

LEIGHTON TOWNSHIP  
**Zoning Board of Appeals**

**Minutes**  
**Monday March 22, 2021**  
**7:00 PM**

1. **The meeting was Called to Order at 7:05 pm by Chairman Scrotenboer**
2. **Approval of Agenda. Motion by Roodvoets and supported by Shoemaker- unanimously approved**
3. **Attendance- Present- Schrotenboer, Roodvoets, Gould, Shoemaker  
Absent with Notice- Skinner**
4. **Approval of Minutes – October 28, 2020 and June 22, 2020**  
P. 9 of June minutes 2<sup>nd</sup> to last para- “the board might deny a variance, that won’t help the Bogemas but THAT would also not benefit Mr. Wright.” Remove 1<sup>st</sup> ‘would’ change to “THAT”.  
Last page #10 name misspelled- Roodvoets- fix  
Motion to approve the June 22, 2020 minutes with noted corrections by Schrotenboer and supported by Roodvoets. Approved Unanimously.  
**Oct 28, 2020 minutes:**  
Shoemaker misspelled on Dunbar request p 2,  
p 2 “Mr. Rimmink presentED (add ED)  
- P 3- 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph- Mr. Remmink... due to lesser impact on THEIR  
- P 3 last para- shoemaker awk sentence... commented that views to which people are entitled pertain to their parcel and not across neighboring property lines.  
- P 4 1<sup>st</sup> sentence- omit word ‘to’ (just make it right)  
- Paragraph D- the ZBA asked Mr. Thompson to review what the significant detriment was” fix to this. The ZBA found that there would not be a significant detriment TO surrounding properties  
- Paragraph E- the ZBA noted that they found no significant special circumstances... omit THE  
P 5- motion TO deny request  
Motion by Roodvoets to approve the 10/28/2020 minutes with the above corrections, support by Shoemaker. Motion passed unanimously
5. **Public Comments (brief - for items not on the agenda)**
  - a. None heard- 5 audience members
6. **Inquiry of Conflict of Interest- none**
7. **Variance Request – Pleune, 0313-300-032-00**

Reading of the Notice- Dave Gould

Applicant Presentation- Ron Pleune- would like to remove existing deck and replace it with a new deck/sunroom. The issue is that the Right of Way for Dolphin Street is not where the improved street is. Part of the right of way contains his driveway and a retaining wall. They would like the front edge of the deck to come to approximately 3 feet from the front property line at its closest point.

Public Hearing – Open and Close- Comments- limited to 5 min per person:

Stacy Molles- question we have about build coming forward- mother owns house next door and lot across the street. Curious as to how that would work since she owns part of their driveway? (Submitted survey to show Bour's property)

Laurie Bour- lots 19, 11, and 33- dwelling is on lots 33 and 11, possibly some of 19.

Laurie and Daughter Stacy pointed out that road crosses one of her parcels and could potentially impede either her or Mr. Pleune's access

Board Discussion:

Item 26.09

- A- Discussion regarding location of Right of Way for alley, Dolphin street, concerns of whether the ROW goes through Mr. Pleune's property. The survey determines that is not the case.
- B- Discussion – No disagreement that the lot is certainly peculiar due to the road location.
- C- Discussion- Agreement that if the Right of Way were to be centered over the road as travel is located, it would be far enough away. Mr. Bob Green- previous owner of neighboring parcels explained past issues with location of road, alley etc.
- D- Discussion-Roodvoets agrees it is not a safety issue and would not affect any issues with neighbors as to property lines and ROW.
- E- Discussion- agreed the property owners did not create the situation.

Gould asked applicant for another overview of what he is doing:

Applicant proposes to remove existing deck, replace with new deck/sunroom/covered parking in their place.

Gould has concerns regarding parking; Shoemaker and Schrottenboer stated the parking area will not become any issue because parking will not be affected.

More discussion- each letter- consensus whether it complies with standards or not:

A - agree

B- agree

C- agree

D-agree

E-agree

Motion to approve the variance as requested based on findings of fact that standards of Section 26.09 are met by Shoemaker and supported by Roodvoets.

Roll Call: Roodvoets Y Schrottenboer Y Shoemaker Y Gould N

Motion passed 3-1 **Variance approved.**

**8. New Business – none**

**8. Public Comments -** (comments are welcome from the public and limited to five minutes.)

**9. Board Members Comments**

**10. Adjournment:** Motion by Roodvoets with support from Schrottenboer. 4 in favor, none opposed. Meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

**Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Castello, Leighton Township Zoning Administrator**

DRAFT