Ganges Township Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes for September 2, 2025

Ganges Township Hall

119th Avenue and 64th Street

Fennville MI, Allegan County

Call to Order

Carol **Josefowicz** called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Roll Call

Present: Audience:

Carol **Josefowicz** Chase **Hawkins** - 1500 Rosewood St, Jenison

Dale Pierson

Pam Jenewein

Tasha Smalley

Katelynn Wolfe

Review/Approve Agenda

Pierson made a motion to approve the agenda. Jenewein seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Public Comment for non-agenda items - None

Public Hearing – Reschedule from Aug. 20, 2025

Owner: Iris Boettcher

Subject Property: 1339 Fabun Road 0307-204-009-00

Iris Boettcher has petitioned for a front setback variance to construct an addition. Required front setback 40 feet; request relief of 23 feet (end of steps to be 17ft from

property line)

a. Opening of Public Hearing – 6:01 PM

b. Applicant explain request

Josefowicz noted that the write up submitted to the ZBA was difficult to read. She asked Chase Hawkins, the Project Manager from Trubuilt Builders, to explain Meadow Avenue, the undeveloped road. Hawkins replied that the road itself acts as a driveway for the residents. He continued, from his understanding, the drive at one point was supposed to go all the way around and connect with another road. Josefowicz asked what it means when they say that Meadow Avenue is an undeveloped road. Smalley replied that it is not a road, it is only a driveway. She continued that it's an undeveloped right-of-way that no one pays taxes on or owns. Josefowicz asked, if it became a road, would there be

requirements on the width of the road for a driveway. **Smalley** replied no because on the plat map, it's a public road that hasn't been developed; but it is already developed to access whoever's already there and the right-of-way is 74 feet. **Smalley** noted that it should be considered a street front. **Josefowicz** stated for setback purposes, there are two fronts, Fabun Road and Meadow Ave.

Hawkins stated that **Boettcher** is requesting an addition onto her existing home, which will create a master bedroom and mudroom, as well as adding steps off the mudroom which will come out to 17 feet, 7 inches. However, it does not exceed the existing structure. The existing home already sits at 10 feet to the property line, this addition would not surpass what is already there.

- c. Correspondence None
- d. Audience for/against comments None
- e. Further discussion None
- f. Close of Public Hearing 6:21 PM

Discussion/Decision of Variance Request

Josefowicz asked if they thought about building the addition going out another direction. **Hawkins** replied due to the location of utilities and how things are orchestrated, they would have to rework the entire house.

Josefowicz asked if the interior of the entire house was going to be redone. **Hawkins** stated no, just the area in question besides trimwork and other little things, but nothing structural.

Jenewein wondered if the stairs could go out towards the guest house. Hawkins replied that is the location for the proposed septic tank. He added that they are not doing anything with the well. Jenewein noted if this plan gets approved, the ZBA is allowing a variance when it wouldn't necessarily have to be had if they built in the other direction. Smalley commented that almost the whole house is in the setback; so there's almost nowhere to build where you would not need a variance.

Pierson commented that he has no issues with this variance due to its location in the house and its location to the homes across the street/driveway.

Hawkins noted that the only addition is the mudroom and the interior of the home really does not move at all; so the addition is 10 feet plus the steps in the front.

Josefowicz agreed with **Jenewein**, suggesting that the door and steps come off the side of the house towards the garage, instead of the front of the house. **Hawkins** replied that it should be doable.

Finding of Facts

For a variance to be granted, all of the following standards must be met.

1. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property in question that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions include any of the following: a) exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of a specific property on the effective date of the Ordinance; b) exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary situation on the land, building or structure; or c) any other physical situation on the land building or structure deemed by the ZBA to be extraordinary.

Met. Meadow Ave is an undeveloped right-of-way and there is no possibility of it becoming a road.

2. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and in the vicinity. The possibility of increased financial return shall not itself be deemed sufficient to warrant a variance.

Met. The addition does need a variance in order to enjoy a substantial property right similar to other properties in the area.

3. The variance will not be significantly detrimental to adjacent property and the surrounding neighborhood.

Met. The variance is not anywhere near the non-developed right-of-way.

4. The variance will not impair the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

Met. The variance will not impair the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

5. The immediate practical difficulty causing the need for the variance request was not created by any affirmative action of the applicant.

Met. The applicant has nothing to do with the planning of the road.

6. The reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of the variance and the variance is the minimum variance necessary.

Met.

Jenewein made a motion to accept the variance for parcel # 0307-204-009-00 with the following condition:

1. The entry steps shall be on the east side of the house.

Pierson seconded the motion. Motion passed (3-0).

Hawkins asked what happens now, permit wise. **Smalley** replied that **Hawkins** should resubmit the print with the door and steps moved, then she can issue a building permit because the plan is approved as of tonight.

Public Hearing – None

Any business that may come before the ZBA - None

Public Comments – None

Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by **Josefowicz** to approve the August 20, 2025 regular meeting minutes with corrections. **Jenewein** seconded the motion. Motion passed (3-0).

Adjournment

Pierson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Jenewein** seconded the motion. Motion passed (3-0). Meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted, Katelynn Wolfe Ganges Township, Zoning Board of Appeals