

SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
September 18, 2019

Call to Order: Chairperson Whitley called the September 18, 2019 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 7:30 pm at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

In attendance: Dean Baker
Bill Whitley
Matt Underwood
Denny Vallad
Jim Carlton

Absent: None

AGENDA:

Board member Underwood moved to proceed with the agenda as presented. Supported by Board member Vallad. Vote yes: Baker, Carlton, Underwood, Vallad, Whitley. Vote no: None. Absent: None. Motion approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Board member Underwood moved to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2019 meeting as presented. Supported by Board member Carlton. Vote yes: Baker, Carlton, Underwood, Vallad, Whitley. Vote no: None. Abstain: Whitley. Absent: None. Motion approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. (Tabled on August 21, 2019) Request from Michael Clemons, 11280 East Holly Road, Davisburg, 48350 for a variance to construct an accessory building with a front setback of twenty (20) feet instead of the fifty (50) feet required per Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Chapter 40, Section 40-572. Also, request to temporarily allow accessory structure square footage in the amount of 2104 square feet instead of the 2001 square feet allowed as per Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Chapter 40, Section 40-649.

The property that is the subject of the request is located at 11280 East Holly Road in Springfield Township and is zoned R-2 One Family Residential. P.I. #07-04-276-026.

Mr. Clemons introduced himself to the Board. He stated that he is proposing a new build on a concrete pad that already exists on the property. He would like to build an accessory building to use as a workshop. The unique shape of the property is such that the actual front of the property is about 480 feet off of East Holly Road. The neighbor is actually in

front of the front of his property. The concrete pad already exists at 20 feet, he would like to use that pad to put up the structure.

Chairperson Whitley confirmed that the existing concrete pad is 20 feet from the property line and the proposed building will be at the 20 foot line.

Mr. Clemons answered yes.

Chairperson Whitley commented that there is currently a shed on the concrete pad. He asked what is being done with that.

Mr. Clemons answered that it will be removed and moved to a different location on the property. Once the new structure is built, he will destroy the shed. He asked for the extension to March of 2020 to give him time to destroy it.

Board member Carlton stated that he understands why the applicant wants to put the proposed structure on the concrete slab. He asked if there was any reason why he could not move it 30 feet back. He is trying to determine what the practical difficulty is other than an existing concrete slab because that is not enough for him.

Mr. Clemons stated that the slab is 44 feet long so he would have to chop up 60% of it to make the new front line.

Board member Carlton stated that he could keep the slab itself because that is not the issue.

Mr. Clemons stated that it is wasteful because that slab already exists and the cost of the concrete. Other than that, there is no reason why he can't go back.

Board member Vallad asked if there was a structure on that slab at one time?

Mr. Clemons replied no.

Chairperson Whitley asked what type of construction was the applicant proposing?

Mr. Clemons answered standard stick build construction. He wants it to be energy efficient.

Chairperson Whitley asked if he was going to require footings and how would that work.

Mr. Clemons answered that the footings would go under the existing pad. The pad will rest on the footings. He clarified how he would construct it around the existing concrete pad.

Board member Vallad confirmed that this would be the 50 foot dimension to the side lot.

Board member Baker stated that he appreciates the desire to use the existing concrete. The Board needs to consider each request to see if the property is somehow keeping the

resident from enjoying the property as other people would enjoy it because there is some unique element about the property. The only unique element is a preexisting concrete slab which is desirable to take advantage of.

Mr. Clemons answered that that is the front of the property solely because of it's parallelism to the road. You can't see the proposed structure from the road. It seems like the intent of the 50 foot rule is to keep people from being too close to the road. His proposed structure would be far from the road.

Mr. Tim Purves, neighbor, stated that this would no way impede the enjoyment or use of his property.

Board member Vallad stated that he understands the points made. There is a lot of property there and nothing impeding it. He asked about access to the proposed garage.

Mr. Clemons answered that it is not a garage, it is a workshop and he will install a concrete walkway.

Board members discussed the lack of practical difficulty with this case.

Mr. Clemons stated that concrete is a big carbon dioxide emitter, so he is trying to eliminate any extra concrete and build it ecologically. He would like to minimize the concrete and install insulation to minimize energy usage.

Board member Underwood asked if there was any topographical issues.

Mr. Clemons stated that the land does slope up from that point so if he did move it 30 feet back, he would have to remove a lot of topsoil in order to get it at the same level as the existing slab.

Board member Carlton stated that he doesn't remember the slope being that close.

Board member Baker stated that the grade does rise as you move to the back but not to such a degree that would hinder moving the proposed structure back. He did not see it as a hardship.

Chairperson Whitley stated that if this was a side setback, it wouldn't be as troubling. From the neighbor's point of view, it is a side yard setback.

Chairperson Whitley stated that the ordinance describes the front setback as the required setback from the property line which is frequently at the road, but not always.

Board members discussed the layout of the property.

Board member Carlton moved to deny the request for the 20-foot front yard setback because no practical difficulty is observed that would preclude a 50-foot front setback. Supported by Board member Baker. Vote yes: Baker, Carlton, Underwood, Vallad, Whitley. Vote no: None. Absent: None. Motion approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Board member Underwood moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:47 pm. Supported by Board member Baker. Vote yes: Baker, Carlton, Underwood, Vallad, Whitley. Vote no: None. Absent: None. Motion approved.

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary