

CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

REPORT OF MEETING

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13TH, 2019

PRESENT: Francis Marella, Chairperson
Michael Deyak, Vice-Chairperson
Robert M. Campbell, Secretary
James D'Angelo
Ronald DiBartolomeo
Thomas Mill
Kenneth Pearl

ABSENT: None

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Marella explained the parameters under which this Board can act and 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.

1.99 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF GARFIELD, NORTH OF 19 MILE ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 43650 GARFIELD (PARCEL #16-11-05-300-023)

- **APPEAL: WELLNESS PHYSICAL MEDICAL CENTER (fka The Neurosurgery Group / Hyduk Professional Building)
FILE #19-6904: PETITIONED BY DR. MARK BRENNAN, NG REALTY LLC
REPRESENTED BY MR. MIKE ZEID, BLUE STONE PROPERTIES LLC**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated October 15th, 2019 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 51 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 7 of those returned as undeliverable. There were no written replies received in response to the mailing.

Mr. Mike Zeid, of Blue Stone Properties LLC, 1545 Kirkway, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48302, thanked the Board for their consideration of this variance request this evening. He stated he is purchasing the property and when the survey was done, they noticed the building extended 1 foot 5 inches into the front yard setback. The building was constructed 15 years ago and is 60% vacant. They hope to fill it with contingent medical uses, with three medical tenants currently in the building. They want to comply with all Township ordinances and are seeking this variance so their building is in compliance.

Mr. Pearl appreciated anyone trying to fill office buildings in Clinton Township, and he added he is not going to complain about a 1.3-foot encroachment.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Marella, with reference to File #19-6904 and application from Dr. Mark Brennan, of NG Realty, LLC, 43650 Garfield, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, as represented by Mr. Mike Zeid, of Blue Stone Properties LLC, 1545 Kirkway, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48302, 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 1.99 acres of land fronting the east line of Garfield, north of 19 Mile Road, addressed as 43650 Garfield (Parcel #16-11-05-300-023), that variance be granted to permit the continuation of a building in the OS-1 Office/Service (Low-Rise) District (Wellness Physical Medicine Center, fka The Neurology Group / Hyduk Professional Building) having a 23.7-foot front yard setback, which is 1.3 feet less than the minimum required 25-foot front yard setback; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty that this is an existing building that was constructed quite a few years ago; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Roll Call Vote: Pearl, Marella, Campbell, D'Angelo, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Mill. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

24.10 ACRES FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GROESBECK HIGHWAY, SOUTH OF HILLCREST, ADDRESSED AS 40445 S. GROESBECK (PARCEL #16-11-15-176-044)
- APPEAL: VET IQ @ MEIJER
FILE #19-6905: PETITIONED BY MR. ANDREW CHRISTENSEN, VET IQ
REPRESENTED BY MR. CHAD LONGSON, VET IQ

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated October 22nd, 2019 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 195 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 49 of those returned as undeliverable. There were no written replies received in response to the mailing.

Mr. Chad Longson, of Vet IQ, 923 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho 83616, appreciated the opportunity to come before this Board tonight. He explained they are a veterinarian clinic looking out for the health and wellness of pets. He noted that they do not do any major surgeries or overnight stays, and they are located in a tenant space within Meijer. He clarified that they do not have access for any of their customers inside the store but have an exterior entrance only because Meijer does not allow pets to enter their store. Their ingress/egress is from the exterior so they would like a sign to show they are at this location and in operation, which is why they are seeking this variance.

Mr. Campbell questioned which entrance belongs to Vet IQ, noting it was not clear on the drawing.

Mr. Longson replied that, when standing in front of Meijers and looking at the two entrances, the right-side entrance, their entrance is located just down the building to the left about 40 feet.

