



12803 S. Wacousta Rd., Grand Ledge, MI 48837  
517-626-6593  
517-626-6405 (Fax)  
[www.watertownmi.gov](http://www.watertownmi.gov)

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, April 12, 2023 | 7:00pm**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by Chair Mark Zarkovich with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ZBA MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Mark Zarkovich, Vice-Chair Donald Lowell, Secretary Charles Openlander, Chad Cooley, and Robert Walling

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Andrea Polverento

**COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED:** None

**AGENDA APPROVAL:**

Motion by Cooley, seconded by Lowell, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**1. August 11, 2021 Regular Meeting**

Motion by Cooley, seconded by Walling, to approve the minutes of August 11, 2021, as presented. Motion carried.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**1. Case No. 23-01 ZBA – Variance Request – 8180 Herbison Road**

Zarkovich opened the public hearing at 7:02pm. The public hearing procedure was summarized.

Zarkovich asked Polverento to summarize the facts of the case. Polverento described the location of the request, on the northwest corner of Herbison and Forest Hill Roads. Polverento described the requested variance, a 20' reduction in the required front yard setback and a 20' reduction in the required side yard setbacks for new parcels to be created in the AG-Agricultural District. This property, having frontage on the Looking Glass River, is also subject to the LGR-Looking Glass River Overlay District, and the F-1 Floodplain Overlay District. Polverento explained that the Looking Glass River Overlay District requires a 150' setback from the river for all buildings, structures, and well and septic facilities. The parcel is approximately 7.35 acres in size. She described the uses of the adjoining parcels and their corresponding zoning districts.

Polverento referenced the materials which were provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals members to prepare for this case. The applicant submitted materials, including an application, FEMA Letter of Map Revision, and multiple surveys of the subject property. Polverento provided the FEMA Flood Insurance

Rate Map, Department of Energy, Great Lakes and Environment wetlands estimation, topographic map, photographs of the site, aerial photo map, and a soils map with a description of the expected predominant soils of the site.

Patrick Feldpausch, 13383 Hideaway Lane, applicant representing Mr. Jerry Jackson, subject property owner, introduced himself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Jackson's son, Kevin.

Feldpausch stated that they had completed a floodplain delineation for the subject property, because they understood that construction had to be a certain distance away, then they found out that the project was in the Looking Glass River Overlay Zone, and since you can't building anything within 150' feet of the river, not even well or septic, it took so much land out of the development area, that it required this variance. Feldpausch clarified that they were seeking the variance for two proposed parcels.

Feldpausch stated that when Mr. Jackson purchased the property, it did not have the overlay zone. Mr. Jackson is looking to move closer to his children, and he is trying to help him maximize his options, as that is expensive. With the overlay, they feel that it hinders them from doing that.

Feldpausch stated that they had done a perc test near the house on Mr. Jackson's property, to possibly put in a new system, and the soil was found to be sand and gravel. They have obtained a permit for that. They have not conducted a perc test on the proposed lots yet. Feldpausch referenced the recent rains, and stated that he had been on the sites proposed to be split and that the water was exactly where the engineer indicated the floodplain was. They know they are very accurate with that detail.

Zarkovich asked for clarification that the area where the two new parcels were proposed had not been underwater with the recent rains. Feldpausch said that part of the proposed eastern lot was wet, but that was in the delineated floodplain area. The lot is four acres, and the buildable area is on the west side, which was specified by the engineer.

Feldpausch stated that he lives on the Looking Glass River, and is aware of where the 100-year floodplain is located on his property. He states that he has yet to see the river hit the 100-year floodplain mark on his property. Feldpausch drove by the subject property after the recent rains, and the eastern side is flooded, but it does that every year.

Zarkovich asked if they had done perc tests on the proposed new lots. Feldpausch said they would not complete that step until they knew how this process resolved. The soils are expected to be sand and gravel, and they do not feel like they will have any issues with getting septic fields approved.

Zarkovich commented that he lived near a former gravel pit on the east side of the Township, and found that they had to install a pressurized system because they found clay on the site.

Walling asked Feldpausch to point out on the map where the proposed parcels would be located. Feldpausch identified the sites, and Polverento directed the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals to a survey included in the reference materials provided. Walling asked what the width of the proposed lots would be, and Feldpausch replied that the two proposed lots were 150 feet, and the lot with Mr. Jackson's existing house would be between 150 feet and 165 feet. Walling indicated that he had just driven by the site and felt the water was quite close to the building areas. Feldpausch said that he had also been by the site, and that it was very close to where the engineers had described the floodplain, and that he had to trust the engineers to delineate that. They know the river will flood on the east side.

Lowell asked Feldpausch to clarify a wetlands determination he had previously referenced. Feldpausch stated that he misspoke, they had completed a floodplain determination, not a wetland determination. An elevation study had been completed.

Polverento described the difference between wetland and floodplain delineations. Lowell asked if a wetland delineation had been done on the subject property. Feldpausch said that because they would be staying out of the 100-year floodplain, they had not conducted a wetland delineation. Lowell said that a wetland delineation could be significantly different from a floodplain delineation, there could be pockets of wetlands, especially wooded wetlands, outside of the floodplain areas. Disturbance of these types of wetlands is egregious. Wetlands could also significantly limit what could be placed in the proposed building envelopes. Lowell is concerned that if the Zoning Board of Appeals approved a variance without that information, and it was determined that wetlands did exist on the property, that could put the ZBA in a difficult situation. He is concerned about this as part of the due diligence in presenting the facts of the case to be able to effectively develop the lots.

Feldpausch said that if it was determined there were wetlands, that would prohibit them from building, so if a variance was approved, it really wouldn't make a difference, if they were unable to build.

Walling expressed concern about the possible precedent. Feldpausch responded that if it wasn't for the 150' setback from the overlay zone, they wouldn't be here at all. If the township had not put this deterrent on the property, a variance would not be necessary. They are asking for a little bit of lenience to be able to do what they would have been able to do before the overlay zone was established.

Lowell asked if Feldpausch understood why the overlay zone was established. Feldpausch indicated that he understood that the township wanted to maintain water quality, and to maintain viewscapes.

Lowell stated that the township was concerned about septic systems near the river, and that keeping septic systems from bleeding into the waters of the state, and that there have been instances in other communities where leaking or failing septic systems caused effluent to be introduced into rivers and streams, which led to communities having to install sanitary sewer systems. By limiting septic systems in areas prone to this, it protects everyone in the community, not just those who are directly affected by the specific site. It protects the river for recreation, fishing, etc. It may be an impact on the lot, it's not undue, given the environmental concerns.

Lowell expressed concern that there would be enough space to secure a primary and replacement septic system area. Feldpausch stated that they did not expect any issue on the center lot. The surveyor had drawn a 2-story, 2,000 square foot home, and they laid out a septic and replacement field, along with the required separation from the well. They kept the septic areas on the western side of the lot, farther away from the floodplain.

Lowell described his prior experience with soil testing, perc testing, designing sites and systems, inspecting, permitting, and laying them out for many years. He has seen many examples of concerning situations where systems were placed where there was a potential for periodic flooding. Lowell has reviewed the available information about the soils, which indicated they were not hydric soils. Hydric soils would be indicative of future problems, but there is also risk with sand and gravel allowing introduction of effluent to go down into the groundwater quickly without proper filtration. He is concerned about the septic system situation.

Lowell spoke about setbacks. This being in the AG District, he is concerned that a 10' side yard setback is not enough. This is not a subdivision, this is an agricultural district where there are certain expectations of the ability to coexist and not be disturbed by people's parties and noise, especially later in the night.

Feldpausch lives in a development in Watertown Township with 2-acre parcels, and they have a 10 foot side yard setback. There is a house 10 feet away from his property line. Just because one situation has a bad neighbor, doesn't mean that happens all over the place. People learn to coexist and get along. Lowell understands that it could be peaceable forever, but there could be enough conflict that the township needs to get involved.

Zarkovich asked about the square footage of the individual proposed lots. Polverento referred to the survey, and explained the proposed lot sizes. Zarkovich asked if the health department required a 2-acre lot size for new parcels. Polverento explained that the health department did not have a specific acreage requirement, but could require additional land if a system could not be designed for the area. Drainfields are designed based on the soils, and components of the proposed residential construction. The number of bedrooms and bathrooms, whether the kitchen has a garbage disposal, these are all factors that contribute to the drainfield design. Zarkovich said that he is familiar with a situation where a larger lot size was required to accommodate a septic field.

Lowell asked about the size of the building envelopes. Polverento explained that the surveyor had calculated around 4,900 square feet for the eastern lot, and that she had not asked for the size of the envelope for the center lot, it appeared to be approximately 1.5 times the size of the eastern lot. These areas were calculated considering the setbacks should the variance be approved.

Polverento asked Mr. Jackson how long he had lived on the site. Jackson responded that his family had been there 59 years. Polverento asked if in those 59 years, had his house ever experienced flooding? Jackson responded no. He reported that he had the property surveyed many years ago, they didn't say they were in a floodplain, and he's never had a problem with water coming up close to the house. Jackson said that he doesn't know how far back the water gets, but it doesn't stay like that all year. When it gets dry, Jackson said, you can do just about anything, you just couldn't go down too deep. Jackson hasn't had any problems that he hasn't been able to take care of himself. They tore down parts of the old house, put a full basement in, and he has sump pumps that take care of all the water. Polverento asked if he had a sense of how close the water table was to the elevation. Jackson talked about his pond, and putting a garden in, and he hasn't had any issues with those.

Walling asked if they were planning to bring in any fill dirt to do construction. Feldpausch said that in his experience, you set the garage on the high side of the property, and in this case, when the foundation is dug, they will be able to reuse the sand and gravel. It should be really good. They are not proposing to bring in soils. They could, as long as they stay out of the overlay and the floodplain, but they are not planning to. Feldpausch said that he expected that if the engineers had seen any wetland areas when they were doing the survey and floodplain elevation study, that would have been brought to his attention. He has done a lot of work with KEBS, and they knew that he was seeking two building sites, so they should have been aware that if there were wetlands present, they would have brought that up.

Lowell stated that wetlands are different from wet areas. Feldpausch understands, he has experience developing property. He has a wetland consultant he uses for delineations on other properties. Lowell asked if he had called this consultant in for this property. Feldpausch replied no, that he hadn't seen a need for that on this parcel. He walked back in there himself, KEBS said nothing, he's not an expert, but he has faith that his surveyor and engineer on the site would have brought that up to him if they had found any signs on wetlands.

Walling spoke about a nearby property on Forest Hill, where fill had been brought in, and it turned out there were wetlands present. The owner had been required to do remediation.

Lowell is not confident that there are no wetlands. Feldpausch agrees, but expects they would be present within the 100-year floodplain. There could be pockets, but he referenced the elevations, where they would also have expected dips if there were wetlands. There was nothing on the elevation study to indicate that. Lowell doesn't necessarily mean a bowl, this is a glacier state, lots of glacial till, there can be variations in the soils, it can be very spotty. He doesn't want to paint with a broad brush and state there are not any wetlands there. He expects there to be pockets here and there. He knows there are ways to get permits to bring in fill.

Polverento referenced the wetland estimate that was included in the reference materials. She also indicated the map was available on the table for the audience. She explained that the township does not maintain a wetlands map, they do not have the experience on staff to produce their own maps, but she has access to the EGLE's wetland viewer, provided online. She provided a snippet of the EGLE map, and while it's not intended to serve as a delineation, it is indicative of areas in which they would expect to find wetlands and hydric soils. Anecdotally, the map appears to generally follow the floodplain, but this is not a replacement. It is possible that during the vacant land evaluation, if the health department finds there are soils indicative of wetland or hydric soils, they may also require a wetland study be conducted before they issue permits as well. The township would require that information if it came up during the building permit process as well. Polverento also referenced the topographic map produced by the surveyor. She indicated that from the edge of the floodplain, you gain approximately 1.5 feet of elevation as you move westward across that parcel.

Zarkovich asked if anyone wished to speak in support of the appeal. Hearing no comments, Zarkovich asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition to the request.

Rachel Freund Romaneschi, 12940 Forest Hill Road, is a neighbor to the subject property. Romaneschi stated that she was there representing her father, Luke Freund, who was ill and unable to attend. She read a statement prepared by Mr. Freund:

*"As a next-door neighbor, I witness this property underwater every year, some more than others. Hopefully the Board has driven past the property. This water actually is not as high as it can get. We have lived here for 35 years, and every year this property [meaning the subject property] has flooded. One year, I personally witnessed water that surrounded Mr. Jackson's home. The water made it all the way up to the home and around the home. I would like to preserve the wetlands and the floodplain and natural habitat as much as possible, and would not be in favor of this variance."*

Romaneschi stated that her family is also very concerned about some of the issues brought up by Lowell, particularly the environmental issues, the septic issues, the potential noise, these are all issues which are of concern.

Romaneschi asked if she could present photographs taken from their property, which is just north of the subject property, on the north side of the Looking Glass River. She presented several photos, the first showing the eastern side of the subject property, and the photographs progress to the west. Romaneschi stated that Mr. Freund had made notes about the photos which were attached. The members of the Zoning

Board of Appeals reviewed the photos. Romaneschi pointed out survey markers which were underwater. Romaneschi noted in one of the photos that the road is visible through the woods, and you can see that the water goes right up to the road.

Romaneschi introduced Bill Darr, the Freund's farming partner, who has been with the family for many years, and has witnessed the flooding of this property over the years.

Darr, 2512 Legend Woods Drive, Grand Ledge, stated that he would be very surprised if hydric soils were not found on the subject property. Sometimes hydric soils will occur if something has flooded for seven days. He would hate to see someone purchase this lot, and then run into environmental issues. He feels it is a big risk. At a minimum, he would think that before a permit is issued, there should be a wetland delineation.

Gloria Miller, 12910 Forest Hill, is a neighbor to the Jacksons and the Freunds. She obtained permission to drive down the lane on the north side of the river, a day after the recent rains, and she took a video of what she saw. She panned the whole area, and it was one huge lake. Miller discussed how the weather is changing, and we can't predict that what is flooding now won't flood even worse in the future. Miller feels that it's a risk to say that this is buildable property, when it looks unbuildable now. Miller doesn't think that the flooding is going to get any better in the future. She is concerned that a buyer could look at this property in the summer when everything is dry, and get excited about building there, only to have the fall rains come and flood the property all over again. She feels it's unfair to the public who may consider purchasing land which is in a perilous condition. It would be unfair to tell people it's nice property, when later they find out they need to have a sump pump running constantly, like people farther back from the river do already. Miller feels that had the township had ordinances like the current regulations when Summer Lane was developed, the situation there would not be what it is today, where people have sump pumps running day and night. Miller thinks it would be a mistake for whomever would build there. Miller also stated that she thinks putting a variance in place sets a terrible precedent, that if you give one, you'll have to give them to anyone who asks, and where does this stop? Miller stated she has lived in this area her whole life, and she doesn't think that the water, as high as it is now, is going to get better in the future. She thinks this will be a continuous problem.

Zarkovich offered the applicant the opportunity to rebut the comments of those who spoke in opposition to the application.

Feldpausch stated that when realtors sell property, they are required to disclose if there are wetlands on the property, that is part of a seller's disclosure. They would also provide the floodplain delineation which would also be marked. Feldpausch said that they do not try to hide anything from potential buyers, they want people to know about the land. Feldpausch reiterated that he has lived on the Looking Glass River in Watertown Township for 30 years, and the engineers know where the 100-year floodplain is. He stated that Mr. Jackson has stated that the water has never even come close to his house. They had an engineer go out to the property and delineate the floodplain, so it would be clear where they could build. Feldpausch stated that the health department allows drainfields on half-acre parcels. He stated that in talking with the health department, that it really depends on the zoning of the township. If the township allows one-acre lots, the health department will allow septic systems on that sized lot. If the township allows half-acre lots, they work with that. The state will allow a half-acre lot with onsite water and septic.

Feldpausch discussed that if you review the township's Future Land Use Map, it shows the subject area as residential. This is exactly what they are proposing with this application. Feldpausch said that the land is not being farmed now, yet that's the zoning district it's located in. The Future Land Use Map tells the township how the land should be developed in the future. Asking for this variance shouldn't be out of the question for that reason. Feldpausch continued, reasoning that there would still be a 150-foot setback from the river, which otherwise would encompass a lot of buildable area. When Feldpausch built his property, this rule was not in place. There are several homes on the water in his development. He understands that they will need to review soil erosion, and come out and review the property where it's staked, they will need to do a perc test, which couldn't be done, because they didn't know where the lot lines would be. They already have a test on the existing homesite where the health department couldn't believe the great soils they found. At that time, Feldpausch stated that they felt this was a good representation of what they would find on the other proposed parcels. Feldpausch understands that soil conditions vary, and you could dig in one spot and find sand, and dig in another and find clay. Feldpausch continued that the Jackson's have taken all of these things into consideration, including that the future land use is residential, which is exactly what they are proposing to do. This request is consistent with the setbacks for residential, and this whole area is categorized as residential on the Future Land Use Map.

Feldpausch asked Kevin and Jerry Jackson if they wanted to say anything, they declined. Feldpausch concluded that this is the lifeline for Mr. Jackson, he's lived in this township and paid his taxes for a long time. They are only asking for 20 foot difference, which isn't going to hurt anyone, or affect anyone else. If you go down the road and look at Summer Lane, the houses there are all very close to each other. There are not going to be any more houses to the north or west. All they are asking is for help.

Zarkovich asked Mr. Jackson to clarify the earlier statements about what his goals are for this property, if he was trying to move his family closer to him. Feldpausch clarified that Mr. Jackson is trying to develop this property to the extent possible, in order to sell the land, and move closer to his family. Kevin Jackson stated that his mother has late-stage dementia, and he's 100 miles away, and his sister is in Ohio. They are trying to move their parents to the Big Rapids area.

Polverento presented the Board with a visual of the Future Land Use Map, verifying the statements made by Mr. Feldpausch. She pointed out the subject property on the map, and noted that it is in the medium-density residential category.

Feldpausch discussed precedent in relation to the Future Land Use Map, and he feels that this is a specific case, if another applicant had property in the agricultural area and wanted a similar setback, the circumstances would be different.

Polverento reminded the Zoning Board of Appeals of the differences between the Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map.

Feldpausch asked when the current zoning ordinance was adopted. Polverento stated that the ordinance was adopted in 2001, with various amendments since that time. The floodplain district was updated in 2011, when FEMA put out their new floodplain maps.

Feldpausch stated that FEMA expanded the floodplain areas with their 2011 update. He noted a situation with his house and his cottage where he hadn't been in the floodplain before 2011, but found he was after

FEMA updated the maps. He filed to change the maps with FEMA, and they were removed from the floodplain. A lot of people fight their floodplain designation and find out where the true elevation is.

Polverento stated that there have been many properties within the township which have applied with FEMA for a letter of map revision, map amendment, or map change, and have found that portions of their property, or structures on their property, are out of the floodplain after having completed an elevation study. FEMA makes determinations based upon this information. She estimated that somewhere between 12-20 properties have gone through this process, most being the removal of structures from the floodplain.

Polverento also briefly discussed how Watertown Township is a National Flood Insurance Program participating community, which means that anyone within the township can obtain federal flood insurance for their property. She explained that mortgage companies require federal flood insurance on properties where floodplain exists.

Feldpausch stated that he appreciated the maps that Polverento provided to the members of the ZBA, showing the wetlands which appear to follow the flood zone, and that while it can't be verified without a delineation, they were reassured that the wetlands were expected to follow the floodplain.

Walling asked Polverento for some clarification regarding how the floodplain map updates affected property owners that had built structures before the maps changed, and how that affected demolition.

Polverento explained that the floodplain maps from 1982, which predated the 2011 map update, were much less understandable than the updated maps. The 1982 maps did not show aerial photography. She explained that throughout the township, on Looking Glass Brook Drive and Riverside Drive on the west side, and Westwinds on the east side, for example, many people found after the 2011 update that portions of their properties or structures were in the regulated floodplain. Property owners who found that their house or a portion of were in the floodplain, conducted elevation surveys to delineate exactly where the line was, to identify if the structures required flood insurance. Demolition is less of a concern than construction or existing structures.

Darr commented that he didn't think the health department could get out there to do a perc test. He thinks there is a difference of opinion regarding whether there was water around the Jackson's house. He thinks Mr. Freund would provide a sworn statement indicating there was water up to the house in past years. Romaneschi described her father as a fair man, who is also a developer. He believes, as she and many others do, that this is not a fair stewardship of this land.

