1	Mason County Planning & Zoning Department		
2	102 E. FIFTH STREET		
3	SCOTTVILLE, MICHIGAN 49454		
4	(231) 757-9272 • FAX (231) 757-9253		
5			
6			
7			
8	June 1, 2016		
9			
	Minutes of the Mason County Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on June 1, 2016, 7:30		
10	p.m. held at 102 E. 5 th Street, Scottville, MI.		
11			
12	MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerry Jensen, Ron Krepps, Richard Anderson, Joanie		
13			
14	Wiersma, Ralph Lundberg		
15			
16	MEMBERS ABSENT:		
17	OFFICIALS DRESENT: Many Dailly Trudy Day		
18	OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mary Reilly, Trudy Roy		
19	larry langer called meeting to order at 7:20 pm		
20	Jerry Jensen called meeting to order at 7:30 pm.		
21	A metion was made by Delph Lundberg and O nd by Disbard Anderson to engrave the		
22	A motion was made by Ralph Lundberg and 2 nd by Richard Anderson to approve the		
23	meeting minutes of May 18, 2016 as amended. Motion carried, 5 yes 0 No.		
24 25	Addition to Agonda: Nono		
25 26	Addition to Agenda: None		
26 27	Public Commont: Nono		
27	Public Comment: None		
28 29	Correspondence: None		
30	Correspondence. None		
31	A public hearing was held for variance application PZ16066 for Gary Kamp. The		
32	subject property is located at 1409 N. Cedar Lane in Amber Township and zoned Single		
33	Family Residential (R1). The applicant is requesting:		
33 34	Tamily Residential (TT). The applicant is requesting.		
35	1. a 12' variance from the required 25' front yard setback for placement of a 24' X 30' attached		
36	garage with 8' X 10' structural connection (enclosed mudroom entry).		
37	2. a 6' variance from the required 40' setback from the water's edge of Hackert/Crystal Lake for		
38	placement of a 10' X 36' deck.		
39			
40	Mary Reilly provided a staff report, summarized below. The report included a site plan		
41	and photos of the site. There was no correspondence for or against the application.		
42			
43	FINDINGS OF FACT:		
44	1. The lot is conforming in frontage and area —area is approximately 13,900 sf (over the		
45	12,000 sf minimum) – Lot has approximately 100' of frontage (75' minimum		
46	requirement). According to the plat, it would have 116' of frontage.		

47	2.	Dwelling is 36 X 47 (conforming). Constructed in 1978 when zoning was in effect. The	
48		parcel was zoned R-1 in 1978, with the same setback requirements of 25 front, 10 side,	
49		40 feet to water. The parcel is still zoned R-1 with the same setback requirements.	
50	3.	The septic system is currently near the SW corner of the dwelling and it is going to be	
51		replaced. The new septic will be relocated closer to the front yard (road side) near the	
52		south property line.	
53	4.	Water well is located on the north side of the house.	
54	5.	The garage will obscure the view of the front of the home.	
55	6.	The garage will be connected to the dwelling via an 8' X 10' addition.	
56	7.	The owner wishes to retain some space between the garage and the house to retain the	
57	7.	windows/light on the front of the house and retain a small green space between the	
58		house and garage.	
59	8.	The owner originally proposed an 8' X 13' breezeway but shortened it up to an 8' X 10'	
60	0.	to decrease the variance and also proposed a 12' wide deck but the agreed to narrow it	
61		to a 10' wide deck to decrease the variance.	
62	9.	The 24' X 30' garage will have 8' sidewalls and be approximately 13'6" to the peak.	
63	9. 10.	There is an existing cement pad, partially in the road ROW and partially in the front	
64	10.	setback where the owners currently park cars.	
		selback where the owners currently park cars.	
65 66	A motion w	as made by Dan Kranne and O nd by Dalph Lundhard to assent the Staff	
66	A motion was made by Ron Krepps and 2 nd by Ralph Lundberg to accept the Staff		
67	Report into the record. Motion carried, 5 Yes 0 No.		
68		and the state of the second state of the second state of the second	
69	Raiph Lund	perg asked about the cement pad at the edge of the road.	
70			
71	Mary Reilly stated the pad is about 25' wide and is used as a parking area for cars. Part		
72	of the pad is in the road right of way, such as how a driveway would be in the road right		
73	of way		
74			
75	Joanie Wersma asked about the height of the house.		
76			
77	Gary Kamp stated he did not know but the garage will be about 13' which will be a little		
78	lower than the house.		
79			
80	There was a	a discussion by the Board on what constitutes an attached garage and if a	
81		uld be needed if there was no mud room.	
82			
83	Ralph Lund	berg mentioned unless Mr. Kamp changed the configuration of his garage,	
84	which would make it a very small garage, he would still need a variance.		
85		i mano n a vory oman galago, no novia om nood a vananoor	
86	The Board discussed the traffic and area around Mr. Kamp's dwelling.		
87		noodobod the trane and area areand wit. Ramp o awening.	
88	larry lanca	n stated he had a problem with the deck. The previous owner built a deck	
89	•	water then enclosed the deck. This makes the deck an issue because the	
90 01	predecessor	r created the problem.	
91 02	Don Kronne	montioned Mr. Kamp could build a notic on the ground and it would not be	
92 02		mentioned Mr. Kamp could build a patio on the ground and it would not be	
93	a problem.		
94			

- Gary Kamp mentioned there was 44' from the house to the waters edge and asked if the Board was saying he could put up a 4' deck.
- 97 98

99

- Mary Reilly said he could.
- 100 Gary Kamp asked if he could put a deck on the south side of his house.
- 101 102 Mary Reilly stated he could as long as the deck was 40' from the lake.
- 103

105

- 104 Gary Kamp stated he would really like to have a deck on the lake side of the house.
- 106 Jerry Jensen explained the standard #2 about not being created by the owner or 107 predecessor in title.
- 109 Jerry Jensen closed the public hearing.
- 110

108

- Jerry Jensen read the standards for receiving a variance from Section 24.05 (3) a, b, c, and d of the Mason County Zoning Ordinance for the variance for the garage.
- 113
- A. The strict compliance with the ordinance would cause a practical difficulty and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by all other property owners within the same zoning district. There are other garages in the front yard in the area and those garages received a variance or were built before zoning. The cars will no longer be parked in the road right of way if the garage is constructed. All agree.
- B. The conditions and circumstances unique to the property were not created by the
 owner or his predecessor in title. The lot is conforming but the natural features
 have created a problem with the land sloping toward the lake. The garage could
 not be located in the side yard to the slope of the property. All agree.
- 123 C. The requested variance will not grant special privileges that are denied other 124 properties similarly situated and in the same zoning district. The Board has 125 granted similar variances in the past for garages in the front yard on lake front 126 lots. All agree.
 - D. The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit of this Zoning Ordinance. The garage will keep the cars from parking in the right of way. This is a low traffic area and a road the ends in a culde-sac, traffic speeds are low. All agree.
- A motion was made by Ron Krepps and 2nd by Ralph Lundberg to grant a 12' variance from the 25' front yard setback (south) to construct a 24' x 30' detached garage with 8' X 10' mudroom. Motion carried, 5 Yes, 0 No. Variance granted based on standards 24.05 (3) A-D of the Mason County Zoning Ordinance.
- Jerry Jensen read the standards for receiving a variance from Section 24.05 (3) a, b, c,
 and d of the Mason County Zoning Ordinance for the variance for the deck.
- 138

135

127 128

129 130

- A. The strict compliance with the ordinance would cause a practical difficulty and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by all other property owners within the same zoning district. Decks have not been approved within the required 40' setback of a lake. All agree.
- B. The conditions and circumstances unique to the property were not created by the

- 144owner or his predecessor in title.When the house and the original deck were145built they were conforming. The previous owner enclosed the deck causing the146new owner to ask for a variance in order to build a deck. All agree.
- 147 C. The requested variance will not grant special privileges that are denied other 148 properties similarly situated and in the same zoning district. A special privilege 149 would be granted because the Board has not granted a variance in the 40' 150 setback. All agree.
- 151 D. **The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit of this Zoning Ordinance.** 152 Granting would be contrary to the ordinance. The deck can be reopened from 153 the three-season room or built on the side of the dwelling. All agree.

A motion was made by Ralph Lundberg and 2nd by Richard Anderson to deny a 6' variance from the 40' water front setback (north) to construct a 10' X 36' deck. Motion carried, 5 Yes, 0 No. Variance was denied based on standards 24.05 (3) A-D of the Mason County Zoning Ordinance.

159

154

- ¹⁶⁰ Zoning Directors Report: The next meeting will be June 15, 2016.
- 161

Planning Commission Report: Mary Reilly gave the Board a summary on the sand mining operation for Jay Shillinger granted at the May 17, 2016 meeting and the preliminary site plan review for a 7-unit site condominium on S. Lakeshore Dr in Summit Township.

- 166
- 167 There was no public comment.
- 168
- 169 Meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.
- 170 171

Joan Wiersma, Secretary Zoning Board of Appeals

- 172 173
- 174
- 175
- 176