

Mt. Pleasant Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes of Regular Meeting  
June 24, 2009

Chairman Curtiss called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**I. Roll Call:** Board Secretary Kench called roll.

Members Present: Benison, Curtiss, Ellertson, Rowley, White

Members Absent: Kulick, Olivieri

Others Present: Kench, Murphy, Appellant

**II. Approval of Agenda:**

Motion by Benison and supported by Ellertson to approve the agenda. Motion approved unanimously.

**III. Approval of Minutes from March 25, 2009:**

Motion by Ellertson and supported by White to approve the minutes from March 25, 2009, as written. Motion approved unanimously.

**IV. Approval of Minutes from Joint Commission meeting held May 13, 2009:**

Motion by Ellertson and supported by Benison to approve the minutes from the May 13, 2009 joint Commission meeting. Motion approved unanimously.

**V. Communications:**

Kench reported that there were no communications to share at this time.

**VI. Public Comments:**

Curtiss opened the floor for public comments. There being no one who wished to speak, the floor was closed.

**VII. New Business:**

Board secretary Kench explained board proceedings and noted a quorum was present.

**Case 04-2009 – 1416/1418 E. Pickard.** Kench introduced Case 04-2009, stating the request was for a front yard variance to allow an addition on an existing building owned by Isabella Bank. Kench explained that the property is zoned C-3, which allows the use by right; however, the site has a non-conforming front yard setback. Kench stated that the existing building is set back 33', 2 ½" from the Pickard Street right-of-way. The proposed addition will be set back 47'8".

John Schwark, from the Thompson-Phelen Group, representing Isabella Bank, addressed the Board. Mr. Schwark gave some background on his company and explained the reason for the request. The current building lacks office space and the bank would like to bring this location up to a full-service branch. To do so, they will need additional office space. The proposed addition also includes an employee lounge area and an additional restroom facility.

Mr. Schwark explained that there is currently a supporting column that cannot be removed, which basically determines the placement of the proposed addition. He further explained that if moved one way, it would put the support right in the middle of the doors. If moved the other way, it causes problems with the drive-through area. The logical solution was to move the addition 3 feet to the North, which requires a variance of 2' 4".

Ellertson asked Kench for clarification on what constitutes a practical difficulty. Kench explained a practical difficulty could be based on various things, such as topography, layout, etc. In this case, you could make the argument that the supporting column would constitute a hardship.

Mr. Schwark stated that this case went before the Planning Commission two years ago and received site plan approval, however, due to the state of the economy at that time, the bank decided not to proceed with the project. Kench explained that if the Board approves the variance request, the applicant will go before the Planning Commission for Site Plan Approval. (Approvals expire one year from approval date if the project is not started within that time frame).

Benison asked for clarification on side yard setback along the Eastern edge. Kench stated the site plan shows approximately 95'. Mr. Schwark reiterated that there is a parking lot and greenbelt along that side, with additional room to spare.

Curtiss asked for clarification that the applicant only lacks approximately 2 ft.

Chairman Curtiss opened the Public Hearing. There being no one there who wished to address the Board, the Public Hearing was closed.

Correspondence: Kench indicated the only correspondence received was from Captain Theisen from the Mt. Pleasant Fire Department, who had no objections to the project.

#### Board Discussion:

Motion by Ellertson to approve the variance as requested, noting the practical difficulty in regards to the supporting column, and noting the reasonableness of the request with the addition setting behind the existing front building line. Benison asked for a friendly amendment to the motion, noting that the request fits well with the future land use for this property.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Rowley, Ellertson, Benison, White, Curtiss. Motion approved 5:0.

Kench stated a letter would be sent to the applicant and also the Planning & Community Development Director.

#### **VIII. Other Business**

Kench stated there has been some discussion on a potential case for July; however we have not yet received the application.

#### **IX. Adjournment**

Motion by White and supported by Ellertson to adjourn. Motion approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.