Feldpausch stated that Mr. Freund approached him wanting to buy the property. Feldpausch has talked to and met with Mr. Freund on this matter, and Mr. Freund knows that if they do not get this variance, he can buy the property for much cheaper. Feldpausch has known Mr. Freund for years, and described him as an entrepreneur who has bought and sold a lot of land. Feldpausch said that Mr. Freund told him that he was asking too much for the property.

Darr and Romaneschi said they didn't feel that Mr. Freund's underlying motive for the purchase was not to develop the property, his intent is to protect the river. They state that Mr. Freund is concerned about the type of environmental impact and the safety issues that were discussed.

There being no further public comment, Zarkovich closed the public hearing at 8:05pm.



**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. Case No. 23-01 ZBA – Variance Request – 8180 Herbison Road**

The Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed the facts of the case and made the following findings of fact:

1. The subject property is located at 8180 W. Herbison Road, Eagle, MI 48822; and is also identified as Parcel ID No. 19-150-008-400-020-00.
2. The subject property is 7.35 +/- acres in size.
3. The property is owned by Jerry Jackson.
4. The Zoning District of the subject property is AG-Agricultural. The subject property is also located in the LGR-Looking Glass River Overlay District, and the F-1-Floodplain Overlay District.
5. The property owner's representative, Mr. Patrick Feldpausch, has applied for a variance seeking a reduction in the required front yard setback of 20 feet, and a reduction in the required side yard setback of 20 feet, for the purposes of developing building sites, subject to land divisions.
6. Approximately four acres of the eastern side of the subject property is located within the regulated floodplain of the Looking Glass River, per the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map, and subject to the applicant's Letter of Map Revision.
7. The applicant is proposing to complete three land divisions of the subject property: the western parcel (Parcel A as described in KEBS survey dated 10-26-22) is proposed to encompass the existing house and barn occupied by Mr. Jackson, the center parcel (Parcel B, as described in KEBS survey dated 10-26-22) is proposed to encompass approximately 1.4 acres, and the eastern parcel (Parcel C as described in KEBS survey dated 10-26-22) is proposed to encompass approximately 4.11 acres.
8. Proposed Parcels B & C are the subject of the variance request.

This request being for a dimensional, non-use variance, the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals considered and discussed the review standards described by Sec. 28-7.6 of the Zoning Ordinance. A determination of fact was made for each of the six review standards. The Zoning Board of Appeals determined the following findings of fact:

- A. Granting the variance will be contrary to the public interest and the spirit of the ordinance cannot be observed.
- B. The requested variance is likely to cause an adverse effect to property or improvements in the vicinity or in the AG – Agricultural Zoning District.
- C. The variance request is not so recurrent in nature as to require an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The request is specific to the individual characteristics of the subject property.
- D. There is no evidence of practical difficulty as the property owner could divide the property into two parcels - one with the existing improvements, and one buildable lot - without need of a variance.
- E. Granting this variance is not necessary for the preservation of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the vicinity in the same zoning district.
- F. The variance request is not necessitated as a result of any action or inaction of the applicant.

Having considered the facts of the case, the following motion was made:

Motion by Lowell, seconded by Walling, that the application of Patrick Feldpausch, for property located at 8180 Herbison Road, with a Parcel No. of 19-150-008-400-020-00 and issued Case No. 23-01 ZBA, a request for a variance from Sec. 28-3.1.3D to permit a building envelope for new residential construction to be setback a minimum of 30 feet from the edge of the road right-of-way, and 10 feet from the side property lines in the AG-Agricultural Zoning District be denied, based on the findings of fact which do not indicate a practical difficulty in accordance with Section 28-7.6 of the Watertown Charter Zoning Ordinance and pursuant to the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Cooley, Openlander, Walling, Zarkovich, Lowell

No: None

Absent: None

Motion carried.

*The Zoning Board of Appeals took a ten-minute break.*

## **2. Officer Elections**

Motion by Walling, seconded by Cooley, to nominate the current slate of officers to their respective offices, cast a unanimous ballot, and elect those officers to serve a one-year term. Motion carried.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:** Polverento reviewed the committee and staff reports.

**COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE, STAFF, AND BOARD MEMBERS:** None.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Zarkovich, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Openlander, Secretary