

**BIRMINGHAM BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS PROCEEDINGS  
TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 2017  
City Commission Room  
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan**

---

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA") held on Tuesday, April 18, 2017. Chairman Charles Lillie convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman Charles Lillie; Board Members Kevin Hart, Jeffery Jones, Peter Lyon, Erik Morganroth; Alternate Board Members Jason Canvasser, Kristen ~~Bairdi~~Baiardi

**Absent:** Board Members Vice Chairman Randolph Judd, John Miller

**Administration:** Matthew Baka, Senior Planner  
Bruce Johnson, Building Official  
Mike Morad, Building Inspector  
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary  
Scott Worthington, Assistant Building Official

The chairman welcomed everyone and explained the BZA procedure to the audience. Additionally, he noted that the members of the Zoning Board are appointed by the City Commission and are volunteers. They sit at the pleasure of the City Commission to hear appeals from petitioners who are seeking variances from the City's Zoning Ordinance. Under Michigan law, a dimensional variance requires four affirmative votes from this board, and the petitioner must show a practical difficulty. A land use variance requires five affirmative votes and the petitioner has to show a hardship. There is one land use variance called for this evening. Also, appeals are heard by the board as far as interpretations or rulings. Four affirmative votes are required to reverse an interpretation or ruling. There are no interpretations on this evening's agenda.

**T# 04-21-17**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BZA MEETING OF MARCH 14, 2017**

**Motion by Mr. Morganroth**

**Seconded by Mr. Lyon to approve the Minutes of the BZA meeting of March 14, 2017 as presented.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Morganroth, Lyon, ~~Baird~~Baiardi, Canvasser, Hart, Jones, Lillie,

Nays: None

Absent: Judd, Miller

**T# 04-22-17**

**677 S. Eton  
Appeal 17-07**

The owners of the property known as 677 S. Eton are requesting the following variance to allow an auto sales agency in the Mixed Use ("MX") Zoning District.

A. Chapter 126, Article 2, Section 2.39, Commercial Permitted Uses of the Zoning Ordinance does not permit the operation of an auto sales agency in the MX District. Therefore, a use variance to permit an auto sales agency in the MX District is requested.

This property is zoned MX Mixed Use.

Mr. Baka advised the property is currently used as an auto repair facility, Auto Europe. The requested use variance would allow the applicant to register their dealership license at this location and store a small number of vehicles that are meant for existing customers. No auto showroom is intended or included on the plans as submitted. Auto repair would continue as the primary use on the property. Plans have been submitted that indicate a small area will be converted into storage.

It was determined that Auto Sales Agency is not defined in the Ordinance. It has always been considered that Auto Sales Agency has the right to sell cars but not display them. It is not specifically listed as a permitted use in the MX District and therefore is considered as not permitted.

Chairman Lillie cautioned if the board grants a use variance it will run with the land and a different owner could expand that use. Mr. Lyon received confirmation that Auto Sales Agency is listed in the Ordinance as a use in B-2, B-2B, B-2C, B-4; and MU-5 and MU-7 in the Triangle District. Auto Showroom is only permitted in B-3 (555 Building and Birmingham Place).

Mr. Roger Young, Young and Young Architects, spoke to represent the property owner, Mr. Tom Schick of Auto Europe, who was present along with the General Manager, Rob Abraham. The proposed use variance would permit Auto Europe to consolidate their existing Woodward sales office with the Eton service business under one roof at the Eton location which was recently purchased by the Schick family. The physical and day-to-day visual activities that occur at the Auto Europe Eton Service Center would remain unchanged because the use is such a low impact on the existing operations and

will not negatively affect the surrounding community. The use would be an accessory to the prevailing service business and allow the storage of a handful of vehicles within a limited area that is outside of the public's eye. The cars are merely stored and prepped in the existing service department. Then the owners come and pick up their vehicle and there is no dedicated sales staff.

Chairman Lillie received confirmation that Mr. Young's client has used the Eton property for 16 years. He explained the problem is there is a much higher burden for a use variance than for a dimensional variance. First, the applicant must show that the property cannot be used for the permitted purpose in that Zone District. Secondly, the plight is due to the unique circumstances peculiar to the property and not the general conditions of the neighborhood. There has been no showing that the property cannot be used or that it is different than any other property in the District. Also, it must be proved that the problem is not self-created, which it is because the owner is trying to move their dealership license to the Eton address.