Mr. Campbell explained that as far as separate entrances in a store the size of Meijers, this Board has granted variances before in those situations. He pointed out that there is already a sign for Huntington Bank, but he commented that is the reason the variance needs to be rewritten because this is actually a request for a total of four signs: one for Meijer; one for Huntington; and two for Vet IQ. The other signs, stating “Fresh”, “Home”, Pharmacy Pickup”, etc. are all considered directional signs. He stated he has a problem with Vet IQ having two wall signs, and he felt that it would be safer and more effective to have one sign located by their door. He indicated that one sign would probably do a better job of directing the public safely to the proper entrance to the facility.

Mr. Longson explained the reason for their request for two signs is if they have a sign toward the top, where the “Meijer” and “Huntington” signs are located, it can be seen from a distance, but the view of the door is somewhat blocked by cars and that sign cannot be seen from a distance.

Mr. Marella agreed with Mr. Campbell that one sign next to the Huntington Bank sign would be sufficient. He pointed out they are inside the building right next to the north entrance.

Mr. DiBartolomeo inquired as to the size of the signs.

Mr. Campbell felt the Planning Department will have to recalculate the square footage because they did not consider the Huntington Bank sign.

Mr. DiBartolomeo stated the problem he has is that the Township's sign ordinance is very antiquated.

Mr. Marella felt it is the same size as the Huntington Bank sign.

Mr. Longson estimated the sign is about 12 square feet.

Mr. Campbell stated that, according to the diagram, the sign is 20 square feet.

Mr. Longson noted the 20-square-foot sign is the larger marquee sign.

Mr. Campbell suggested a variance be granted for one additional wall signs, being a total of three business wall signs, and the total combined square footage of those three signs can be calculated by the Planning Department.

Mr. Pearl agreed with Mr. Campbell. He pointed out that everyone will have one sign, but the Subway is out now, so he anticipated there will be another tenant sign being requested once something occupies that space in Meijer.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Marella, with reference to File #19-6905 and application from Mr. Andrew Cristensen, Vet IQ, 923 S. Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho 83616, as represented by Mr. Chad Longson, same address, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Chapter 1488.02-(e)-(1)-C-1, Signs, Definitions and Restrictions, "Commercial sign", "Wall sign", concerning 24.10 acres of land fronting the west line of Groesbeck Highway, south of Hillcrest, addressed as 40445 S. Groesbeck (part of Parcel #16-11-15-176-004), that variance be granted to permit the installation of one (1) additional wall sign on a building in the B-3 General Business district (Vet IQ @ Meijer at Hillcrest), resulting in: 1) Three (3) wall signs (Meijers, Huntington and Vet IQ), being two (2) wall signs in excess of the maximum permitted one (1) wall sign; and 2) Total combined square footage of the three (3) signs is 461.6, being 200 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 251.6 square feet; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed hardship based on the need to direct the public safely to the proper entrance to the facility; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Marella, D'Angelo, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Mill, Pearl. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

LOTS 5 THROUGH 8, AND LOT 29, MAPLEWOOD SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF GRATIOT AND HOLLY, ADDRESSED AS 36217 S. GRATIOT (PARCEL #16-11-27-252-040)

**- APPEAL: BRAVADO EVENT VENUE
FILE #19-6906: PETITIONED BY MR. MIKE EIDA, ULTIMATE SIGNS
(IN CONJUNCTION WITH UNIVERSAL LED & SIGNS)**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated October 22nd, 2019 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 40 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. Wallace Wells, of Universal LED & Signs and in conjunction with Ultimate Signs, stated he is here on behalf of Mr. Kosh, owner of the location. They are seeking a variance with regards to the new LED to take the place of the existing LED. He explained their hardship is that the current LED is using old technology, and it is very difficult to get replacement modules that go on the front of the sign. As a result, it limits the ability of the owner to present current events and upcoming events in a compelling way. The proposed LED is cloud-based and they feel it will allow easier capabilities as far as showing current and upcoming events. They are able to comply with any dimming or brightness settings with which the Township would be concerned. He explained they were able to address the ground clearance to 73 inches, so that portion of the variance that was requested is no longer needed. He hoped the Board will consider their variance request. He stated Mr. Kosh requested he let the Board know that he has invested a considerable amount of money in landscaping on the west side of the venue and increase business with not only the new LED but also with improved landscaping. Mr. Wells added that Mr. Kosh was unable to attend tonight's meeting because he recently had knee surgery.

