

A meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order on Tuesday, November 20, 1984 at 7:30 p.m. by the Chairman, Kenneth Lashmet.

PRESENT: Kenneth Lashmet, Chairman  
John Wilson  
John Lovio  
Carmelo Milia  
Richard Bonham  
James Giachino

ABSENT: James Reece, Jr.

ITEM #1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 16, 1984 meeting

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to approve the October 16, 1984 minutes as presented.

Ayes: 5  
Nays: 0  
Abstain: 1 (Milia)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO APPROVE CARRIED.

ITEM #2. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Kerby's Koney Island, 2901 Crooks Road, for relief to maintain a 6 foot high wood fence in lieu of a 4'6" masonry wall at the rear property line.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting renewal of relief granted, by this board, in November of 1983 to maintain a 6 foot wood fence in lieu of a 4'6" masonry screening wall along the rear property line where the off-street parking is located. This item was originally approved based on the fact that the adjacent surrounding area could possibly become non-residential in the future and also the petitioner indicated that when they expand their facility they would erect the wall if it was still required. The site has had an expansion and they have erected the wood wall at the off-street parking area, they are now requesting renewal of this relief to maintain the fence in lieu of the required 4'6" masonry wall.

Jim Keros was present and indicated that they had expanded. However, they would like renewal of their variance to maintain the wood fence because they may need more parking and it would mean moving the wall if it were required at this time. Also, it is possible that the surrounding area could become non-residential

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Milia

MOVED, to grant Kerby's Koney Island, 2901 Crooks Road, renewal of the variance to maintain a 6 foot high wood fence in lieu of a 4'6" masonry screening wall.

1. It is possible that the adjacent area may become non-residential.
2. There are no complaints or objections on file.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO RENEW VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR CARRIED.

ITEM #3. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Vel Corporation, 3236 Rochester Road, for relief of the 6 foot masonry screening wall required along the rear property line.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting renewal of relief for the placement of a masonry screening wall along their rear property line. Relief was originally granted in December of 1968 and renewals have been granted on a yearly basis since then. The conditions remain the same and we have no objections or complaints in our file.

D-1

## ITEM #3.

Richard Elhert was present and indicated that there were no changes and asked the board for a renewal of their variance.

Motion by Milia  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to grant Vel Corporation, 3236 Rochester Road, renewal of the relief of a 6 foot masonry screening wall required along the rear property line adjacent to residential.

1. The conditions remain the same.
2. There are no complaints or objections on file.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO RENEW VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR CARRIED.

ITEM #4. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Dave Evans Landscaping, 4832 Rochester Road, for relief to maintain use of a temporary structure.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting renewal of relief to use a temporary building for display of vegetables and plants. The variance has been granted on a yearly basis since 1964 and the conditions remain the same. We have no objections or complaints on file regarding this request.

Dave Evans was present and indicated that he had nothing to add to Mr. VandenBussche's statement.

The board questioned Mr. Evans on placement of material/merchandise in the right-of-way. Mr. Evans stated that the material for sale was kept back of the right-of-way and he would continue to monitor the conditions.

Motion by Bonham  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to grant Dave Evans, 4832 Rochester Road, renewal of relief to maintain use of a temporary building for the sale of vegetables and plants.

1. The conditions remain relatively the same.
2. There are no complaints or objections on file.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO RENEW VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR CARRIED.

ITEM #5. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Hollywood Supermarkets, 2670 W. Maple Road, for relief of the 6 foot masonry screening wall required along the north property line.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting renewal of relief of the 6 foot masonry screening wall required along the north property line of their site that abuts residential zoning. This relief was originally granted in 1976 based on the fact that the property to the north is a Bell Telephone utility site which is a permitted use in residential districts. The conditions remain the same and we have no objections or complaints in our file.

Jay Welch was present to represent Hollywood Markets and stated that he had nothing to add.

ITEM #5

Motion by Milia  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to grant Hollywood Market, 2670 W. Maple Road, renewal of relief to omit the 6 foot masonry screening wall at the north property line.

1. The conditions remain the same.
2. There are no complaints or objections on file.
3. The abutting property to the north is a Michigan Bell Telephone utility site.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO RENEW VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR CARRIED.

ITEM #6. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Arthur Ranieri, 2973 Ranieri, for relief to use an existing structure in a residential zoned area as a sales/construction office.

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to table this item until the end of the agenda (Item #20) to give the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED.

ITEM #7. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Federal Lawn Sprinkler, 2073 E. Maple Road, for relief to maintain outdoor storage in a fenced, obscured and landscaped area.

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Bonham  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to table this item until the end of the agenda (Item #21) to give the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED.

ITEM #8. RENEWAL REQUESTED: Charles Campbell, 6516 Norton, for relief to maintain an accessory building (greenhouse) for agricultural use on a parcel of land less than 5 acres.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting relief to maintain an accessory building (greenhouse) for agricultural use on a parcel of land less than 5 acres. The accessory buildings consist of a garage and greenhouse which in total exceed the area of the principal structure by 1,950 square feet. This relief was originally granted in November of 1978 based on the fact that there were no objections from the adjacent property owners. The conditions remain the same and we have no objections or complaints in our file.

