

CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

*REPORT OF MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17TH, 2020*

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

Mr. Deyak advised that there are only five members of the Board of Appeals present this evening, and in order for a variance to be granted, a vote in favor by at least four members is required. He questioned whether anyone would like to postpone their item until they have a full board present, but no one indicated that choice.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Campbell stated they have a revised agenda which reflects the request for approval of the minutes from the August 19th, 2020 meeting which were postponed from last night's meeting.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to approve the amended agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Mr. Deyak announced that this meeting is being held virtually via GoToMeeting. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Governor issued Emergency Order 20-154, authorizing remote participation of public meetings in order to avoid person-to-person contact. Prior to the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, a dedicated email has been established, directing emails to the Zoning Board. A dedicated email address has been established to direct emails to the Zoning Board, which allows them contact via email to

provide input and ask questions regarding agenda items prior to the meeting. He advised the email is zba@clintontownship-mi.gov. Throughout the meeting and on agenda items, emails relating to the specific agenda item will be read prior to the Zoning Board voting on each agenda item. Following consideration of all of the agenda items, persons who have connected remotely will be permitted to speak, adhering to existing rules of participation.

Mr. Deyak addressed the procedure related to public comment. The Chairperson will acknowledge all persons wishing to address the Board during the public comment period, and they are to provide their name and address. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes, and comments must be confined to Zoning Board of Appeals business, being topics over which the Zoning Board of Appeals has authority and which involves Zoning Board of Appeals matters. Should the Board decide that a response to a specific question raised by persons in that Public Comment section is needed, they shall refer the questions to the Planning & Community Development Department Director or his designee for review.

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 reaching 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 advised that there are only five members of the Board of Appeals present this evening, and in order for a variance to be granted, a vote in favor by at least four members is required. He questioned whether anyone would like to postpone their item until they have a full board present, but no one indicated that choice.

LOT 266, INGLESIDE FARMS #1 SUBDIVISION, LOCATED SOUTH OF REMICK, EAST OF S. GRATIOT, ADDRESSED AS 22940 REMICK DRIVE (PARCEL #16-11-23-326-011)

- **APPEAL: SFR – REMICK, 22940**

FILE #20-6951: PETITIONED BY MS. ALEXANDRA BETTINI

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested. He advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 37 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 6 of those returned as undeliverable. No emails or written replies were received as of late this afternoon.

Ms. Alexandra Bettini, 22940 E. Remick, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, replied to inquiry that she would like to proceed with her petition this evening. She explained they are requesting an additional two-foot height on their fence. She explained that her property abuts a logistics company, and there is a concrete wall between them. The ground of the logistics company property is elevated, so from their side, a height of six feet looks down into their yard. She stated they have a young daughter so it is not comfortable with people being able to peer into their yard. She added they have a half-acre so they have a good-sized lot, but the fence does not do any good at six feet in height, which is why they are requesting the ability to add an additional two feet to the height. She stressed it is a privacy issue for them because the employees come up to the wall and smoke, and they look over the wall.

Mr. Thompson replied he has received no emails regarding this issue.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for comments or questions from the participating audience, but no one spoke.

Mr. Campbell questioned what they are going to do with the existing masonry wall that is in a significant amount of disrepair. He questioned whether that wall belongs to Ms. Bettini or to the abutting property owners.

Ms. Bettini replied that wall belongs to the abutting property owners. She replied to further inquiry that she has not asked the abutting owners to help them with this fence.

Mr. Campbell inquired as to whether they will build their fence next to the wall.

Ms. Bettini replied they will put up the fence on their own property. She replied to further inquiry that they are going to use treated red cedar.

Mr. Campbell felt the proposed plan is good and is a reasonable request.

Mr. Pearl questioned the distance between the two fences.

Ms. Bettini replied that she would have to ask the contractor who will be installing the fence, but she assured it will not be right up against the wall.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether there would be any way to do maintenance between the fence and the neighboring wall.

Ms. Bettini replied there would not be a large gap, but she assured it will not abut the wall.

Mr. Merrill pointed out that if the fence is four inches away from the wall, his concern would be overgrown grass or maintenance of the property. He felt she has a very valid point in making this request, but he wanted to make sure they are able to keep everything maintained.

Ms. Bettini assured they take great pride in their property and do not plan on moving.

Mr. Campbell felt the concern is that with only a few inches between the wall and the fence, it could be difficult to maintain and keep trimmed. He felt it would be good if they could take the wall down.

Ms. Bettini replied that would be nice, although she does not know if the abutting property owners are willing to do that. She explained they were also thinking about keeping a two-foot distance between the wall and the fence, and putting paver rocks in between, which would help keep the grass from growing in between.

Mr. Deyak suggested if they keep that distance, put down some landscape fabric and cobblestone, it should not be a problem.

Mr. DiBartolomeo felt their other option is to butt the fence right up to the wall.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Campbell, with reference to File #20-6951 and application from Ms. Alexandra Bettini, 22940 E. Remick Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Chapter 1472.03-(f), Fences, General Requirements, Height, concerning Lot 266, Ingleside Farms #1 Subdivision, fronting the south line of Remick, east of Gratiot, addressed as 22940 E. Remick Drive (Parcel #16-11-23-326-011), that variance be granted to permit the installation of an 8-foot-high privacy fence in the side yard of a single-family residence in the R-3 One-Family Residential District, which is 2 feet in excess of the maximum permitted height of 6 feet; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty that the additional height of the fence will provide privacy for the occupants of the home; further, this variance is granted on the condition that the fence is to be installed in such a manner that will resolve the problem of growth between the proposed fence and the existing wall on the abutting property, either by installing the fence against the existing wall, or by the use of landscape fabric and stone between the fence and the wall; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no emails have been received regarding this item.

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

LOT 256, PARTRIDGE CREEK VILLAGE SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MERGANSER AND BUFFLEHEAD LANE, ADDRESSED AS 17873 MERGANSER DRIVE (PARCEL #16-11-05-307-014)

- **APPEAL: SFR – MERGANSER, 17873 (FOR TRANSFORM RX, LLC)
FILE #20-6950: PETITIONED BY MR. FERNANDO GAMARRA &
MS. MONICA BUCELLATO**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested. He advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 46 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. He added there were about eleven emails and written replies received in response to this request.

Mr. Deyak reminded there are five Board members present this evening and four votes are needed for a motion to pass. He offered the opportunity to the petitioners to postpone this case until the next Zoning Board meeting, where they will have more than five members present. He stated if the vote is 3 to 2, it is denied.

Mr. Campbell commented that if it is a 3 to 2 vote, it is not denied but is postponed until the next meeting. That applies whether the motion is to approve or to deny.

Mr. Thompson clarified they need four positive votes on a motion one way or the other, and if they do not get the four votes, the motion is denied.

Ms. Monica Buccellato, petitioner, inquired as to the date of the next meeting.

Mr. Thompson replied the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 21st.

Ms. Buccellato replied to inquiry that they would like to proceed this evening with their request.

Mr. Fernando Gamarra and Ms. Monica Buccellato, petitioners, provided their address as 17873 Merganser Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038.

Ms. Monica Buccellato thanked the Board for considering their request this evening. She explained they opened their business in Fall 2019. They started operating out of their basement. She left her 15-year as a CPA to do this full-time. They researched the zoning laws at the time and understood they could run the business in their basement. Since that time, they have all been affected from the Covid-19 pandemic, and on March 17th, 2020, per the Governor's orders, they closed everything down and notified everyone who was coming to their gym at the time. A couple of weeks prior to

June 8th, she recalled the Governor said it was permissible to work out in an outside environment. With her husband's G.I. position and the fact that 90 percent of his cases were canceled unless they were life-threatening, his income went to \$0. She added that the little income she had went to \$0, and with the new laws allowing them to work outside, they were trying to do their best to try to provide for their family and at the same time provide a way for people to work out and find sanity amidst Covid. She explained they have worked out personally in their garage and there have never been any complaints with them using it personally, so they moved their small fitness classes to the gym in their garage since they had to follow the Governor's orders of not being able to work out inside.

Mr. Gamarra claimed that, from the beginning when they opened their business, their intention was always to eventually get a commercial space. When Covid hit, it was impossible to obtain a commercial space because no one was leasing, although they are now working with a realtor. He reiterated operating out of their home has always been a temporary plan, and he claimed that if the pandemic had not hit, this would have resolved itself.

Ms. Buccellato questioned whether it would be possible to be granted a variance until the end of 2020 so they have an opportunity to find a commercial space. She complained that if they are unable to get this variance, it would put an end to their business, so they are asking the Township for a little understanding.

Mr. Campbell stated he will read the letters received, noting he has put them in alphabetical order by the sender's last names. He read letters from the following:

- Dr. David J. Castle – opposed; did not feel it is appropriate for homeowner to operate a commercial fitness center in their garage.
- Ms. Jamie Deratany – neighbor in support; no issues or experience with noise or traffic on the street; supports their business and is a client.
- Ms. Julie Fett – resident in the subdivision; no objection to request; commented they maintain their home very well and do not have multiple families living in their house; enjoys being able to work out so close to home; they are trying to help people feel better about themselves.
- Mr. Matthew Kramer/Ms. Kristie Kramer, 17782 Goldeneye – felt it should follow ordinances and be completely confined to the inside of their home; lives behind the subject location so he does not see traffic flow; sympathized with neighbors living closer and experiencing disturbances; concerned about property values; urged Zoning Board of Appeals to deny this request.
- Ms. Pamela Lavis-Albers, 43630 Bufflehead – resident next door; in support; business is not a disturbance and they are trying to support health and well-being; they are not loud; they look out for the neighborhood; requested Zoning Board consider approval.
- Ms. Kimberly Mahoney, 17753 Merganser – lives 3 houses away; in support of business and is a client; noted clients are asked to not drop weights or make excessive noise that would disturb the neighbors in any way; classes are small,

with no more than 4 people; working out is a stress reliever in these trying times; urged Zoning Board of Appeals to let this business continue.

Mr. Thompson stated that they are reading all of the emails into the record this evening, but he assured that all of the emails and attachments were forwarded to the Zoning Board of Appeals members prior to tonight's meeting. He explained they are reading these into the record to assure compliance with the Open Meetings Act. He read a letter from the following:

- Mr. Robert Mrozak and Ms. Lisa Mrozak, 17843 Merganser – homeowner immediately west of the subject location; claimed the home is identified as a business on some maps; owner is health care professional who operated gym in his home during pandemic when gyms were mandated to be closed; not appropriate for residential neighborhood; provided background; complained about dropping weights, open during covid and clients are without masks, excessive traffic and parking for clients (occasionally parking in a way their mailbox is blocked from mail delivery); advertising their home gym on their website; loud music (including clapping and cheering) and clanging steel weights; in violation of the ordinance and it is against their homeowner's association rules; concerned about their property value; urged Board to deny this request.

Mr. Thompson added that a 22-page attachment including photographs was also forwarded to the Board members.