It was established that in order to move the license a showroom is needed that is permitted by the zoning.

Mr. Jones pointed out it is relatively clear that what the petitioner wants is not permitted in the zoning area where the building is located. So, he is asking the board for a license to avoid the law. The criteria requires a hardship and Mr. Jones does not see a hardship. Mr. Young replied the hardship for the Schick family is they would like to stay in the community at that location. They are asking the board to consider the use strictly tied as an accessory to the primary operations within the facility.

Mr. Jones inquired if they have made any efforts to go to the City and/or City Commission relating to a modification of these Zoning Ordinances specifically as a clarification of what the board views as a grey area, versus asking this board to take a legislative position when they are not a legislative body. Mr. Young indicated they had a meeting with City staff to discuss all the various procedures available. It was felt they should start with this board first before going to the City Commission.

Chairman Lillie observed if the board were to grant the use variance it would be spot zoning.

There were no comments from members of the audience at 8:08 p.m.

**Motion by Mr. Lyon**

**Seconded by Mr. Morganroth in regard to Appeal 17-07, 677 S. Eton for a use variance. Unfortunately he would move to deny the variance as advertised. The appellant has quite an uphill battle to prove first of all that the property cannot be used for a permitted purpose when it is actually being used for a permitted**

**purpose. That is the first, so it kind of becomes moot to meet the rest of them. He is very sympathetic to the plight of the applicant; however this would be spot zoning almost by definition and it is hard for us to get the intent of the Planning Board when they set up the MX District. This is the second similar variance that has been requested in this area. It might be time to have the Planning Board consider adding some limited amount of sales agency or auto showroom.**

**But because the appellant hasn't met the burden of proof, Mr. Lyon would move to deny the variance as advertised.**

Mr. Morganroth noted the board is handcuffed to the idea that if a hardship is not shown they cannot do the spot zoning.

Mr. Canvasser indicated he would support the motion to deny because the property has been used for the past 16 year for the purpose permitted. He also noted that Auto Sales Agency is not expressly included the MX District permitted uses. Therefore he believes it is excluded. To him Auto Sales Agency means that it sells cars, regardless of the volume and that is not permitted.

Mr. Hart said he will not support the motion because he feels this is a perfect example of a well suited use for this District. This board could apply restrictions to the variance that would meet all of its concerns.

| Ms. ~~Bairdi~~BaiardiBaiardi expressed her support of the motion. She feels the petitioner has failed to meet the burden of proof. The plight is due to the business plan of the petitioner and not really related to the unique circumstances of the property.

Mr. Jones observed he will support the motion. The petitioner has not expressed a hardship. This board doesn't want to legislate and he believes this would be spot zoning. The majority of the petitioner's concerns are business related and they are not zoning issues.

The Chairman said he too will support the motion. The petitioner has not established a hardship.

**Motion to deny carried, 6-1.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

| Yeas: Lyon, Morganroth, ~~Bairdi~~BaiardiBaiardi, Canvasser, Jones, Lillie

Nays: Hart

Absent: Judd, Miller

**T# 04-23-17**

**909 SOUTHFIELD RD.**

**Appeal 17-08**

The owners of the property known as 909 Southfield Rd. are requesting the following variance for a front porch with basement below.

A. Chapter 126, Article 02, section 2.08 requires structures to be behind the front yard setback, except for allowable projections named in Article 04, section 4.30. The basement encroaches into the required front setback of 47.12 ft. by 4.64 ft. Therefore a variance of 4.64 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-2.

Mr. Worthington advised the builder has modified the approved plans on file without approval from the Building Dept. and constructed the basement into the required front yard setback. The builder was informed of the zoning issue back on 11-31-15 during a slab inspection. They were told the basement had to be filled in but have not done so. They were allowed to progress on other areas of the house while they submitted tonight's application.

Mr. Lyon thought it would be an easy matter for the builder to wall off the area, waterproof it, damp proof it, insulate it, fill it up with sand and be done.

Mr. Joe Bolsoma spoke on behalf of Trowbridge Companies. He indicated this was brought to his attention during the basement stone inspection. The whole area had been excavated to take out the pre-existing house. Being that it was excavated he decided to keep it open and construct basement walls. He was not thinking that it was in the setback and that they couldn't do that. That area is blocked off right now. He has gotten estimates of about \$15 thousand to block off the area and fill it in. Even worse they have an interested buyer that may be lost.

Chairman Lillie said he hasn't heard a practical difficulty. The petitioner hasn't shown a reason why he couldn't have complied with the Zoning Ordinance. Filling in the basement will cost some money, but dollar cost is not a criteria for granting a variance.

Mr. Lyon noted that once the pre-existing house is gone they have a blank slate and the zoning applies. Mr. Hart added this is a brand new house and it should have been a piece of cake, so he doesn't see a hardship. The petitioner submitted plans to the City but didn't build to those plans.

The chairman took comments from the public at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Sal Orlando spoke on behalf of the Trowbridge team. He stated the City should have denied the footing inspection because it deviates from the plan and not let them

proceed to put in a basement. He added the area under the porch is not habitable space; it is storage.

**Motion by Chairman Lillie**

**Seconded by Mr. Morganroth regarding Appeal 17-08, 909 Southfield Rd., to deny the requested variance on the basis that the petitioner has failed to show a practical difficulty. He has not established why he couldn't comply with the Ordinance. He did not comply with the drawings as presented. At one point the problem was pointed out to him and he continued to work. This is really a self-created problem on the part of the petitioner. It does no justice to the surrounding neighbors to go ahead and grant this variance, and if this motion is approved then one criteria he is adding is that the non-conforming portion of the basement is to be filled in and restricted to an unexcavated condition as shown on the plans that the City has approved.**

**Motion to deny carried, 7-0.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Lillie, Morganroth, ~~Baird~~BaiardiBaiardi, Canvasser, Hart, Jones, Lyon

Nays: None

Absent: Judd, Miller

**T# 04-24-17**

**847 SOUTHFIELD RD.**

**Appeal 17-09**

The owners of the property known as 847 Southfield Rd. are requesting the following variance to replace an existing driveway in the same location.

A. Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.31 A.1 allows a maximum of 35% of paved surfaces or parking area. The existing and proposed driveway covers 44.79%, therefore a variance of 9.7% (285 sq. ft.) is requested.

This property is zoned R-2.

Mr. Worthington noted the house was built in 1989, before the limitations were in the City Ordinance. The driveway will be replaced to match the existing size and location of what is there today. Chairman Lillie added the advantage of having the extra space would appear to give the petitioner a chance to turn around and not have to back out onto Southfield Rd.

Mr. Jones noted this is an existing non-conforming use and it is merely a replacement of the concrete.

Mr. Michael Dul, Landscape Architect located at 212 Daines, spoke to represent the property owners, Nancy and John Levy. Mr. Dul requested permission to re-install the driveway as-is and grant the variance of 285 sq. ft. of driveway, based on the current Ordinance. Safety reasons and because the requested variance is just slightly larger than a handicap parking space really mitigate any negativity of the 285 sq. ft.

Mr. Canvasser received confirmation that there isn't any other way to design the driveway to fit in with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Dul indicated they are limited by a large tree in the City right-of-way and it would be awkward to change the configuration.

There were no comments from members of the audience at 8:45 p.m.

**Motion by Mr. Canvasser**

**Seconded by Mr. Lyon to approve the variance for Appeal 17-09, 847 Southfield Rd. and tie it to the plans as presented. In making the motion Mr. Canvasser thinks that strict compliance with the Ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose and would render conformity unnecessarily burdensome.**

**He doesn't think they want anyone backing into Southfield Rd. and then having to put their car into drive and create an unnecessary danger to other vehicles and to pedestrians. So in that regard, he definitely feels it would do substantial justice to other property owners and to the general public.**

**He thinks this is due to the unique circumstances of the property and it is certainly not self-created. Again, we have a large tree in the right-of-way which we certainly want to keep and we don't want that to be torn down. Further, the petitioner indicated that there really is no other option, other than to get rid of a little spot which is as minimal as possible to back out and back into Southfield Rd., which he thinks everyone can agree is not ideal. For those reasons, Mr. Canvasser would again move to grant the requested variance and tie it to the plans presented.**

**Mr. Lyon stated he will support the motion. This is obviously not self-created and he noted it is repair of an existing non-conformity. It does not appear to be self-created.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**ROLLCALL VOTE**

**Yeas: Canvasser, Lyon, ~~Bairdi~~BaiardiBaiardi, Hart, Jones, Lillie, Morganroth**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: Judd, Miller**



**T# 04-25-17**

**325 S. OLD WOODWARD AVE.**

**Appeal 17-10**

The owners of the property known as 325 S. Old Woodward Ave. are requesting the following variances to construct a new Bistro in an existing building.

