**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Richard Hill, Carol Hagler, Tim Green, Eric Hernandez, Nancy Davis

Building Official Planning/Zoning Admin./ Matt Place

**Attorney David Lattie** 

Recording Secretary Jami Vert

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Ken Bullis, Brittney Beavers, Mark Perkoski, Steve Shimmons,

Robert Burley, Roy Banister

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Davison Township Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 P.M. at the Davison Township Municipal Center, 1280 N. Irish Road, Davison, MI 48423.

### **ADOPT THE AGENDA**

**MOTION BY DAVIS, SECOND BY HAGLER** to adopt the September 13, 2022 agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **PREVIOUS MINUTES**

**MOTION BY HAGLER, SECOND BY GREEN** to approve the June 14, 2022, regular board meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

CASE #16-V-2022-6 – WINDSOR PLACE APARTMENTS – IRISH/COURT – A VARIANCE REQUEST OF SECTION 1738.7.a. – A 50-FOOT REDUCTION OF THE REQUIRED 75-FOOT SETBACK FROM A WETLAND.

Ken Bullis – from Edward Rose and Sons representing Windsor Place; request a reduction from the buffer requirement from 75-foot to 25-foot; reason for request is so that we can reduce the fill required of the wetlands; we had EGLE come out and verify with us; typical setback from EGLE is 25-foot; State of Michigan does not have a buffer; we respect the 25-foot; we are in the process of going for an application from EGLE; if we have to go with the 75-foot we will impact more of the wetland than what we would like to do; in your packet you should have an email EGLE.

Brittney Beavers – you should have an email in there explaining what we found.

Mark Perkoski – from Edward Rose and Sons; we understand the setbacks required by the township; however, we want to preserve more of the wetlands; if we were to apply the ordinance, we would have an unbuildable site; or we would have to fill more wetlands than what needs to be done.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Public Comment Period opened up at 7:15 p.m.

Roy Banister – 8261 E. Court St., Davison, MI – I was told by Randy back in 1998 when I was in the process of purchasing this property that in order for them to build more apartments, they would have to buy more land; I am not happy with this at all; I did not realize it was because all of the wetlands; my house is relatively close; no privacy in my back yard.

Robert Burley – I own property in the township; they are doing the same thing this time as they did last time; they are creating a hardship; think about that for a minute; what if I came to you and wanted to build a 20-story high-rise knowing that the ordinance would not allow that; you have to live with that law; I would say no.

Public Comment Period closed at 7:25 p.m.

Place – administrative review; variance request; Windsor Place Apartments; Edward Rose and Sons; Irish/Court; Case #16-V-2022-6; Parcel ID #25-05-08-551-050; they are requesting a variance of Section 1738.7.a for a reduction of 50-feet of the required 75-feet to the natural features setback of the wetlands; there are four areas shown on Sheet C200 presented by the applicant; area 1 contains 1,987 sq. ft.; area 2 contains 925 sq. ft.; area 3 contains 9,525.2 sq. ft; area 4 contains 3,191.1 sq. ft.; with a total affected wetland area of .25 acres; the Township Zoning Ordinance per section 17387.7.a requires a 75-foot setback to all natural features; however, Michigan Department of Environmental, Great Lakes and Energy states in their report that they will accept a 25-foot wide buffer to the wetlands on this site; the wetlands affected are in a low pedestrian traffic area; due to the sporadic locations of the wetland areas a practical difficulty does exist within this site; the Planning/Building Department would support a recommendation for approval based on the following reasons:

- 1. Due to the recommendation by the State of Michigan allowing a 25-foot buffer.
- 2. Due to the minimal encroachment to the wetlands and the size of the wetlands.

Lattie – I usually don't comment on the cases; Michigan regulates the wetlands; Issue we have is if the State of Michigan accepts the 25-foot buffer; we don't want to destroy the wetlands by filling it in; that carries heavy on my end; I will let you guys' figure that out, just wanted to give you, my opinion.

Hagler – if Michigan accepts 25-foot buffer; I don't see why we would fill in any.

Davis – you plan on filling some of the wetlands; across the drive?

Ken Bullis – we believe that those were carved out for ditches to get one body of water to the other spot; I don't have any historic information; we have owned the land back when we purchased in the early 70's; the body of water would build up; if we can reduce the impact we will; we still want to be able to run a mower through there.

Davis – if we did approve this or not approve can the state come in and override us?

Place – that is the process for the applicant to take it to the court and they could overturn this.

Hill – I just learned something if we voted to turn it down, they could take it to circuit court.

Lattie – they have the option; they may find their way around it; they can go to circuit court and overturn it.

Davis – main concern EGLE could still disapprove it.

Green – how many units are they proposing to do?

Davis – 72 units.

Green – I am not in favor; they had all the opportunity back when they purchased it to do something with it.

Hernandez – I walked back there the other day; not pumped about extra apartments; some of these spots looks like the put irrigation systems in there to get water from one side of the other side; I am an environmentalist; I like to preserve for sure; it looks like dried ditches created by someone at some time; they have to have the apartments spaced out that far? State of Michigan does not require a setback for wetlands?

Brittney Beavers – they don't have setback requirements.

Hernandez – you would have to apply for a permit to fill in the wetland; does Michigan trump what we say in our township?

Lattie – State of Michigan has authority over the wetlands; they decide what the proper buffer should be; we haven't tailored our ordinance to deal with wetlands; that is the spot we find ourselves in; they do have the right to apply to EGLE to override our ordinance.

Hernandez – I feel okay if EGLE comes in and says this is okay.

Davis – even if we approve this, they still have to get approval from EGLE?

Lattie – correct.

Green – didn't they come in front of the planning commission?; didn't they come in front of us with building longer buildings.

Place – yes.

Green – can they still build without doing any of this?

Place – not with the 300-foot building; if the variance is denied they can get a permit to fill that.

Green – can they build without doing any of this what we asked them what we said last time?

Place – yes.

Green – that is why I am against this.

Lattie – is there a way to use this property for multi-use and not need this variance?

Ken Bullis – I think the answer is yes; but coming to the zoning board we are asking for a smaller set back.

Lattie – in all respects they are meeting the requirements.

Steve Shimmons – if you grant this variance, we are filling in less wetland; or if you deny it, we will fill in more wetland which is what we don't want to do.

Green – we gave them a solution before; so now they come back to have a variance of a setback; I know Davison Township is for nature and our trails.

Hill – do we have any other questions?

Hernandez – these are actually smaller buildings then they put up before.

Green – they are coming at us at a different angle.

Davis – they did come back with the specs of the buildings; they are built to our ordinance; location of the wetlands.

Green – correct; but they do not have a hardship.

Ken Bullis – we are not coming at you from a different angle; we like Davison Township; we are trying to talk to the neighbors.

Green – do they still have to come in front of the planning commission.

Place – yes.

Lattie – you normally are a seven member board and in order to get the approval you need at least four votes.

**MOTION BY DAVIS, SECOND BY HAGLER** to approve Case #16-V-2022-6 – Windsor Place Apartments – a variance request of section 17387.7.a. – a 50-foot reduction of the required 75-foot setback from a wetland. Motion carried. Aye – 4; Nay - 1

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Public comment period opened at 7:15 p.m./ Public comment period closed at 7:25 p.m.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

None

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION	BY HAGLER,	SECOND BY	<b>DAVIS</b> to	adjourn a	at 7:40 p.m	. Motion	carried
unanimously.							

Eric Hernandez, Secretary