Mr. Campbell read correspondence received from the following:

- Mr. Michael Pepper, of RT Instruments – in favor of the request.
- Mr. Thomas Rodgers, 17753 Merganser – located 3 houses away; in support of the request; petitioners are making positive impact in many people's lives; did not feel they are creating any disruption; has not witnessed dropped weights or excessive noise.
- Ms. Paulette Vultaggio – in support; providing great service to community; has not witnessed excessive traffic; classes limited to 3 or 4 people; claimed most clients park on the driveway of the subject location; many clients are neighbors and walk; noise is kept to a minimum; because of situation with Covid-19, she felt this variance should be granted.
- JBC Property Management, on Canal Road in Sterling Heights – written on behalf of Partridge Creek Village Homeowner's Association; cited sections and articles of their by-laws which prohibits this use; owners have been in violation and will be required to address this by September 17th, 2020; stressed all lots are to be used for single-family residential purposes only; and no noxious activity shall be carried on upon any lot, nor shall anything be done on or around any lot which may become an annoyance or nuisance to the neighborhood or the other owners on the lots in the subdivision; included copy of violation letter sent certified to the homeowners on September 10th, 2020; claimed they are not complying with social distancing; Michelle M. Schuppe will be representing the Partridge Creek Village Homeowner's Association at the meeting.. This letter was signed by Mr. Jeffrey J. Podolski, Partridge Creek Village Homeowner's

Association which was sent to Mr. Gamarra indicating they are in violation of the Cease and Desist order.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for questions and/or comments from the participating audience.

Mr. Pearl reminded that they have a three-minute limit per person, and that was verified by the Township attorney.

Mr. Rob Mrozek – stated they realize not all of the neighbors are as concerned as they are; felt a commercial business should not be located within a subdivision; compared it to having a grocery store or gas station in the middle of the subdivision; assured this is not about whether the petitioners are nice people, and added they are lovely people; issue is operating a business inside a residential neighborhood; complained neighbors are breaking laws, zoning rules and Governor's directive to offer convenience to the neighborhood; concerned about variance setting precedence in the neighborhood; disregard for homeowner's association bylaws; believed this request should be denied.

Michelle – representing the Partridge Creek Village Board; complained that petitioners are not following homeowner by-laws; commented that, while many are empathetic to the petitioner's desire to run the gym for all the good reasons, she is here to reinforce the bylaws of their community are not being followed; they are required to follow through when any single member of their community does not follow the bylaws; wished them good luck on all their pursuits, but Partridge Creek Village Homeowner's Association does not support this.

Ms. Lisa Mrozek – addressed petitioner's comment that they have always been looking for a commercial property, but she commented their business website does not reflect their in-home gym facilities being temporary; refers to "main gym" (basement) and "accessory gym" (garage); referred to other statements in their business website; could not understand how a physician could decide to go against Governor's orders and open a fitness center on June 6th amid Covid pandemic; objected to the business in residential because it is not a quiet business.

Mr. Thomas Rodgers – noted the petitioner indicated the variance is for a short period of time, being a maximum of 30 to 45 days; lives three doors away and felt the scenario presented by the abutting neighbors was inaccurate; felt to stop the business for the next 30 to 45 days could damage their business irreparably.

Mr. Gamarra claimed that as soon as the Governor allowed outdoor gyms, that is when they opened. He assured they were following the executive order with regard to their indoor gym, and that is why they moved their facility from their basement to their garage. The Governor limited group gatherings to less than 10 people, but he stressed they limited their classes to no more than 4 people. He is aware Michelle spoke for the

subdivision that the home is only allowed to be used for residential purposes, but he claimed the president of their board runs a personal training studio out of her home, and there is a Facebook page that lists her home address as the location. He felt that is extremely hypocritical. He assured it is not their intention to be disruptive, and they try to do their best, although they may not be perfect all the time, but he stressed this is just a temporary situation. He felt it is unfair to shut down their business when half of America is working from home and the other half is unemployed, especially when they are only asking for an opportunity to iron out the details. He admitted it is not ideal, but Covid has affected all of their lives, and this request is temporary.

Mr. Thompson replied no additional emails have been received.

Mr. Pearl requested the petitioners explain how the Governor's order to allow gyms to open will affect their business.

Mr. Gamarra replied it will affect them in a positive way, but they have had trouble finding a commercial space because landlords were not renting, knowing the renters could not bring in money to afford the lease. Now that gyms are able to open, they are hoping to find a space.

Mr. Pearl pointed out before the Governor allowed gyms to open, that was their practical difficulty. He questioned their hardship or practical difficulty now.

Mr. Gamarra replied they could move back into the basement and it would not be a problem, which is something they would have to do when the weather got colder. He stated if they would go straight by the Governor's orders, gyms can open at 25 percent capacity, so 25 percent of 4 people is 1 person, which would be difficult.

Mr. Pearl questioned where they came up with that calculation.

Mr. Gamarra stated they limit their classes to 4 people, and he took 25 percent of that number. He replied to further inquiry that they cannot accommodate more than 4 people at one time because their entire basement is not converted to a gym, but they have some living space in the basement as well.

Mr. Campbell admitted he has a tough time thinking positive about this, adding that one of this Board's standard conditions in granting a variance is that it has to be a condition that is unique to the property. The variance carries on forever with the property unless the Board places certain limitations on the approval. He pointed out the entire argument seems to be based on the fact that these are unusual times with Covid-19, and he did not feel anyone can claim that is unique to their property. He did not feel a variance is the appropriate vehicle, and he did not feel it is appropriate to grant it for 30 days. He suggested this might be something that should go to the Township Board if they are looking for some of the Township rules to be changed. He stated he cannot support any continuation of this business being operated out of the garage.

Mr. Merrill appreciated the petitioners trying to run a business and help people to stay healthy as they are challenged in these unique times, but he agreed with Mr. Campbell and has a difficult time supporting this variance. They are trying to make sure everyone is safe, so ordinances are in place to do that. He pointed out the homeowner's association has stepped in and sent letters to indicate it is against their bylaws.

