARCH 18TH, 2020 REPORT**
-

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Mill, to approve the minutes of the February 19th, 2020 Report of Meeting, with the changes as noted at the February meeting. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Mill, Pearl, DiBartolomeo. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Abstain – Deyak, Merrill. Motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Mill, to approve the minutes of the March 20th, 2020 Report of Meeting, as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Mill, Merrill, Pearl. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Abstain – Deyak, DiBartolomeo. Motion carried.

BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING SCHEDULE

- **CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA AND ATTENDANCE:
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17TH, 2020 AT 6:30 P.M.**
-

Mr. Thompson confirmed the next Board of Appeals meeting for Wednesday, June 17th, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. He advised that there are three cases, all of which are coming to this Board through the Planning Commission. He explained they all deal with site development plans, and he briefly outlined the three cases for the next meeting: 1) The Redwoods Condominiums, a small condominium development on the north side of Canal, east of Hayes; 2) Dunkin Donuts Drive-Thru at BP Gas Station at the southwest corner of Hall and Gratiot; and 3) Henry Ford Macomb Hospital Addition. Mr. Thompson explained where the addition is proposed to be added at the hospital.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Merrill, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Campbell

Robert M. Campbell, Secretary
CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

ces:05/26/20
ces:05/30/20
ces:0618/20
Approved 06/17/20