

**SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES  
AUGUST 27, 2020 – REGULAR MEETING**

Present: Ellen delaRosa-Pearn, Jack Ketchum, Larry Mierle, Tom TenCate, Rachel  
Terpstra  
Absent: George Postmus  
Participant: Lukas Hill, Community Development Director

*Pursuant to Executive Order No. 2020 – 154, the Township of Spring Lake Zoning Board of Appeals conducted its business via conference call to mitigate the spread of COVID-19. Members of the public were encouraged to dial in to this meeting. Members of the public were not required to register or otherwise provide information to attend.*

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Ketchum at 7:04 p.m.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

Terpstra moved to approve the minutes of the July 23, 2020 meeting as presented. DelaRosa-Pearn seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

**III. Adopt Agenda**

Terpstra moved to adopt the agenda as presented. DelaRosa-Pearn seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

**IV. Public Comment**

A time for public comment was provided. There were no comments.

**V. Kinney – Variance and Authorization to Expand an Existing Non-Conforming Accessory Building – 15192 Hickory St**

Dan Kinney presented his request to add on to an existing structure. The existing building was conforming when it was built, but is now non-conforming because it is in the front yard of the flag lot. Kinney would like to add 15 feet to the north end of the building. The addition will match the existing building and the house. The space will be a finished space for hobbies.

DRAFT

Hill clarified that this request is for a variance to expand a non-conforming structure, and an accessory building authorization to construct an accessory building larger than allowed by right.

DelaRosa-Pearn asked if the existing building has water. Kinney stated there is an existing tap on the end for the lawn hydrant. He will run a pipe to the back of the accessory building for use. There is no heat in the garage.

DelaRosa-Pearn asked if there would only be cold water available. Kinney stated that he intends to install an instant hot water heater and a small restroom. There will be no living space in the accessory building.

Mierle asked about the rendering of the front elevation that was provided, which doesn't match the existing building, and whether changes would be made. Kinney stated that what appears to be brick on the rendering is the block foundation, and that the existing building has panel doors. The addition will match the existing building.

Terpstra asked if the siding would be extended and the door matched to the existing doors. Kinney stated that it would match, and that the accessory building matches the house.

The public hearing was opened at 7:16pm. There were no comments. Motion by Ketchum, support by Terpstra, to close the public hearing at 7:17pm. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ketchum confirmed that the existing building is non-conforming because it is in a front yard.

Ketchum stated that board members would consider the variance request first.

The standards for granting a variance were reviewed.

Motion by delaRosa-Pearn, support by Mierle, to approve the variance application as presented at 15192 Hickory St. as it complies with the approval standards in Section 112, I, with the following conditions:

- a. The applicant will comply with any other local, state, and federal laws.
- b. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.
- c. There will be no living quarters in the accessory building.

A roll call vote was taken. The motion was approved unanimously.

The accessory building authorization was then considered. It was noted that the request would add 450 square feet to the existing building. There is also a 144 square foot dog kennel on the property. The total accessory building area requested is 1794 square feet, and the maximum allowable is 1920 square feet.

DRAFT

The standards for an accessory building authorization were reviewed. Board members agreed that a landscape plan was not required as the building is already landscaped. They also determined that a restrictive covenant was not necessary in this case.

Motion by delaRosa-Pearn, support by Terpstra, to approve the accessory building authorization application as presented at 15192 Hickory as it complies with the approval standards in Section 306 with the following conditions:

- a. The applicant will comply with any other local, state, and federal laws.
- b. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.

A roll call vote was taken. The motion was approved unanimously.

**VI. Vanneste – Landscape Plan and Minor Changes to Approved Deck and Pergola – 17626 Oakwood**

Michael Paré from Blue Water Pools of Grand Rapids presented the request. In August, 2019, three retaining walls were approved by the ZBA. Part of the approval required the presentation and approval of a landscaping plan. Paré presented the planting plan for the retaining wall area.

Additionally, the deck design has changed. The new deck has the same square footage as the one which was approved, but the shape has changed.

A 450 square foot pergola was approved, but instead of the pergola they would like to install three arbors. There would be one arbor on each side of the fireplace and one next to the pool. Each arbor would be three feet by ten feet, for a total of 90 square feet of arbor.

A flag pole was added to the plan.

Eric Rosendall from Lakeshore Property Services stated that the landscape plan was adapted to use native plants which can be supplied by Hortech. They are sure that these plants will thrive in this area.

Board members generally agreed that the landscape plan was attractive and that the plants chosen would do well.

TenCate asked how the plants would break up the expanse of retaining wall. Rosendall stated that there are many plants being installed in the wall, which will screen large amounts of the wall. In addition, the plants installed in front of the wall will be of varying heights and will grow to cover the wall. Paré stated that the stones used for the retaining walls have planter pockets dispersed throughout the wall. Rosendall stated that the woody plant material chosen will grow to be four to six feet tall.

Ketchum asked if there would be fabric on the arbors. Paré stated there would be no fabric used.

DRAFT

Ketchum asked about lighting the flag. Rosendall stated that they use low-voltage lighting that is directed at the flag. It is generally installed at the base of the flagpole and directed to light the flag. Hill confirmed that the Township does not regulate lighting at the residential level.

Paré stated that they talked to the neighbors on both sides. An email was received from Kurt Lacks, 17622 Oakwood, stating that he supports the project. Paré read a text from Karen Hill, 17628 Oakwood, stating that she did not object to the changes in the plan.

Motion by Mierle, support by Terpstra, to approve the landscape plan, the changes to the deck and pergola, and the flag pole installation as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion was approved unanimously.

**VII. Adjournment**

Mierle moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:59pm with support from delaRosa-Pearn. With a unanimous vote, the motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Ketchum, Chairperson  
Zoning Board of Appeals