Mr. Pearl stated he does not know if this Board can be concerned about homeowner's association bylaws because those are their rules they have to enforce, and the Township cannot get in the middle of it. He admitted it is a very emotional issue, and he appreciated everyone's comments, but as the neighborhood changes and people move in and out, they will be asking the Township why this is allowed. He stated it is difficult to grant this type of variance, and he cannot vote in favor of it.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no additional emails have been received.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Merrill, with reference to File #20-6950 and application from Mr. Fernando Gamarra and Ms. Monica Buccellato, 17873 Merganser Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1258.02-(o)-(2), R-0 through R-5 One-Family Residential Districts, Principal Uses Permitted, concerning Lot 256, Partridge Creek Village Subdivision, located at the northwest corner of Merganser Drive and Bufflehead Lane, addressed as 17873 Merganser (Parcel #16-11-05-307-014), that variance request to permit the continuation of a home occupation (for Transform RX, LLC) in an attached accessory structure for a single-family home located in the R-4 One-Family Residential District, with home occupations required to be wholly confined to the interior of the dwelling and not permitted in attached or detached garages or other accessory structures, be denied by reason that no practical difficulty unique to the property has been demonstrated. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Merrill, Pearl, DiBartolomeo, Deyak. Nays – None. Absent – Marella. Motion carried.

0.915 ACRE OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GARFIELD ROAD, NORTH OF 18 MILE ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 41591 GARFIELD ROAD (PARCEL #16-11-07-476-005)

- **APPEAL: FIRESTONE COMPLETE AUTO CARE
FILE #20-6953: PETITIONED BY MR. PATRICK STIEBER,
ALLIED SIGNS, INC.**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested. He advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 76 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. He added there were two emails received in response to this request and he read the two emails from the following:

- Mrs. A. Dunn, 41440 Anthony – upset with this business and fought construction of it; infuriated with Consent Judgment; opposed to this business receiving any further breaks.

- Ms. Judith Redmann – as resident and board member of the condominium complex immediately behind the subject location, she is opposed to this variance request; complained about excessive ambient lighting and noise.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no additional correspondence has been received.

Mr. Jim Fields, of Allied Signs, 33650 Giftos Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, replied to inquiry that he would like to proceed with the hearing this evening. He explained the petitioner is requesting permission to allow two wall signs. The Board already approved one wall sign on the north elevation, and they are proposing a wall sign on the east facia, facing Garfield Road. He pointed out the total square footage of the wall sign allowed would be 100 square feet. The approved sign is 57.7 square feet, and the additional wall sign would be 38.6 square feet, with the combined total square footage being 96.3 square feet, which is still under what would be allowed for this property. They would like a small sign on the east elevation to identify the business for traffic travelling on Garfield, with the larger wall sign already approved facing the former K-Mart parking drive for the entry drive. He pointed out other businesses along Garfield have done the same thing, obtaining variances to get additional wall signs for visibility due to the traffic on Garfield. He stressed the main difference in this case is that the combined total square footage of these two wall signs still comes under what would be allowed for one wall sign.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for anyone from the listening audience who would like to speak.

Mr. Anthony Maltese, 16575 Tyler Drive (Macomb Village Condos) – questioned whether the proposed second sign will be on the east side of the building, facing away from the condominiums to the west.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively, confirming that it will not project over the roofline or past either one of the walls. He confirmed that no further emails were received.

Mr. Campbell felt this request is fairly straightforward. The information presented to the Building Department seems inconsistent with what Allied Signs is requesting. They have been doing business in Clinton Township for many years and they understand very well that this Board has been willing to approve variances for multiple signs if the total combined square footage is under what would be allowed for the one sign. He noted that the application reflects they are seeking approval for a wall sign on the east elevation measuring 74.58 square feet, so the write-up from the Building Department shows two signs at 74.58 square feet. He believes the measurements presented tonight by Mr. Stieber, indicating the total square footage of the two signs will not exceed 96.3 square feet, is correct, and he would be willing to approve that variance with the stipulation that the total combined square footage does not exceed 96.3 square feet.

Mr. Fields confirmed that is correct. He explained the original 74.58 square feet shown on the application was the original design review sizes. With the original findings being over 100 square feet, they dropped the logos so that lowered the total square footage to 57.7 square feet for the approved sign on the north facia, and 38.6 square feet for the proposed sign on the east facia.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Merrill, with reference to File #20-6953 and application from Mr. Patrick Stieber, of Allied Signs, Inc., 33650 Giftos, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Chapter 1488.02-(e)-(2), Signs, Definitions and Restrictions, “Commercial sign” concerning 0.915 acre of land fronting the west line of Garfield Road, north of 18 Mile Road, addressed as 41591 Garfield (Parcel #16-11-07-476-005), that variance be granted to permit the installation of two (2) wall-mounted signs on a commercial building in the B-2 Community Business District (Firestone Complete Auto Care), which is one (1) wall sign in excess of the maximum permitted one (1) wall sign; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed hardship that providing this signage is in the interest of public safety to identify the location of where to turn off of Garfield, and the entrance to the property off of the former K-Mart parking lot; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Deyak questioned whether Mr. Thompson is in concurrence with the calculations presented.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively. He noted that is in a statement in the package provided by the petitioner and highlighted in yellow by the petitioner. He pointed out it matches the drawings that were submitted, so he is comfortable with the dimensions as approved. He replied to further inquiry that he has received no further emails.

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

21.28 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF DUNHAM AND HEYDENREICH, ADDRESSED AS 20615 DUNHAM ROAD (PARCEL #16-11-04-400-051)

**- APPEAL: WINDERMERE EQUESTRIAN CENTER
FILE #20-6955: PETITIONED BY MS. JENNIFER HALLMANN, OF
WINDERMERE EQUESTRIAN CENTER
REPRESENTED BY MR. ROBERTK KIRK & MS. MARYANNE DENEWETH,
OF KIRK, HUTH, LANGE & BADALAMENTI**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested. He advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 224 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as

undeliverable. He added there were three emails received in response to this request and he read the three emails from the following:

- Ms. Pauline Hemmingson, 20654 Dunham Court– in support of the variance request.
- Bill and Lori Swatsworth, 44015 Dunham Court – complained about the subject property being an eyesore behind their yard; submitted two photos taken yesterday showing trash and debris on the subject property and hoped they are taken into consideration when hearing this case. Mr. Campbell noted two photos were attached.
- The Chakers – questioned whether anyone from the Township has walked the properties to observe the view of the surrounding residents; complained about what the abutting residents are seeing.

Mr. Thompson replied that no further emails have been received.

Ms. Maryanne Deneweth, of Kirk, Huth, Lange and Badalamenti, 19500 Hall Road, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, stated she is representing Windermere Equestrian Center and Ms. Hallmann, owner. She explained to inquiry that they would like to proceed this evening with this petition. She indicated they are requesting a setback variance as well as a variance on paving versus gravel. She addressed the setback issue, noting the ordinance requires a minimum of a 300-foot setback from the property line on a minimum eight (8)-acre parcel. She pointed out if that is measured out, it renders this parcel unusable. In their correspondence, this creates an unnecessary hardship and practical difficulty, noting it is an improvement to a preexisting business. She did not consider it an expansion other than the property recently purchased, because this is the same business with some improvements. They will be adding some pasture areas, an outdoor arena, and an indoor arena. One of the questions is whether it is a paddock or a pasture, and she explained that, as set forth in the ordinance, it is not really a paddock because it is not for instruction or stable. They are asking for the setback variance to meet the same setback that is consistent with the rest of the property. As far as the paving, they are asking for a variance based on health, safety, and welfare. This would be an extreme hardship and practical difficulty because it causes a slippery surface for the horses and the people handling the animals. They are generally show horses and their hoofs are unshod. Traction shoes can actually be dangerous. They are asking to be consistent with other agricultural areas and allow the driving areas, which would be fenced in and used by horses, to remain gravel. Ms. Deneweth stressed the circumstances for these variances are unique to this property, adding that this property has been an agricultural use since the 1800's, and this equestrian center has been in existence for a very long time. She pointed out there is not another property in this area that is comparable so it is a unique situation and a unique property. These situations were not created by the owner, and it will not be contrary with the spirit or intent of the ordinance, and it is a consistent use with the ordinance because it is allowed under the R-1 One-Family Residential zoning district. It is a use that will adversely impact the purpose or the objectives of the Master Plan for Future Land Use. It is currently a split-zone parcel, with R-1 One-Family Residential and RML Multiple-Family Residential (Low-Density), but they are in the process of

rezoning the RML to R-1 so it will be a consistent zoning as it has been consistently used. She invited the Board members to look at some of the attachments they have added to their letter, some of them reflecting other comparable horse facilities within the surrounding area, with most of them in Macomb County and some in Oakland County. She pointed out they use gravel on the horse surfaces, and most of them are closely surrounded by R-1 zoning and residential uses. She indicated they submitted information supporting their request for the horse surfaces to remain gravel, and she offered to answer questions.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for comments from the participating audience.

Ms. Lorraine Smith, 44105 Dunham – complained that the setback being requested is ten times less than the minimum required; claimed Ms. Hallmann was “taken advantage by her lawyers” who negotiated this land purchase; complained she cannot understand why the neighbors have to accept these variances; concerned about the fires they have had close to the fences from pallets and wood debris.

Ms. Renee Chaker, 44135 Dunham Court – her backyard abuts the subject property; concerned about parking up to her fence during the horse shows; questioned the location of the arena; commented her husband has concerns about the manure pile due to allergies.

Mr. Simon Chaker, 44135 Dunham Court– claimed Ms. Hallmann is required to dispose of the manure once a year; questioned how many horses that law applies to; he felt 61 horses is a lot.

Ms. Jennifer Hallmann, 20615 Dunham, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, clarified that far as manure management, she had over 70 horses in the early 1980's and 1990's. The manure management does not state a maximum number of horses, but only that the State must be clear that it must be cleaned and has to be relocated to a new location at least fifty feet from the old location every calendar year to prevent any leaching of water or moisture into the water table from the manure pile. She clarified that they applied to the Department of Agriculture for a manure bunker, which will be designed by the Department of Agriculture on their site plan. When it is constructed, it will be done so under the supervision by the Department of Agriculture. She stressed that they have been following the ordinances. As far as parking, she assured it will not go up to the fence during the horse shows. The site development plan has a 30-foot swale for water retention, and the collected water will go into the system. There will be no parking along the fence line. It will be similar to where it has been in the past during horse shows, and she explained there is a circular gravel drive that comes around the back side of the stable barn, which is 200 feet long. The gravel dirt drive is about 30 feet to the east of the barn and wraps around the building. The people at the horse shows park along the edge of that road, and the trailers normally park behind that drive on the grass, but they do not go near the houses and are just a car length off of the

gravel drive. Ms. Hallmann proceed to explain other places where cars park but calculated they would be about 62 feet off of the property line.

Ms. Deneweth clarified the manure pile will be approved by the State and that is not an issue this evening but is part of the site plan approval. She stressed that the existing property is owned by Ms. Hallmann, and she purchased the additional acreage. The lot line they are talking about would continue straight back. She pointed out that there are several property owners encroaching onto her property.

Ms. Lori Swatsworth, 44015 Dunham Court – claimed when they purchased their property, the vacant property was a field; questioned what this expansion will do to their property values; concerned about dust; complained about loud speakers; felt Ms. Hallmann should have known the property was not zoned properly before she purchased it; complained about violations and indicated she sent pictures of it to the Township.

Mr. Chaker – complained about the smell of manure and felt it is unacceptable; stressed the Township needs to look at it.

Mr. Thompson clarified the manure pile is not part of this variance request, and that is something that is part of the site planning process. It was discussed at the Planning Commission meeting and it would be addressed at the Township Board level if they want to request a change to their site plan, but it is not the purview of this Board. He reminded that the setback and the gravel drives and parking areas are the only issues being considered this evening. If the variances are granted, this will go to the Township Board for their final decision and at that time, the manure issue can be addressed.

Mr. Deyak advised if Mr. Chaker is concerned about the manure pile, he can attend the virtual Township Board meeting when this item is on their agenda, and he can voice his concerns at that time.

Ms. Paula Leeds, 43902 Robinson Ridge – residents directly behind the horse ranch; moved to this location because of the horse ranch and would rather hear, see, and smell the horse ranch than all of the commotion that comes down Heydenreich with the traffic; expressed her support of anything they want to do; claimed she can also speak for her neighbors who are up and down Heydenreich.

Ms. Renee Chaker – questioned the location of the outdoor arena that is being proposed; questioned whether it will be closer to or further away from the neighboring single-family homes.

Ms. Deneweth replied to inquiry that the indoor arena, which is the structure, is proposed to be located on the west side.

Mr. Deyak clarified they are not discussing that issue tonight because it is related to the site plan and not the requested variance.

Ms. Lorraine Smith – requested clarification as to whether Ms. Hallmann purchased the land that is requiring the 300-foot distance from the residential homes and now wants to change it to a 30-foot setback.

Mr. Thompson replied that is correct.

Ms. Lorraine Smith – questioned whether the Building Department or Township Trustees walked the property to see how close the manure pile is to the tributary of the Clinton River; concerned it acts as fertilizer and will cause overgrowth that will choke out their area; claimed her yard floods every spring and fall; stressed she loves horses but wants what is fair; concerned about fire risk and being downwind of manure smell.

Mr. Campbell addressed the comment made by a resident that Ms. Hallmann purchased the adjacent property that requires a 300-foot setback and is now asking for a 30-foot setback. He understands that she is not looking to change any setback that was there but wants to maintain the 30-foot setback.

Mr. Thompson replied that the setback issue is related specifically to the paddocks. The setbacks that exist on the developed portion of the property applied to what is there now, which includes a variety of uses including parking, buildings, and other existing facilities. The variance being requested is very specific from a setback standpoint, and the ordinance states that any paddocks have to be set back at least 300 feet. It is based on the design, because the paddocks are part of the improvements that are being proposed, and that is where the setback difference is being requested.

Mr. Campbell stated that, because of the 300-foot setback requirement and considering the size of the property, the petitioner has no other choice.

Ms. Deneweth replied that is correct.

Mr. Campbell stated he did not get a chance to walk the property completely, but he drove around Bayview, Heydenreich, and Dunham. He added that he did not go into the subdivision off of Dunham Court, which seems to be the most prominent area. He commented that he could see very little of this property from driving the other streets in the area, and he could see no reason for any concerns. He felt it is the residents on Dunham Court who seem to have the biggest concerns about this. He addressed the photographs submitted by a resident that depict the junk cars on the property. He stated he has no problem with their expansion plans, but he would like to see a condition placed on the motion to approve that the petitioner needs to clean up and maintain the property.

Ms. Deneweth addressed Mr. Campbell's comments, pointing out that this property had been a dumping area for quite some time before Ms. Hallmann purchased it, so she has been actively working on getting a lot of the junk and debris off of it. This has been slowing down as she has been working to get some of these approvals. She had no right to do any of that before she purchased the property, so it was only after the purchase that she began cleaning up the ditches and other areas. Ms. Deneweth pointed out the reason they requested the Board to look at the setback issue is because this does not quite fit. They are seeking a setback variance if the Board believes it is necessary, but the 300-foot setback requirement applies to paddocks and stabling areas. She clarified that this is more of a turn-out area for grazing. She also noted it is her understanding that some of the neighbors are encroaching onto Ms. Hallmann's property so they have an interest in maintaining that property. She also reminded that this development predates the ordinance, and what they are asking is that the new acreage mirror what has already been on the developed parcel.

Mr. Pearl stated he was worried that it was going to be developed for apartments so he is glad it is being left the way it is. He recalled the parking there years ago when the homes in the area were just being built. He felt it is unique to have this, and the majority of homes were constructed long after the equestrian center was there. He assumed the residents knew it was there and must have appreciated it or they would not have moved in that area. He agreed they need to clean up anything that is a problem, and he noted that, under their Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals, in deciding any matter which is requested to pass under the Zoning Code, may establish requirements for the use of a site or structure on such site as well as assume reasonable protection to abutting properties and adjacent districts. He questioned whether this allows them to consider Mr. Campbell's request to include the condition that the property be cleaned up.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively, noting the Board of Appeals is allowed to place reasonable conditions. He cautioned that if they look at the site plan that will go to the Board, they will see that will have to be done because the areas that are proposed for site development are also the areas that need to be cleaned up. He felt it is implied with the site plan that those areas are proposed for improvements, but he replied to Mr. Pearl's inquiry that they can place the condition on it to clean it up.

