

PROPOSED MINUTES
LAKETOWN TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
4338 BEELINE ROAD
ALLEGAN COUNTY
HOLLAND, MI 49423
(616) 335-3050

January 24, 2018

ARTICLE I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman David Weishaar called the regular monthly Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Weishaar, Ed Stielstra, Jim Johnson,
Marcia Perry, Casey Kimes, Richard Swanson
MEMBERS ABSENT: Carl Blauwkamp
STAFF PRESENT: Diane Ybarra – Recording Secretary

ARTICLE II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Zoning Board of Appeals members reviewed the minutes of the June 28, 2017 meeting. **A motion was made by Stielstra and seconded by Johnson to approve the minutes as submitted. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED.**

ARTICLE III. OLD BUSINESS - None

ARTICLE IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Kimes and seconded by Stielstra to approve the current slate of officers as follows: David Weishaar, Chair; Jim Johnson, Vice Chair; Ed Stielstra, Secretary. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

B. HAWK VARIANCE REQUEST

Ms. Elizabeth Hawk, owner or agent of property located at 2394 Waukazoo Trail, that being parcel

#0311-340-288-00, requests a variance from section 38-242 of the zoning code. This section requires certain minimum setbacks from a lot line. Ms. Hawk would like to construct a deck on the rear of her existing cottage that would have less than the required minimum setbacks.

Bill Petroelje represented Ms. Hawk and explained it is a 30 x 40 deck. The setbacks are 25' so requesting a variance setback of 12 feet, adding that the DEQ permit was approved and received. Johnson asked if there were any objections from the neighbors and Petroelje responded not to his knowledge. Kimes asked for clarification of the variance from the lot line or the center of the road. Perry asked what percentage of the lot will be left uncovered and Petroelje was uncertain of the exact measurement.

Weishaar opened the public hearing.

One letter of support was received from Haislet and Strehle of 2425 Waukazoo Trail.

Hearing no comments, **a motion was made by Stielstra and seconded by Swanson to close the public hearing. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

Johnson said based on the unique characteristics of the Macatawa area, we have approved similar requests and he does not see a problem with it. Stielstra supported; Perry said it seems harmonious with the surrounding area; Kimes clarified that the approval is for the variance of 14-15' from center of road to edge of deck.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Johnson and seconded by Stielstra to approve the Hawk Variance Request finding the standards and requirements stated in Section 38.242 have been met, in compliance with the application and compliance with all federal, state, county and township laws and ordinances and the verbal representation provided at this meeting and in the minutes. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

C. POPP VARIANCE REQUEST

Bryan and Toanh Popp, owners or agents of property located at 2219 Griswold Avenue, that being tax parcel #0311-340-178-00, request a variance from section 38-242 of the zoning code. This section requires certain minimum setbacks from a lot line. Popp would like to construct an addition and deck on their existing cottage that would have less than the required minimum setbacks.

Chuck Posthumus represented the applicant and explained the proposed addition to the existing cottage and a new deck. The builder has a permit for the renovation of the existing cottage. The DEQ permit is not available (1930's cottage) but application has been submitted. The plan is to do most of the major construction in the fall after the summer season. The plan is to keep the character of the old cottage and add on to the north side of the house to include an upper level screened sleeping porch. There will not be a garage but additional parking spaces will be added consisting of concrete and pavers. Posthumus referenced a letter of support that had not been received by the township. Johnson

asked if there will be view obstruction for the neighbor to the east and Posthumus responded that there will not be. Swanson asked for clarification of the entrance. Perry asked about the mature trees along the side yard and asked if excavation will be done. Posthumus said the owners are sensitive to the trees. Stielstra asked about the elevation to the north and Posthumus responded that it is almost level.

Weishaar opened the public hearing.

Frank Barrett of 2225 Crescent Walk said he just bought property which is directly to the east and would like more information as he is concerned about his view of the lake. He asked if it will be a one or two story addition. Posthumus explained the proposed construction elevation. Following discussion, there was some uncertainty as to whether or not the new construction would cause a view obstruction.

Hearing no further comments, **a motion was made by Swanson and seconded by Johnson to close the public hearing. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

Swanson said from every other standpoint sees no problem but appreciates the concerns of Barrett.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Swanson and seconded by Perry to table the Popp Variance Request pending additional information. Chair Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. 4 to 1 VOTE - MOTION APPROVED**

Stielstra suggested Posthumus provide an elevation drawing of the current cottage and proposed addition at the next meeting to include the northern most roof line and the tree placement. Posthumus agreed.

ARTICLE V. CITIZENS COMMENTS

Posthumus said he will provide more clarity of the multiple projects underway in this area at the next meeting.

ARTICLE VI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Swanson and seconded by Stielstra to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 P.M. Chairman Weishaar called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED