
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WATERFORD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting - 4:00

- I. Chairman Zuehlke called the Meeting to Order at 4:03 PM
- II. Roll Call
Present: Dave Zuehlke, Chairman
Stan Moore, Vice Chairman
Todd Bonnivier, Secretary
Todd Hoffman, Board Member
Marie Hauswirth, Board Member
Rick Schneider, Board Member
Art Frasca, Board Member
Sue Camilleri, Alternate Board Member
- Also Present: Stacy St. James, Environ. And Housing Rehab Coordinator
Janine Tremonti, Admin. Assistant
- General Public: approximately 64
- III. Approve the Minutes of the February 21, 2023 regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as printed.
MOTION AND VOTE
Moved by SCHNEIDER
Supported by BONNIVIER; RESOLVED to APPROVE the Minutes of the February 21, 2023 meeting Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting as Printed.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
6-0 (ZUEHLKE, BONNIVIER, HAUSWIRTH, SCHNEIDER, FRASCA & CAMILLERI)
- IV. Approve the Agenda of the March 21, 2023 regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as printed.
MOTION AND VOTE
Moved by FRASCA
Supported by BONNIVIER; RESOLVED to APPROVE the agenda of the March 21, 2023 meeting Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting as Printed.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
6-0 (ZUEHLKE, BONNIVIER, HAUSWIRTH, SCHNEIDER, FRASCA & CAMILLERI)

V. Old Business

Case No. PZBA23-009

Sidwell No. 13-20-151-001, Section 20, T3N, R9E, Waterford Township, Oakland County, Michigan

Requesting

1. An 86 unit variance from Section 3-900 to allow the proposed development to have a maximum density of 166 units. (80 units maximum allow for subject property)
2. A 3.83 ft. variance from Section 3-900 to allow Buildings 1-9 in the proposed development to have a maximum height of 38.83 ft. (35 ft. maximum allowed)
3. A variance from Section 3-901 Footnote 8.A(3) to reduce the minimum setback between any buildings and any off-street parking facility as reflected by the revised site plan submitted on January 31, 2023.
4. A variance from Section 2-802.2, 2-802.9 and 3-402.6.B to reduce the landscaping requirements as reflected by the revised site plan submitted on January 31, 2023.
5. A variance from Section 2-404 to reduce the amount of required nonmotorized pathways as reflected by the revised site plan submitted on January 31, 2023.

Property Location: Vacant Pontiac Lake Rd
Property Zoned: R-M2, Multiple-Family Residential
Applicant: Jordan London, AIA – Edmund London & Associates

Applicant or representative present: Jordan London, Casey Leach – Kieft Engineering & Dr. Ammar Alkhafaji

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by **FRASCA**,

Supported by **BONNIVIER**; *RESOLVED to remove ZBA Case No. PZBA23-009 from the table*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6-0 (ZUEHLKE, BONNIVIER, HAUSWIRTH, SCHNEIDER, FRASCA & CAMILLERI)

Dr. Ammar Alkhafaji said he represents the developer. He indicated they took in all the opinions and thoughts into account from the previous meeting. He stated that he understands how beautiful the property is and would like to have new residents join this community and enjoy it. He indicated sitting down with numerous people, including the conservancy group that was here last month. He indicated they would draft a conservation easement to preserve the wetlands, but it would also allow for minimal development such as walkways, raised boardwalks and/or gazebos. He stated pavement would not be used.

Casey Leach stated the walkways and such would be very low impact.

Dr. Alkhafaji said they are not here to destroy wetlands and really want the residents that will live here, to enjoy the views. He hopes to move forward with the easement.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke regarding the request:

Jeane Smith - 455 N Hospital Rd., stated the property has a long history. She indicated when the first project started it was zoned R-1A and could support 16 duplex units and 4 single family homes for a total of 36 dwellings. She stated that with the current zoning, it could support up to 80 units. She felt that the ordinances and standards that the community relies are in place to insure that their investments are protected from major swings that could negatively affect their home values. She stated that the property was rezoned in 2018 to RM-2. She indicated receiving correspondence from EGLE that they approved a bridge for the entrance and exit based on the original plan. The permit was transferred to the new owner. However, it expired in October 2022. She said that EGLE stated this will not be extended and is considered closed. Per EGLE, all new studies will need to be completed because of the new developments in the area. She stated she would like the Township to go back to what it was approved for originally. She felt that would fit with the neighboring communities and would not stress the infrastructure. She questioned what has changed over the years. If current request is approved, she felt it would set a precedence for all future developers, in that they can come in and grossly over burden the community. She is requesting that the original approve be upheld and reject this request.

Mike Simpson - 324 Pinecliff Ct., stated practical difficulties do not exist. This is greed to make as much money as they can. He felt they should develop within what is allowed.

Theresa McVeigh - 1108 Oak Pointe Dr., said her home is close to Pontiac Lk Rd and she cannot enjoy her deck in the summer because of traffic now. She questioned as to if the applicant can enter the proposed development from Hospital Rd. She felt it would help with the extra traffic. She also questioned what is planned on the east side of the site.

Chairman Zuehlke said the Board will be voting to passing this case to the May 16th ZBA meeting to allow for the applicant to provide a traffic study and provide revisions to the plans.

Debbie Downs - 1088 Oak Pointe Dr., stated she appreciated what the Chairman had to say and does not believe the applicant has a hardship. She felt that there are enough apartment complexes that are not full. She did not feel that apartments bring in tax revenue, compared to homes.

Board Member Camileri stated the tax revenue as higher for residents that are not owner occupied, such as apartments.

Christopher Ripplinger - 1407 Sherwood Forest Ct., said he is against this variance and apartments in general. He felt that the Waterford parks do not meet current standards. He was concerned about more cars, traffic, light and noise issues, along with possible power outages.

Rev. Charles Packer - 1343 Sherwood Forest Ct. said he is against this variance. He questioned if a new environmental impact study has been done since 2016.

Staff stated the Township has not received one.

Jeri Berger - 1423 Sherwood Forest Ct. asked who was the decision making body for this request.

Board Member Camileri stated the ZBA would be making the decision.

Chairman Zuehlke explained how variances work and the authority of the ZBA.

Gary Pinner - 1077 Oak Pointe Dr. questioned the number of tree proposed for removal.

Chairman Zuehlke stated that the trees are not part of this variance. The Board does not make decisions regarding trees. The plans will be reviewed by the Planning Department.

Rick Currie - 435 Pinecliff Ct., indicated that has was with the association. He stated that the applicants are money developers and they do not have hardships.

Karen Sherman - 324 Pinecliff Ct., submitted a letter to be read into the record.
Board Member Camileri read the following:

*Charter Township of Waterford
Zoning Board of Appeals
Attn: Board Members*

March 10, 2023

*To Waterford ZBA,
I am writing this letter in regards to Parcel ID 13-20-151-001, on behalf of my Homeowners Association of Pinecliff Estates. We are located off Pontiac Lake Rd., just east of Hospital Rd. I am the President of our HOA and our residences are very concerned about this proposed development.*

This parcel is zones R-M2, which is multi family and per Waterford zoning Division 3-4, Section 3-400: Purpose and Intent: This is designed to be the most intensive of the residential zoning districts as to use and density.

It says it is designed to have the highest density of all the residential zones. The RM-2 zoning allows approx.. 86 units max and this owner/developer wants to build 166 units. Almost double the number of units allowed in the zoning! What is the hardship? The ZBA is for hardship issues and should not allow double what the ordinance allows. There is also the issue of the natural land and lake that this property has on it that cannot be overlooked.

Waterford section 2-213 NATURAL FEATURES PRESERVATION: #2-213.1 Purpose & intent is to recognize that there is a special relationship between natural features and the adjoining upland etc...

As noted in Waterford's ordinance above.....the township needs to acknowledge, retain and preserve some of the existing land and lakes that we still have and conserve them. Once they are destroyed, we cannot get them back. Please consider a Conservation Easement which has been brought to your attention. At a minimum, please have a professional evaluation on this land and lake prior to allowing any building to be approved.

If you want to make Waterford a better place to live, this must be a number one priority.

Please do not allow an owner/developer to come in and build double the number of apartments that are allowed and destroy some of our natural beauty along with it. The owner/developer is going to build as many as they can, pack up and leave town. We on the other hand are left with what they have done and destroyed the land that we cannot get back.

The ZBA needs to uphold the Township zoning ordinance as it stands and look into preserving what natural beauty we still have.

Thank you in advance for your time,

*Pinecliff Homeowners Association
Karen Sherman, President Pinecliff HOA
324 Pinecliff Ct.
Waterford, MI 48327*

Elizabeth Spry - 1040 Oak Pointe Dr., stated her family moved here because of the lakes and the land and that over the years, many changes have been done. She questions how this will affect the natural resources and environment.

Sue Julian - 7150 Dixie Hwy Ste 2, stated she is with the Blue Heron Head Waters Conservancy, and she is concerned about the wetlands. She said that they offered to assist the developers with a conservation easement and the developer turned them down. She did not feel as though what is being proposed meets the intent of a

conservation easement and that the current laws already govern what the applicant is proposing.

Board Member Camilieri asked if there is an ongoing inspection process for conservation easements that they set up and if there is a fee.

Ms. Julian stated the wetland would be monitored, as it is an ongoing process.

Steve Klein - 2740 N Williams Lake Rd., said he would like the developer to negotiate the conservation easement with Blue Heron Head Water and to charge each unit a fee to help pay for the easement.

Theresa McVeigh - 1108 Oakpoint Dr., asked if the property on the East side of the lake is going to be developed. She question that if the variance is not approved is the applicant they still going to build.

Chairman Zuehlke stated that it can be assumed that the property would developed eventually.

Casey Leach, Kieft Engineering reference the proposed conservation easement design and said anything in green and blue on the map will not be developed, with the exception of boardwalks, etc.

Tina Collins - 1231 Sherwood Ct., stated that the development will be seen from her backyard. She would also like the conservation of the wetlands. She expressed concerns with additional impact on the current infrastructure, her quality of life and property value.

Chairman Zuehlke stated that when her neighborhood was built (Sherwood Ct), residents were opposed to the development.

Dale McDowell - 6270 Pontiac Lake Rd., was not in support of the request. He felt the original wetland would eventually returned and he questioned the impact on the current wildlife.

Greg Bauer - 6950 Hatchery Rd., referenced a new development at Williams Lk. and Hatchery Rd. and how the wildlife was impacted by the development. He was concerned that the proposed development would have a similar impact on the area.

Board Member Schneider stated the property is zoned multi-family. He felt something would be built there and the builder should consider the concerns of the neighbors so to have something nice that will work for everybody.

Board Member Camilieri stated that while the conservation easement is not required, she felt it should be a condition of the Boar so as to protect the wetlands and the natural

degradation that happens to all wetlands. If the easement is in place, the wetlands would be monitored and maintained.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by CAMILLERI

Supported by SCHNEIDER; to PASS ZBA Case No. PZBA23-009 to the MAY 16, 2023 meeting so that the applicant can provide a traffic study and address the comments/concerns presented at the meeting.

MOTION CARRIED

5-1 (with ZUEHLKE, BONNIVIER, HAUSWIRTH, SCHNEIDER AND CAMILLERI APPROVED - FRASCA OPPOSED)

VI. New Business

Alternate Board Member Camilleri exits the dias. Board Member Moore and Board Member Hoffman enter the dias to hear the remaining cases.

Case No. PZBA23-010

Sidwell No. 13-02-156-001, Section 2, Lot 67, "Bird Island", T3N, R9E, Waterford Township, Oakland County, Michigan

Requesting

1. A 65.0 ft. variance from Section 2-104.3 to allow the proposed deck to be located 37.0 ft. from the east lakefront shoreline. (102 ft. minimum setback required for the subject property)
2. A 2.0 ft. variance from Section 2-104.3 to allow the proposed deck to be located 3.0 ft. from the south side property line. (5 ft. minimum setback required)

Property Location: 4124 Lamont Dr
Property Zoned: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Applicant: Paul Halabu

Applicant or representative present: Paul Halabu; Jamie Ruddy - Builder

Paul Halabu stated he purchased his house in 2017. He was told it was previously a bait & tackle shop, that is why it is as close to the water as it is. He stated the deck was originally approved in 1979. Over time, it has degraded. He would like to bring it to code and make it structurally sound.

Chairman Zuehlke stated that the applicant is to sign a hold harmless with the Township because of the sewer easement.

Mr. Halabu agreed that they would be signing the agreement and recording it with the Register of Deeds office.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke

Benjamin Glazer - 5145 Edge Lake, stated he was in support of the variance.

Board Member Moore asked the applicant if the deck will be reconstructed in the same location.

Jamie Ruddy stated they are bringing it in two feet on one side and changing the location of the stairs, so it will be less total square footage than the original and more conforming. They are trying to make it look good for the neighbors with fewer posts and use a glass railing.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by **FRASCA**

Supported by **HOFFMAN**; to find that practical difficulties exist and to **APPROVE** the variances requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-010 based upon the information presented by the applicant and for this hearing demonstrating each of the review standards in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met with the **CONDITION** that the applicant record the hold harmless agreement with Oakland County for the encroachment into the Township sewer easement.

MOTION CARRIED

(7-0)

Case No. PZBA23-011

Sidwell No. 13-04-429-040, Section 4, Lots 89 & 90, "Eagle Lake Heights", T3N, R9E, Waterford Township, Oakland County, Michigan

Requesting

1. A 1.5 ft. variance from Section 2-104.2 to allow the proposed roof eave and gutter to be located 3.5 ft. from the southeast side property line. (5 ft. minimum required)
2. A 21.0 ft. variance from Section 3-901 Footnote 4 to allow the proposed addition to be located 28.0 ft. from the northeast lakefront shoreline. (49 ft. minimum required for subject property)
3. An 18.5 ft. variance from Section 2-104.2 to allow the proposed roof eave and gutter to be located 27.5 from the northeast lakefront shoreline. (46 ft. minimum required)
4. A 21.0 ft. variance from Section 2-104.3 to allow the proposed balcony to be located 18.0 ft. from the northeast lakefront shoreline. (39 ft. minimum required)

Property Location: 5186 Eagle Lake Dr
Property Zoned: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Applicant: Terry Taylor

Applicant or representative present: Terry Taylor; Mark Pacitto

Terry Taylor stated they have lived at their house for several years. She indicated that they do not have a garage. They are requesting a variance for a 2-car attached garage, with extra living space above it.

Mark Pacitto stated he felt the project would improve the functionality of the home, provide for parking, storage and extra living space. This improvement would also increase the value of the property; make it aesthetically pleasing and consistent with designs in the area. The rear of the structure would be in line with neighbors.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding the request.

MOTION AND VOTE

*Moved by **SCHNEIDER***

*Supported by **FRASCA**; to find that practical difficulties exist and to **APPROVE** the variances requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-011 based upon the information presented by the applicant and for this hearing demonstrating each of the review standards in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met.*

MOTION CARRIED

(7-0)

Case No. PZBA23-012

Sidwell No. 13-17-101-057, Section 17, Lot 60, "Williams Lake Grove", T3N, R9E, Waterford Township, Oakland County, Michigan

Requesting a time extension to act on variance(s) granted February 15, 2022, from February 15, 2023 to February 15, 2024. (The timeframe for acting upon variances granted shall be one calendar year)

Property Location: 6942 Hatchery Rd
Property Zoned: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Applicant: Lorrie Kobylik

Applicant or representative present: Lorrie Kobylik

Chairman Zuehlke stated that occasional work cannot be started before a variance expires. The applicant is then required to request an extension.

Lorrie Kobylik stated that this is the situation.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding the request.

MOTION AND VOTE

*Moved by **MOORE***

*Supported by **BONNIVIER**; to **APPROVE** case #PZBA23-012 extending the timeframe of variances previously granted in case #PZBA22-008, until February 15, 2024 **MOTION CARRIED**
(7-0)*

VII. Discussions

VIII. All Else

Election of Officers

1. Chairperson
 - a. Nominations
Board Member Moore nominated **Dave Zuehlke**, supported by **Board Member Bonnivier**
 - b. Vote(s) to elect carried (6-0)
2. Vice-Chairperson
 - a. Nominations
Board Member Bonnivier nominated **Stan Moore**, supported by **Board Member Hauswirth**
 - b. Vote(s) to elect carried (6-0)
3. Secretary
 - a. Nominations
Board Member Moore nominated **Todd Bonnivier**, supported by **Board Member Hauswirth**
 - b. Vote(s) to elect carried (6-0)

IX. Public Comment

X. Meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Members of the public will only be able to speak during any public hearing that is held at the meeting and during the public comment period at the end of the meeting and such comments will be limited to three minutes per person. The Chairperson will recognize all persons wishing to speak during a public hearing and the public comment period. Prior to the meeting, members of the public may contact the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals to provide input or ask questions by email or mail to the Township employee/official and at the addresses listed below. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations to be able to participate in the meeting should provide at least 24-hour advance notice to the listed Township employee by phone, email, or mail and an attempt will be made to provide reasonable accommodations.

Stacy St. James, Environmental and Housing Rehab Coordinator
Charter Township of Waterford
5200 Civic Center Drive, Waterford, Michigan 48329
Email: [sstjames@waterfordmi.gov](mailto:ssstjames@waterfordmi.gov)
Phone: (248) 674-6240

Case No. PZBA23-010

Property: 4124 Lamont
Applicant: Paul Halabu
Zoning: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Site Use: Single Family Residential
Proposal: Deck

Analysis

The applicant is requesting variances to allow the construction of a deck on the lakefront side of the property. Based upon the site plan submitted, the proposed deck is shown to be located in a similar location as the existing deck, with a slightly greater setback from the side property line than the existing deck. The site plan also shows that the existing deck and proposed deck will be located within a sanitary sewer easement. The Waterford Township Department of Public Works has been made aware of this. They stated that the new deck may be constructed within the easement, but a hold harmless agreement must be signed. They have provided this document and the applicant has been made aware of this condition. If the Board approves the requested variances, the agreement would need to be signed and recorded at Oakland County before a building permit can be issued.

The applicant has provided information addressing the standards listed below on the "Supplemental Information" sheet. These standards and the information provided by the applicant addressing these standards shall be used by the Zoning Board to determine whether the requested variance shall be granted.

DRAFT MOTION FOR APPROVAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to approve the applicant's request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision. Adding a summary of the evidence relied on at the end of the motion is encouraged. The Worksheet is intended to assist in doing that.

MOTION to find that practical difficulties exist and to APPROVE the variance(s) requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-010 based upon the information presented by the Applicant and for this hearing demonstrating each of the review standards in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met.

(Evidence provided: _____)

DRAFT MOTION FOR DENIAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to deny the applicant's request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision. Adding a summary of the evidence relied on at the end of the motion is encouraged. The Worksheet is intended to assist in doing that.

Motion to find that practical difficulties do not exist and to DENY the variance(s) requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-010 based upon the applicant's failure to demonstrate that the following review standard(s) in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met:

**** (ONLY list standard(s) the Applicant DID NOT demonstrate and exclude those that do not apply) ****

- *Strict compliance with the ordinance provisions being varied is unnecessarily burdensome.*
- *The variance will do substantial justice to the applicant and other property owners.*
- *A lesser variance than requested would not give substantial relief to the applicant and/or be consistent with justice to other property owners*
- *The variance is needed due to unique circumstances of the property.*
- *The problem and resulting need for the variance was not self-created by the applicant or the applicant's predecessors.*
- *The variance observes the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, will not adversely affect public safety and welfare, and will do substantial justice.*

(Evidence provided: _____)

Case No. PZBA23-011

Property: 5186 Eagle Lake Dr
Applicant: Terry Taylor
Zoning: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Site Use: Single Family Residential
Proposal: Addition and balcony

Analysis

The applicant is requesting variances for the construction of an addition and balcony at the subject property. The addition is shown to be an attached garage with living space above on the southeast side of the house. The addition meets the minimum side yard setback. However, a variance is needed for the overhang. The addition will also need a variance from the lakefront side of the house, even though it is keeping in line with the existing house. The applicant is also proposing to construct a balcony on the lakefront side of the house. This will also need a variance from the lakefront shoreline. Again, this is also keeping in line with the existing deck.

The applicant has provided information addressing the standards listed below on the "Supplemental Information" sheet. These standards and the information provided by the applicant addressing these standards shall be used by the Zoning Board to determine whether the requested variance shall be granted.

DRAFT MOTION FOR APPROVAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to approve the applicant's request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision. Adding a summary of the evidence relied on at the end of the motion is encouraged. The Worksheet is intended to assist in doing that.

MOTION to find that practical difficulties exist and to APPROVE the variance(s) requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-011 based upon the information presented by the Applicant and for this hearing demonstrating each of the review standards in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met.

(Evidence provided: _____)

DRAFT MOTION FOR DENIAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to deny the applicant’s request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision. Adding a summary of the evidence relied on at the end of the motion is encouraged. The Worksheet is intended to assist in doing that.

Motion to find that practical difficulties do not exist and to DENY the variance(s) requested in ZBA Case No. PZBA23-011 based upon the applicant’s failure to demonstrate that the following review standard(s) in Section 6-100.5 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met:

**** (ONLY list standard(s) the Applicant DID NOT demonstrate and exclude those that do not apply) ****

- *Strict compliance with the ordinance provisions being varied is unnecessarily burdensome.*
- *The variance will do substantial justice to the applicant and other property owners.*
- *A lesser variance than requested would not give substantial relief to the applicant and/or be consistent with justice to other property owners*
- *The variance is needed due to unique circumstances of the property.*
- *The problem and resulting need for the variance was not self-created by the applicant or the applicant’s predecessors.*
- *The variance observes the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, will not adversely affect public safety and welfare, and will do substantial justice.*

(Evidence provided: _____)

Case No. PZBA23-012

Property: 6942 Hatchery Rd
Applicant: Lorrie Kobylik
Zoning: R-1C, Single-Family Residential
Site Use: Single Family Residential
Proposal: Timeframe extension of previous variances

Analysis

The applicant is requesting an extension of the timeframe of the variances that were previously granted on February 15, 2022 (original staff review below). The variances were scheduled to expire on February 15, 2023. The applicant is requesting an extension to allow the variances to be valid until February 15, 2024

February 15, 2022 Staff Review:

The applicant is proposing to construct an addition to the house at the subject property. The addition is shown to be located on the west side of the house. The proposed addition is shown to be located 10.6 ft. from the west side property line. The zoning of the subject lot only requires a minimum setback of 5 ft.

from the side property line. However, the side property line is a canal. There is a minimum setback of 25 ft. required from canal. Therefore, a 14.4 ft variance is required.

The applicant has provided information addressing the standards listed below on the "Supplemental Information" sheet. These standards and the information provided by the applicant addressing these standards shall be used by the Zoning Board to determine whether the requested variance shall be granted.

DRAFT MOTION FOR APPROVAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to approve the applicant's request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision.

MOTION to APPROVE case #PZBA23-012 extending the timeframe of variances previously granted in case #PZBA22-008, until February 15, 2024

DRAFT MOTION FOR DENIAL

If the Zoning Board of Appeals chooses to deny the applicant's request, the following is a draft motion that could be used to make that decision.

MOTION to DENY case #PZBA23-012 extending the timeframe of variances previously granted in case #PZBA22-008, until February 15, 2024