Mr. Pearl stated he will not make it part of the motion but he felt they have a practical difficulty meeting the 300-foot setback. He assured they can take care of it at the Board level.

Mr. DiBartolomeo explained this was a topic of discussion at the Planning Commission meeting a couple of weeks ago, and it was a big concern of the Planning Commission. He stated he has a family member who lives in the apartments near the subject location, so he walks from his house to the apartments. He has noticed that it has been neglectful in that area, and although he understood that if the site plan goes through, that area will be cleaned up. He noted, however, there is no time limit as to when that will be development, so it could sit there for another year or two.

Mr. Pearl felt possibly they should include the condition in the motion that the site must be cleaned up in six months.

Mr. DiBartolomeo agreed that some time frame should be put on it because that area has not been touched.

Mr. Deyak agreed, and questioned whether Ordinance Enforcement can be directed to visit the site.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively, noting he can refer this to Ordinance Enforcement if the Board of Appeals directs him to do so.

Mr. Campbell inquired as to whether they need to define “clean-up”.

Mr. Thompson replied that if they are referring this to the Building Department’s Ordinance Enforcement division, the code they would use is the adopted Property Maintenance Code. Any removal of junk and debris they would like to see should be worded in the motion that the site be brought into compliance with the adopted Property Maintenance Code. It focuses any recommendation they make on the code or ordinance for which the Building Department would use to enforce.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pearl, with reference to File #20-6955 and application from Ms. Jennifer Hallmann, of Windermere Equestrian Center, 20615 Dunham, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, as represented by Mr. Robert Kirk and Ms. Maryanne Deneweth, of Kirk, Huth, Lange, & Badalamenti PLC, 19500 Hall Road, Suite 100, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1298.02-(a)-(3)-B, Supplementary Regulations, Uses Requiring Special Approval; Procedure, Riding and boarding stables; and Chapter 1296.02-(a), Off-Street Parking and Loading, Space Layout Standards, Construction and Maintenance, concerning 21.28 acres of land located at the northeast corner of Dunham and Heydenreich, addressed as 20615 Dunham (Parcel #16-11-04-400-051), that variances be granted to permit construction of a riding arena and expansion of horse paddocks at an existing equestrian center (Windermere Equestrian Center Expansion): 1) With 5 proposed paddocks at the rear of the property located 30 feet from the adjacent property lines, being 270 feet less than the minimum required distance of 300 feet; and 2) Allowing drives and parking areas to remain gravel, rather than paving them as required by ordinance; further, these variances are granted on the condition that the Planning Department direct the Building Department’s Ordinance Enforcement Division to go out to the property as soon as possible and assure the site is brought into compliance with the adopted Property Maintenance Code; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulties that: 1) the size of the property makes it difficult to meet the required 300-foot setback; and 2) the allowance of the parking and drive areas to remain gravel is for the safety of the horses and their riders; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Thompson replied that no additional emails were received.

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

**LOTS 518 THROUGH 521, AND LOTS 523 AND 524, INGLESIDE FARMS
SUBDIVISION #3, BEING 8.501 ACRES AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF
HARRINGTON AND HILLDALE, ADDRESSED AS 21550 HARRINGTON, AND 38785,
38765, 38745 AND 38725 HILDALE (PARCELS #16-11-15-452-003, -004, -005, -006,
-007, AND -012)**

**- APPEAL: HARRINGTON MEDICAL CENTER
FILE #20-6956: PETITIONED BY MESSRS. BEN SMITH, MIKE PIETTE,
ANDREW DANAHER, AND PAT WILLIAMS**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested. He advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 42 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable. He added there was one letter received from SensusOne.

Mr. Thompson clarified that SensusOne is the petitioner and they were submitting additional support information regarding their request in that letter, which is why he forwarded that letter to the Board. He replied to inquiry that it does not need to be read into the record.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that there were no emails received.

Mr. Michael Piette, 16948 Merrywood Drive, Macomb Township, Michigan, replied to inquiry that he would like to proceed with the hearing this evening. He introduced others participating in this meeting tonight, including Mr. Tim Vargas, Chief Operating Officer of McLaren Macomb Hospital; Mr. Andrew Danaher, principal of Stucky-Vitale Architects; and Mr. Patrick Williams, with Nowak and Fraus Civil Engineers. He added they are all available to answer questions.

Mr. Piette stated he is the principal of SensusOne, a health care real estate development company. They work with healthcare organizations around the country, and he is here to facilitate a strategic requirement and need that is driven by the hospital. He mentioned the unique hardship and practical difficulty is driven from the hospital, and he provided some background so everyone understands the scope and difficulty of the practical difficulty for the hospital. He explained the project is a 60,000-square-foot medical office building and ambulatory surgery center. He explained the federal government is altering the reimbursement for elective surgeries. He pointed out there is a fairly quick proliferation of ambulatory health care facilities in southeast Michigan, and the government is rapidly putting pressure on hospitals to create these ambulatory locations because it has a direct correlation to reducing health care costs.

He emphasized this surgery center is crucial to McLaren for a couple of reasons. The first is that within a couple of years, the government will be penalizing hospitals for performing elective surgeries, such as knee, hip, and shoulder replacements, in a hospital setting as opposed to an ambulatory setting because of the cost. He stressed the location of this building is crucial because it allows McLaren to transfer operating room licenses from their main campus to this building across the street. The federal government has a 300-foot limit that prevents a hospital from being compensated appropriately if that service center is beyond 300 feet from the main hospital. The unique hardship is that for the hospital to move toward this ambulatory environment demanded by the federal government, this is the only site that is available. One of the other practical difficulties the hospital faces is that it is landlocked. He stressed McLaren has invested significant dollars since its acquisition of Mount Clemens General Hospital and they continue to do so. He stressed this is the only site that allows them to transfer the operating room licenses to this building.

Mr. Piette addressed the variance request of the three-story building, which allows them to get 60,000 square feet. He noted the surgery center will be approximately 18,000 square feet, with an approximately 9,000-square-foot imaging and diagnostic center. McLaren will be leasing approximately 45,000 square feet of the building, which also helps them to try to decompress their current campus. They believe the three-story building is materially characteristic of the surrounding development, noting that the parking deck across the street is a 5-story facility. He added there is a one-story office building across the street, and there will be parking to the south. They will be providing berm and landscaping to buffer this facility from some of the residential properties to the east of Hilldale. He summarized that for McLaren to continue to invest in this community, they are landlocked but this site allows them to participate in the current reimbursement model to move these operating rooms to an outpatient setting.

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for comments from the participating audience.

Ms. Lorraine Smith, 44105 Dunham Court – made comments about a doctor at McLaren.

Mr. Deyak reminded that comments have to be kept in the context of the variances being requested.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no emails have been received.

Mr. Pearl stated he drove by this site today. He felt the developer is making a good point that the proposed building is directly across from the hospital so it is the farthest distance from the residents.

Ms. Lois Kavanagh, 38786 Hilldale – resident directly across the street from the subject property; thought this was approved 2-1/2 years ago when the property was purchased; questioned why they are seeking approval again.

Mr. Thompson is aware that this site had been visited for this in the past. He explained that a site development plan is only valid for a period of 18 months, at which time it would expire and they would have to start the process over. They are again requesting site plan approval for a three-story building and that is the focus of the variance. He explained he was not the Planning Director at that time, but if there was a site plan approved at that point, it has long since expired.

Ms. Kavanagh questioned whether the plans for the building are in the Planning Department office and available for viewing.

Mr. Thompson replied the site plan is available for viewing in the Planning Department on Mondays through Fridays from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. He suggested Ms. Kavanagh call him and he would be glad to meet with her and show her the plans.

Ms. Kavanagh stated they have been to the office a few times looking for site plans, but she claimed there were never plans.

Mr. Thompson stated the plans are available now.

Mr. Campbell commented that this proposal makes a lot of sense, noting that parking is always an issue regardless of the reason for going to McLaren. He noted that having a three-story building with a smaller footprint makes sense, and the employees have to walk quite a distance from the parking lot on the other side of the railroad tracks. He acknowledged the hospital is landlocked facility so this makes a lot of sense.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Campbell, with reference to File #20-6956 and application from SensusOne Harrington, LLC, 251 Diversion Street, Suite #201, Rochester, Michigan 48307, as represented by Messrs. Ben Smith, Mike Piette, Andrew Danaher and Pat Williams, same address, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1292.01, Land Use Regulations, Schedule of Regulations Limiting Height, Bulk, Density and Area, concerning Lots 518 through 521, 523 and 524, Ingleside Farms Subdivision #3, being 8.50 acres of land located at the southwest corner of Harrington and Hilldale, addressed as 21550 Harrington, and 38785, 38765, 38745 and 38725 Hilldale (Parcels #16-11-15-452-003, -004, -005, -006, -007 and -012), that variance be granted to permit the construction of a three-story, 51-foot 6-inch high medical office building in the OS-1 Office/Service (Low-Rise) District (Harrington Medical Center), being: 1) One (1) story in excess of the maximum permitted two (2) stories; and 2) 16 feet 6 inches in excess of the maximum permitted height of 35 feet; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty that this is a dimensional variance and it is strictly complying with the height requirements established because the property is zoned OS-1, which also exists to the south and could end up with more office buildings across from residential homes instead of the parking lot; further, raising the building height increases the office building separation from residential structures and a view obscured by a third story is looking toward the hospital, its parking and Comerica Bank; further, greater separation distance of the buildings from residential in exchange for the additional building height results in

substantial justice to all, and the safety is secured by the building going up rather than sprawling as parking will not impact Hilldale as much as closer to Harrington; further, the building located closer to Harrington increases the likelihood of people walking to the hospital rather than driving, which decreases vehicular traffic; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no emails were received.

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Deyak opened the floor for public comments and indicated that each speaker will be limited to three minutes.

Ms. Lorraine Smith – questioned whether Dr. Jim Kehoe is an investor on the subject property.

Mr. Deyak explained that under public comments, the person making the comment is allowed to do so as long as it relates to the Zoning Board of Appeals, but the Board does not necessarily answer.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that no emails were received.

Ms. Lorraine Smith – indicated she will be preparing and sending an email.

REPORTS OF MEETINGS

-- APPROVAL OF AUGUST 19TH, 2020 REPORT

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Merrill, to approve the report of the August 19th, 2020 meeting with the following change:

Page 9, Paragraph 7:

Add the word “total” after the word “enormous”.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Merrill, to approve the report of the August 19th, 2020 meeting as revised. Motion carried.

MEETING SCHEDULE

-- CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING – OCTOBER 21ST, 2020 AT 6:30 PM.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals is scheduled for Wednesday, October 21st, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. via GoToMeeting. He indicated the following items will be on the agenda:

- Rear yard setback for a covered porch
- Carport on James Drive
- Lot width-to-depth ratio variance submitted by residential property owners abutting the Family Life Broadcasting property at Cass and Heydenreich, who are purchasing a large portion of that property, resulting in a series of splits and combinations resulting in subdivision lots that are deeper than permitted when considering their width.
- Possible fourth item if Mr. Bleau would like to move forward with his variance request.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Campbell, supported by Mr. DiBartolomeo, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Campbell

Robert M. Campbell, Secretary
CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

ces:09/28/20

ces:09/28/20

Approved 10/21/20