A. Article 03, Section 3.04, C(10)(f) of the Zoning Ordinance requires 70% glazing between 1 ft. and 8 ft. in height on façades facing the street; with 23% proposed on the north façade and 22% proposed on the west facade. Therefore, variances of 47% and 48% respectively are requested.

This property is zoned B-2 General Business.

Mr. Baka explained the property known as the Peabody Mansion is currently under consideration for a Bistro License. The property is a designated historic structure in the City of Birmingham. In accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant appeared before the Historic District Commission ("HDC") for approval of exterior changes proposed in association with the Bistro following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation. The applicant was granted approval for minor changes to the exterior of the building. However, in order to comply with the 70% glazing requirement, the applicant would have to dramatically alter the façade of the building which would violate the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation that governs the decision making process for the HDC. Accordingly, such changes could not be approved by the HDC.

Chairman Lillie summarized that the Zoning Ordinance is in conflict with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Buildings. What the petitioner is proposing meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Baka added that the 70% glazing requirement is part of the Bistro Ordinance.

Mr. Canvasser received clarification from Mr. Baka that this year there are three applicants for a Bistro License and the City Commission only grants two. If the petitioner receives the variance and doesn't get the Bistro License, the variance doesn't apply to other uses.

Mr. Christopher Longe, Architect, spoke on behalf of the petitioner, Adachi Bistro. This is an adaptive re-use of a permitted use of the property which has not been occupied since December 2015. Having been built in 1878, the building is not easily modified to accommodate many uses from an exterior point of view. It was built as a single-family residence and as a result does not provide the 70% glazing required by the Bistro Ordinance. The proposed changes are within the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as validated by the HDC. The proposed Bistro seems to be exactly



what the Bistro Ordinance was meant to do, which is to target properties that are not activating the street. So he respectfully requested the variance from the Downtown Overlay Development Standards for this historic property. In response to the Chairman, Mr. Longe stated if they don't get the Bistro License they will not use it as a restaurant.

At 8:55 p.m. no one in the audience wished to comment on this appeal.

**Motion by Mr. Morganroth**

**Seconded by Mr. Lyon to approve the request in regard to Appeal 17-10, 325 S. Old Woodward Ave., request for a variance due to the Bistro License requirement for 70% glazing. Mr. Morganroth thinks in this particular case the historic character of the building prevents the applicant from being able to achieve the 70% glazing. On this building which we all know very well, he has heard rumors about a restaurant going in and he is personally excited about it. The idea that the historic portion of Birmingham will not allow for the modification shouldn't prevent the applicant from achieving the concept of a great use for that property.**

**Mr. Morganroth thinks that strict compliance would be unduly burdensome and that the neighbors around the property will benefit from this in terms of the retail section of Birmingham. For that reason, he moves to approve and ties the motion to the plans as submitted. The motion is contingent upon the applicant getting a Bistro License. That would be the only case where the variance is applied.**

Mr. Lyon stated he supports the motion because he feels this is a very good example of why the BZA is needed. This is a historic building existing in non-conformance with re-use of the property for a permitted use, allowing some modifications, but limiting them to what can be done under the historic designation. This request is not self-created as the building has existed here for well over one hundred and forty years.

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Morganroth, Lyon, ~~Baird~~Baiardi~~Baiardi~~, Canvasser, Hart, Jones, Lillie

Nays: None

Absent: Judd, Miller

**T# 04-26-17**

**615 OAK**

**Appeal 17-11**

The owners of the property known as 615 Oak are requesting the following variance to construct a two-story rear addition:

A. Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.74 requires a minimum of 14 ft. between principal structures. The existing house and proposed addition is 12.5 ft. from the adjacent house; therefore, a variance of 1.5 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned R-2.