## ITEM #8

Charles Campbell was present and had nothing to add.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Milia

MOVED, to grant Charles Campbell, 6516 Norton renewal of relief to maintain an accessory building (greenhouse) for agricultural use on a parcel of land less than 5 acres.

1. There are no objections or complaints on file.
2. The conditions remain the same.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO RENEW VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR CARRIED.

ITEM #9. RENEWAL REQUESTED: John R. Spring, 3009 John R., for relief to maintain a storage building within the future right-of-way of Big Beaver Road.

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Milia  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to table this item until the end of the agenda (Item #22) to give the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED.

ITEM #10. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Donald Waggoner, 1400 Rochester Road, for relief to provide off-street parking in the required front setback.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting permission to maintain a parking area in the required front setback of an industrial zoned district on Rochester Road just south of Maple Road. This item was tabled at the last regular meeting to allow the petitioner the opportunity to work out some additional landscaping at the front of the site. The petitioner has submitted a revised plan and the plan indicates that all the parking will occur away from the front property line. There is no designation of landscaping and it is suggested that if landscaping is desired by the board, it should be along the area adjacent to the front property line and still leave adequate maneuvering lanes for the parking that will be facing east.

Dawn Phillips, Attorney for Waggoner Corporation and Vincent Alvaro, the contractor were present. The applicants stated that the concrete for the parking is existing and they do not desire to remove it because of the cost. The parking immediately adjacent to Rochester Road will be removed and they are willing to install additional landscaping, as directed by the board. The parking lines will be removed and large planters or whatever is necessary will be placed on the paved area to discourage parking. They eventually plan on developing a third phase and if they lose all the parking in front they will have a shortage of 27 spaces when this phase is developed according to their calculations based on present parking requirements.

Motion by Giachino

MOVED, to grant Donald Waggoner, 1400 Rochester Road a variance for provided that the first 25 feet be a planted area. That planters or bollards be placed within that 25 feet to restrict parking within that area. That a distance be maintained to allow for the access, by vehicles, to the phase II addition and the parking and unloading zone.

## Item #10

Motion failed due to lack of support.

Dawn Phillips indicated that they would like to present the boards requests and concerns to Mr. Waggoner. They would accept a tabling motion to give them the opportunity to prepare a landscape plan.

Motion by Wilson  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to table the request of Donald Waggoner, for relief to provide off-street parking in the required front setback to give the petitioner the opportunity to present a landscape plan to include landscaping within the first 25 feet and showing the accessway to the parking and truckwells on the property.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #11. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Zion Evangelistic Temple, 3668 Livernois, for relief to erect a 4'6" berm in lieu of a masonry wall along the south and east property lines.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting permanent relief of a requirement for 4'6" masonry walls along the south and east portions of their site at the off-street parking areas. The site has had a year to year variance on these walls and now the petitioner is requesting that the variance become permanent. They based their request on the fact that they have constructed a 4'6" berm along the south edge of the parking area and the east side of the parking is adjacent to the church's own recreational property. In reviewing this site, the board has always indicated that a berm must be landscaped to provide adequate or equal shielding that a wall would provide. The present site does not appear to meet this criteria of the board.

Arthur Kalajian the architect was present and stated that the berm along the south property line has been re-done, however it is too late in the season to plant the berm. It was their understanding that a 4'6" berm with grass was acceptable and met the intent of the ordinance. He indicated that the church has met with the neighbors and is willing to do additional planting if it is necessary. If they are granted a permanent variance, they will meet the planting requirements set forth. As far as the east side, it is adjacent to the church's own recreational property and presents no detriment to the area. The area is to be used for future bleachers. Because of this 100 feet plus, they feel there is no need to screen. However they will do what the board feels is necessary to satisfy the screening.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Robert Champion, 3496 Livernois was present and stated that the present berm is unacceptable and the maintenance of the same is unacceptable. He indicated that he would be in favor of a berm if the plantings on the berm were of a good size, quantity and quality.

There were 3 letters of approval: Mr. & Mrs. Freeman, 31 Wendleton - Earl Amell, 3533 Livernois and Don and Muriel Gregory, 53 Kirk Lane.

There was one letter of objection on file: Gary & Claudia Koziarski, 3505 Livernois.

There was a letter on file from Robert W. Champion, 3496 Livernois objecting to the present conditions and maintenance of the bermed area.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to deny Zion Evangelistic Temple, 3668 Livernois a permanent variance for relief to install a 4'6" berm in lieu of a 4'6" masonry screening wall until good faith is shown that the berm will be landscaped and planted sufficiently to screen the off-street parking.

## Item #11

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

The board then considered the tabling action on the yearly renewal that was tabled at the last regular meeting.