Mr. Campbell stated he is confused as to the dimensions. He has no issue with the square footage, but the ground clearance and height of the sign is unclear. He questioned whether Mr. Wells has updated numbers.

Mr. Wells replied there is a 73-inch clearance from the bottom of the sign to grade, with a 2-inch metal gap with supporting screws. If they were not to include that, it would actually be 75 inches from the ground to the base of the sign.

Mr. Campbell clarified that would meet the required 6-foot under clearance for the sign. He calculated that is 73 inches, then another 50 inches for the sign, 2 inches for the base and the top 76-inch portion that is unchanged, totaling roughly 200 inches.

Mr. Pearl stated he is not asking for a lot because it is on Gratiot. He noted the facility has changed hands a couple of times, and the owner has spent a fortune fixing the

place up. He recalled when it was Dimitri's Rendezvous a few years back, and he felt the owner needs to be able to attract people to that facility because he is renting it out as a banquet facility. He was not aware the owner was coming in with this request, noting he has not talked with him in a long time, but he has been there for events and he is aware they are investing a lot of money into this location to make it successful. He did not feel this is an unreasonable request.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. DiBartolomeo, with reference to File #19-6906 and application from Mr. Mike Eida, of Ultimate Signs, 8827 Mark Twain, Detroit, Michigan 48228, and in conjunction with Universal LED & Signs, 16706 Telegraph Road, Detroit, Michigan 48219, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Chapter 1488.02-(d), Signs, Definitions and Restrictions, "Changeable Copy"; and Chapter 1488.02-(e)-(1)-B-1 and -3, Signs, Definitions and Restrictions, "Changeable Copy" and "Commercial Sign", "Pylon Sign", concerning Lots 5 through 8, and Lot 29, Maplewood Subdivision, located at the northwest corner of Gratiot and Holly, addressed as 36217 S. Gratiot (Parcel #16-11-27-252-040), that variance be granted to permit the replacement of an LED changeable copy board on a free-standing sign for a business in the B-3 General Business District (Bravado Event Venue), with: 1) An LED message board measuring 34.72 square feet, being 14.72 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 20 square feet; and 2) The total combined square footage of the free-standing sign (including the new LED portion) measuring 106.72 square feet, being 6.72 square feet in excess of the maximum permitted 100 square feet; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed hardship that they are having a difficult time locating replacement modules, which would prevent the best ability to showcase current and upcoming events; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Campbell inquired as to the square footage and whether the petitioner agrees with the calculations on the agenda.

Mr. Wells assured those are accurate calculations.

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

LOTS 38 AND 39, DONALDSON PARK SUBDIVISION, LOCATED NORTH OF DONALDSON, EAST OF HARPER, ADDRESSED AS 23655 DONALDSON (PARCEL #16-11-36-354-008)

- **APPEAL: SFR – DONALDSON, 23655**
FILE #19-6907: PETITIONED BY MR. GEORGE SKAKUN JR.

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated October 22nd, 2019 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 57 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. George Skakun, Jr., 23655 Donaldson, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated he would like to tear down his existing garage because it is too small, and he would like to double its width and add 16 feet so he can get his vehicles into it, as well as his snowblower, generator, barbeque, household appliances and other things that are currently being stored outside. He added that he has a double-wide lot so he does not know how the ordinance addresses it.

Mr. Marella inquired as to whether Mr. Skakun's house is sitting on a double lot. He questioned what was being stored under the tarps.

Mr. Skakun replied the tarps are covering the things that he is waiting to put in his garage. He indicated he thought this was going to be done in July when they applied for their permit.

Mr. Campbell questioned what is in the storage pods.

Mr. Skakun replied the things being stored in the pods are items he does not want to get wet, such as saws, electrical equipment, pipes, etc.

Mr. Campbell inquired as to whether Mr. Skakun is running a business out of his home.

Mr. Skakun assured he is not running a business, and everything he has is typical "homeowner stuff". He admitted he has woodworking machinery and now that he is retired, he wants to be able to use it. He replied to further inquiry that he has spoken to his neighbors about the proposed garage, and he claimed they have no objection to it and actually want him to build it.

Mr. Campbell commented it is an interesting street, with many houses on small lots, but there are a few homes on double lots.

Mr. Skakun stated the houses to the east and west of his property were each three lots. He believed one of them was sold and they may be single lots, but the other is still a triple lot.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Mill, with reference to File #19-6907 and application from Mr. George Skakun Jr., 23655 Donaldson, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, for variance to Clinton Township Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1298.01-(b), Supplementary Regulations, Accessory Buildings (Including Garages), concerning Lots 38 & 39, Donaldson Park Subdivision, located fronting the north line of Donaldson, east of Harper, addressed as 23655 Donaldson (Parcel #16-11-36-354-008), that variance be granted to permit the replacement of a detached accessory structure (garage) for a single-family dwelling in the R-5 One-Family Residential District measuring 1,344 square feet, being 508 square feet in excess of the maximum

permitted 836 square feet; further, this grant of variance is based on claimed practical difficulty being the need for storage space to neatly keep woodworking equipment, garden equipment, and other homeowner's belongings under cover and inside; further, this grant of variance is contingent upon compliance with all other requirements of Township ordinances. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Mill, Pearl, D'Angelo, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Marella. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**3.429 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED EAST OF MORAVIAN, SOUTH OF CASS,
ADDRESSED AS 20975 MOXON (PARCEL #16-11-15-152-013)**

- **APPEAL: SFR – MOXON, 20975**

**FILE #19-6908: PETITIONED BY MS. MARLENA FRONCZEK-DUCZYNSKA
REPRESENTED BY MR. RANDALL FRITCHEY & MR. RICH STRENGER PLLC**

Mr. Campbell summarized the variance being requested and read the Planner Review letter dated October 23rd, 2019 into the record. Mr. Campbell advised that notice of this public hearing was issued by regular mail to 16 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 1 of those returned as undeliverable. There were no written replies received in response to the mailing.

Mr. Rich Strenger, attorney on behalf of the applicant, explained the reason Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska would like the fence in her front yard is because when they purchased the house last year, located on 3.4 acres, the majority of that acreage was in the rear yard. He claimed the seller disclosure statement indicated that there were no wetlands in the rear yard, but as it turned out, the majority of the rear yard is wetland. He explained that Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska has pets and her intention was to put a fence around the rear yard for the pets to run. Now that she has discovered most of that area is wetlands, she cannot do that so he claimed she is forced to put the fencing in the front yard, which is the main reason for the request. He cited examples of fencing in the front yards of homes in the adjacent areas, and he is not sure whether those people were grandfathered, or whether they were granted variances.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska, petitioner, explained that they intend to plant shrubs around to make it look nice, and the fence will be less visible. She stated they intend to erect an aluminum fence, with the style referred to as the "Martha Washington", and it is a light brown color that will blend in with the natural setting. She anticipates that by summer, the entire yard will be covered with plantings. She explained when they purchased this property, they always intended to clean it up and make it attractive. They want to enjoy their yard, but there are a lot of wild animals in that area, so they are trying to prevent them from coming up to their door, and they want to protect their small pets. She indicated the wildlife can be unpredictable, so they want to enjoy it from a distance and not have them right up to their living room. She added that they also want to plant a vegetable garden and keep the wildlife away from it.

Mr. Gary Broad, 20850 Moxon, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, resident across the street from the subject location for at least 35 years, noted that the

neighborhood is 100 years old. He is not aware of any fences situated in front yards in their area. He questioned how many pets Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska has.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska replied she has four pets.

Mr. Broad noted that some of Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska's property is in the floodplain, but in all the years he has been living at this location, he only witnessed the river overflow one time and encroach into part of the yard. He felt if they want to put up a fence to protect their cats, they can put it up behind their house and not in front. He stated it is a private road, and they have never had fences in the front yards.

Mr. Tim Phillips, 20825 Moxon, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, stated his property abuts the subject parcel. He agreed with Mr. Broad and claimed there are no front-yard fences. He replied to inquiry that he lives on the same side of the street as Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska, and his property ends at the start of the floodplain. He estimated that out of the 3.4-acre parcel owned by the petitioner, about 0.3 acre is in the floodplain. He questioned the height of the proposed fence.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska replied the fence is about 4 feet in height.

Mr. Phillips replied to inquiry that he is opposed to the variance request.

Mr. Campbell stated that there was no picture of the fence submitted with documentation to the Township. He felt it is difficult to deal with the request without a specific picture of what they are proposing. He commented that if this were a privacy fence, he would be firmly against it, but if it is an upscale aluminum-type fence with a lot of gaps, it might be something more acceptable and amenable to the neighborhood. He stated he would like to postpone this item until the petitioner and her representative have an opportunity to submit documentation as to their exact request.

Mr. Marella noted as he drove around, he observed a wrought iron fence, but he did not know if it was in the front or the back, adding that the homes face different directions along that street. He agreed with Mr. Campbell that he would like to see what it looks like before he considers the request.

Mr. Pearl pointed out that, according to the diagram, they are showing fencing all around the house. He inquired as to which part of it is situated in the front yard.

Mr. Thompson replied that not all of the fencing is within the front yard because the fencing wraps around the sides of the house. He explained it is an unusual-shaped lot and the house is oriented differently so it is not straightforward as to what is the front yard and what is the rear yard. He indicated if they look at the survey, north is up and

slightly to the right, so the building line between the northwest and southwest corners of the house constitutes the front of the house.

Mr. Pearl questioned whether that would be the west section of the driveway and the part of land south of that which would be considered in the front yard.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively.

Mr. Pearl clarified the portion requiring the variance would be the portion of fencing that measures 82 feet, then the 60-foot section heading northwest, and then a portion of the 194-foot section that would head northeast back to the building line of the home.

Mr. Thompson replied that is correct, and that portion would all be in the front yard.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether the neighbors are aware that the petitioner can put the remainder of the fence up without a variance and the part he just outlined is the only section that would require a variance.

The neighbors came up to view the survey, and Mr. Pearl pointed out the portion of the requested fence that is proposed to be located in the front yard.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether looking at the proposed location has changed the feelings of the neighbors.

Mr. Broad agreed with Mr. Campbell's suggestion that the matter be postponed so the petitioner can submit a good drawing and everyone can see exactly what is being requested.

Mr. Marella agreed they need to see what the fence is going to look like.

Further discussion took place regarding the location of the proposed fence.

Mr. Campbell questioned whether the house is currently occupied. He indicated it appears to be empty.

Mr. Strenger replied that his clients are doing extensive renovation, and there have been contractors in and out. He claimed when they submitted their request, there were drawings included from the fence company.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska claimed when they submitted the application, they included a drawing from Eastside Fence showing the measurements, and they also attached a survey of the property, showing the total fence line measured 540 feet wrapping around the back, the sides and the front.

Mr. Campbell confirmed that there was a Proposal/Contract included that was prepared by Eastside Fence, but they are looking for a photograph of the type of fencing because

the type of fencing is not evident on the paperwork submitted. He noted a common type of fencing in the past was the chain-link style of fence, but he pointed out this is an upscale neighborhood but he could not see where anyone would agree to a chain link fence in a front yard.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska explained she provided the name of the type of fencing but understood that they would like her to provide a picture of the type of fencing. She claimed at the corner of Moravian and Moxon, the owner has a wooden fence.

Mr. Marella stated they will postpone this item so the petitioner can submit the photograph of the type of fence being proposed.

Mr. Campbell stated he would also like to see the exact location because it appears the driveway is being cut off with the fencing extending across the driveway.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska replied claimed it appears as though there used to be a fence in the front. She tried to explain where the fence will go in relation to the driveway, the easement and a landscaped portion of the front.

Mr. Marella understood the petitioner is trying to explain where it will go, but he emphasized that they cannot see it so they will have to show that in a drawing and a picture of the type of fencing.

Ms. Fronczek-Duczynska understood that they already have the drawing showing the location, but she indicated she can submit a picture.

Mr. Strenger requested that this be postponed so they can come back with the picture.

Mr. Pearl pointed out the dimensions they are showing on the fence proposal actually encompasses a large area of land for small dogs to run, but the portion of that area that extends into the front is not that big, so he could not see what the advantage is to extending the fencing into the front. He stated he is not convinced that the petitioner needs this portion that falls within the front yard, especially if the neighbors are in opposition. He stated this is a nice area, and he could not see where the petitioner will gain that much by extending the small portion into the front yard.

Mr. Strenger claimed there are wetlands in the back, and he was under the impression to build even a fence in the floodplain, they have to obtain permission from the DNR.

Discussion took place regarding the proposed area for the fencing.

Mr. Pearl understood that they are not fencing in the entire acreage, but they are fencing in a sizeable area in the back that can be used. He pointed out that a of residents across Moravian do not even have that much area.

Mr. Campbell stated in looking at the sketch from Eastside Fence and in looking at the front of the house from the street, the portion to the right side of the house drops off dramatically. He questioned how much of the land is useful to have fenced in for dogs or kids because of the topography. He added that a topographical plan would be useful to convince him that this is the right plan for this property.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether the Building Department can come up with that information.

Mr. Thompson stated it is something they can look at. He felt it would be best if they get a picture of not only the fencing proposed but also to clarify the two drawings submitted. He felt the Eastside Fence proposal sketch does not match the mortgage survey that was submitted with the proposed fence lines drawn in.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether the neighbors will be notified of the next meeting.

Mr. Campbell replied they are not notified if this is postponed to a specific date at this meeting.

Motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Marella, with reference to File #19-6908 and application from Ms. Marlena Fronczek-Duczynska, 20975 Moxon Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, as represented by Mr. Randall Fritchey, same address, and Mr. Rich Strenger, Law Offices of Rich Strenger PLLC, 1064 Arbroak Way, Lake Orion, Michigan 48362, for variance to Clinton Township Building and Housing Code, Part Fourteen, Title Six, Miscellaneous Building Regulations, Chapter 1472.03-J, Fences, General Requirements, Location in Front Yard, concerning 3.429 acres of land located east of Moravian Drive, south of Cass Avenue, addressed as 20975 Moxon Drive (Parcel #16-11-15-152-013), that further consideration of request for variance to permit the installation of a fence for a single-family residential dwelling in the R-3 One-Family Residential District to be allowed in the front yard, which is not permitted, be postponed until the next Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, December 11th, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. so the petitioner can provide additional information to include pictures of the fence, clarification of topographical layouts of the diagrams and exactly where the fence will be located. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Campbell, Marella, Mill, Pearl, D’Angelo, Deyak, DiBartolomeo. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

REPORT OF MEETING

-- APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 16TH, 2019 REPORT

Mr. Campbell requested the following change:

Page 2, last line:

Change from:	“He questioned how it got in the wrong location.”
Change to:	“He questioned how the pool got in the wrong location.”

Motion by Mr. Mill, supported by Mr. Campbell, to approve the minutes of the October 16th, 2019 Report of Meeting, as presented this evening. Motion carried.

BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING SCHEDULE

**-- CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA AND ATTENDANCE:
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11TH, 2019 AT 6:30 P.M.**

Mr. Thompson confirmed the next Board of Appeals meeting will be on Wednesday, December 11th, 2019 at 6:30 p.m., which is the second Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Thompson stated there are two applications for consideration at the next meeting:

- Residence Inn on Hayes – requesting a sign variance
- Velic Transportation on Groesbeck – new development requesting variances for front yard setback for parking, and for screening requirements.

He added that the postponed item from tonight will also be on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Deyak, supported by Mr. Campbell, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Campbell

Robert M. Campbell, Secretary
CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

ces:11/21/19

ces:11/22/19

Approved 12/11/19