Mr. Worthington explained the house was built in 1925 and the proposed addition will meet all required setbacks on their own lot. The existing house at 607 Oak is only 2.9 ft. off the property line.

Chairman Lillie summarized that the addition is within the existing plane of the house and the driving force for this variance is the fact that the neighbor's property to the east is too close to the lot line.

Mr. Louis Leonor, the homeowner, said his home and addition conform to all zoning requirements except for this one issue which is a hardship because the home on the east encroaches into the side yard setback on their side. In response to Mr. Morganroth he said the addition cannot be shifted over 1.5 ft. because it would encroach on their kitchen and upstairs bedroom. He noted for Mr. Lyon that the roof line will extend the same on the addition and the walls are tied to the existing house.

No one in the audience wanted to comment on this appeal at 9:03 p.m.

**Motion by Mr. Lyon**

**Seconded by Mr. Canvasser with regard to Appeal 17-11, 615 Oak, to approve the variance as advertised. The appellant seeks a variance under Chapter 126, Article 04, section 4.74 for the minimum distance between buildings. He believes that strict compliance with the Ordinance would be unduly burdensome in this particular case, given the proximity of the neighbor's house to the property line which is an existing non-conformity.**

**The appellant meets all the other setback requirements and would meet the distance between buildings if the existing building to the east was not non-conforming. So therefore he thinks that strict compliance would be unduly burdensome. He does not believe it is self-created. Also he believes it does substantial justice to both the property owner and the surrounding neighborhood. He would tie the motion to the plans as presented.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Lyon, Canvasser, ~~Baird~~BaiardiBaiardi, Hart, Jones, Lillie, Morganroth

Nays: None

Absent: Judd, Miller

**T# 04-27-17**

**2100 E. Maple Rd.  
Whole Foods  
Appeal 17-12**

The owners of the property known as 2100 E. Maple Rd. are requesting the following variances to allow new signs at the Whole Foods Market currently under construction.

A. Chapter 86, Article 01, Section 1.04 B General Sign Standards, states that for all buildings, including multi-tenant office or retail buildings, the combined area of all types of signs shall not exceed 1 sq. ft. (1.5 sq. ft. for addresses on Woodward Ave.) for each linear foot of principal building frontage. The principal building frontage for this building is 265.5 ft. allowing 265.5 sq. ft. of signage. The applicant is proposing 280.3 sq. ft. of signage; therefore, a variance of 14.8 sq. ft. is requested.

B. Chapter 86, Article 01 Table B, Name Letter Signs, states that the maximum height of name letter signs is limited to 24 in. The applicant is proposing a sign on the south elevation at 3 ft.; therefore, a variance of 1 ft. is requested.

This property is zoned B-2 General Business.

Mr. Baka recalled the applicant was granted Final Site Plan approval by the Planning Board on September 30, 2015. At that time the applicant did not provide sufficient detail to determine compliance with the Sign Ordinance. Accordingly, the applicant was informed that they would be required to obtain approval for the signage at a later date. On January 10, 2017 the applicant appeared before the BZA. At that time the BZA requested that the applicant appear in front of the Design Review Board ("DRB") in order to obtain their input on the proposed signage. The DRB sympathized with the size of the structure and its frontage on Maple Rd. and suggested that the applicant revise the sign plan in accordance with the sign regulations that govern properties on Woodward Ave. The applicant returned to the BZA at the February meeting with a revised plan. However, the new proposal did not comply with the signage limitations on Woodward Ave. The application was denied by the BZA at that time. The applicant has now submitted another variance application. The new proposal does comply with the standards for Woodward Ave. Also, the applicant is now requesting two (2) variances as opposed to five (5) as was previously requested.

Mr. Canvasser received confirmation that the leaf over the O in "WHOLE" is not considered part of the square footage. There are no other properties on Maple Rd. that have signage comparable to this. Mr. Morganroth noted that the total square footage requested is below the Woodward Ave. standards. The 3 ft. height on the one sign is the only one that is actually at the height allowed on Woodward Ave.

Mr. John Streetz from Doyle Signs, Inc. was present on behalf of Whole Foods. He thought what they are proposing now is an excellent compromise and summarized what they have changed since the last meeting:

- Height of all the signage reduced to 36 in. or less as allowed on Woodward Ave.
- The leaf is ignored and counted as an ascender;
- Eliminating the word "Market" was non-negotiable so they went with the suggested alternative of stringing out the sign in one line;
- Eliminating the west wall sign and replacing with a small monument sign that will address traffic coming from the underpass;

With regard to the sign on the south elevation, it is Whole Foods' intent to have that be their main entrance and to have the larger sign on that elevation. The sign must be 3 ft. tall so there is no question where the entrance is. It is part of their branding standard to have the largest sign over the main entrance. This sign would still fall under the Woodward Ave. standards as the DRB recommended for the site. Mr. Morganroth noted if the sign was 2 ft. in height, no variances would be needed.

There was no one left in the audience to comment at 9:20 p.m.

**Motion by Mr. Lyon**

**Seconded by Mr. Morganroth with regard to Appeal 17-12, 2100 E. Maple Rd., to approve the variances as advertised, tied to the plans as presented tonight. He believes that strict compliance with the Ordinance would be unduly burdensome in this case due to the particular plight of the land and the fact the land lies in a portion of the City cut off from the rest of the City on a main road.**

**This is not self-created in that the particular plight of the property is in an area that is cut off from the rest of the City and near sort of a commercial area in the City of Troy.**

**Mr. Morganroth believes it does substantial justice to both the appellant, due to the large size of the building and the need for business identification, and to the surrounding area which is mainly residential in the City of Birmingham. Again, the motion is tied to the plans as presented.**

Mr. Canvasser stated he will not support the motion. The BZA is not here to negotiate or compromise. While he appreciates the applicant's mitigation efforts, the board still needs to look at the standards for granting or denying this request. He doesn't believe those standards have been met, specifically with respect to the large sign in the rear of the property. He thinks that is self-created because the extra signage is not needed there.

Mr. Morganroth said he supports the motion because the BZA sent the petitioner to the DRB because they felt the DRB is the appropriate body to make a recommendation.

Also, he is supporting because he thinks there was massive mitigation along with the fact that this is a unique piece that needs additional advertising because of its location.

Chairman Lillie announced he will not support the motion. There is enough signage in front that people will know where the store is located. The issue is the sign in the back. It is the business policy that is driving this. They can comply with the Ordinance if they want to so he does not think they have shown a practical difficulty.

Mr. Hart agreed on several points. However in this case the signs are not really intended to be wayfinding. They are branding of the building, which is vital to the success of the business. That side of the building needs aesthetic appeal because of its bleak surroundings.

Mr. Lyon noted the applicant followed the suggestion of the DRB to apply the Woodward Ave. standards. He sees no harm with the sign in the back because it is not on the street and can't be seen from there. The only beneficiaries are people in the parking lot. He thinks the petitioner has done a fair job of mitigating. The building is unique and in a unique location, so he feels the applicant should get a little leeway with the signs.

Mr. Jones voiced his support for the motion because of the uniqueness of the property. This applicant is complying with the technical advice of the DRB that the BZA requested.

| Ms. ~~Baird~~BaiardiBaiardi said she will support the motion although she has a problem with the branding standard becoming the driving force behind what the board is doing. However she agrees with the unique circumstances and for that reason she feels there has been a showing of practical difficulty.

**Motion carried, 5-2.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

| Yeas: Lyon, Morganroth, ~~Baird~~BaiardiBaiardi, Hart, Jones

Nays: Canvasser, Lillie

Absent: Judd, Miller

**CORRESPONDENCE** (none)

**T# 04-28-17**

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

Board members received the 'Zoning Board of Appeals Handbook.' Chairman Lillie recommended that Chapter 3 has really good information. Mr. Johnson hoped to have someone from the Michigan Municipal League come in to conduct a class for board members.

Mr. Lyon said he recently visited the BZA for the City of Atlanta. They work with a consent agenda that is recommended by staff. Chairman Lillie said in another municipality the board members talk about the cases and when they come out they have already made their decision. Then it is up to the appellant to convince them to make a change.

**T# 04-29-17**

**OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA** (no one spoke)

**T# 04-30-17**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

No further business being evident, the board members passed a motion to adjourn at 9:43 p.m.



---

Bruce R. Johnson, Building Official