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to table the request of Zion Evangelistic Temple, 3668 Livernois, until the next regular meeting (December 18, 1984) to give the petitioner the opportunity to present a landscaping plan before making a decision on continuing the yearly variance.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #12. EXPANSION OF NONCONFORMING: Schweitzer Real Estate, 906 E. Long Lake Road, for relief to expand a nonconforming structure.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to construct a 24'x52' addition to an existing nonconforming building. The site is nonconforming in that the required setback from Long Lake Road is 30 feet and the existing building is setback only 23 feet. This site has a year to year variance on parking in the proposed right-of-way of Long Lake Road. It appears that the new site plan has deleted the parking and moved it to the rear of the site. This site also has also received approval for a conforming office building through the Plan Commission. This approved conforming site was never developed; they are now requesting that they be allowed to add to the existing structure. The Zoning Ordinance does not permit additions or expansions of a nonconforming structure.

Kenneth Kernen was present to represent Schweitzer Real Estate. Mr. Kernen indicated the circumstances that occurred which ultimately forced them to change their plans. He also indicated that they have not been able to obtain financing for the new building. They plan to remodel the entire existing structure when they construct their addition. The cost to remove the existing building and erect a new one would be prohibitive. They also feel this would give them the option of erecting an office building to the rear of theirs at a future date as this is a long parcel of property.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

The chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to deny Schweitzer Real Estate, 906 E. Long Lake Road the request for relief to expand a nonconforming structure.

1. Insufficient hardship or practical difficulty.
2. There is adequate property to erect a building that meets the requirements of the ordinance.

Ayes: 5  
Nays: 1 (Milia)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO DENY REQUEST CARRIED.

The board recessed at 9:05 p.m. and reconvened at 9:20 p.m.

ITEM #13. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Michael McIntyre, 565 E. Big Beaver Road, for relief of the side yard setbacks.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to construct an office building and the site plan indicates there will be a 24 foot setback to the east property line and a 20 foot setback to the west property line. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the side yard setbacks in this zoning district (O-M) shall be a minimum of 30 feet.

Dwayne Frechett of Master Plan Construction was present to represent Mr. McIntyre. He indicated that because the site is a long narrow site they are restricted as to what they can build on it. Their site has been included in a rezoning to O-M which has changed the requirements. To get the maximum usage of the site and fulfill the applicants needs for his building the building has been designed with his needs in mind. He cannot apply for rezoning of his site because of the time element - his present lease is expiring and he would be forced to relocate twice. Their building has been designed as per several previous discussions with the Planning Department and it is felt by all, this is the best design for the site. If they were to go higher they still could not meet the side yard setbacks because of the narrow lot - the higher they go the more side yard they will need. They purchased the property with an O-1 Zoning in mind. Mr. Frechett and Mr. McIntyre indicated that they feel they have met the intent of the ordinance. He also indicated that they are not able to purchase additional to give them the needed lot width for their building.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

There was one letter of objection on file: Art Kurgin, 620 Hartland.

The chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Milia  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to grant Michael McIntyre, 565 E. Big Beaver, a variance as requested for relief of the side yard setbacks.

1. The petitioner has a unique or unusual situation triggered by a rezoning action.
2. The lot is narrow for normal office development.

Ayes: 3  
Nays: 3 (Lashmet, Bonham, Giachino)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION FAILS - VARIANCE DENIED.

ITEM #14. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Gordon Standewick & Bill Liller, 4107 John R., for relief of the 5 foot sidewalk required between a building and vehicle use area.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to construct an office building addition to an existing site on the west side of John R. just north of Wattles Road. The site plan indicates that there will not be a 5 foot walk along the south side of the building, which is adjacent to the vehicle use area. The Zoning Ordinance requires that there be a 5 foot concrete walk installed between a side or front of a building and a vehicular use area. The petitioner indicated that when the building was originally constructed, this walk was not required and they installed a greenbelt area with a sprinkler system

Gordon Standewick was present and indicated that their building is not a multi-tenant building and they have no entrances on the south side of their building; therefore they feel that the walk would serve no useful purpose. Because the existing building has a landscaped area which includes a sprinkler system, crushed stone and shrubbery along the south side; the installation of a sidewalk along this side of the building would cause an unnecessary burden. They feel the sidewalk would detract from the aesthetic appearance of the site and give any one passing by the windows a chance to look into their building. They do confidential work and visitors walking down this walk could see into their windows.

November 20, 1984

## ITEM #14.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

There was one letter of objection on file: Tunis Creech, 1815 E. Wattles Road.

The chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to deny Gordon Standewick and Bill Liller, 4107 John R., a variance for relief of the 5 foot sidewalk required between the side of the building and the vehicular access area.

1. The hardship has been self-imposed.
2. The petitioner has not presented sufficient hardship or practical difficulty as to why they could not install the walk.
3. To grant the variance would be contrary to the intent of the ordinance.

Ayes:

4

Nays:

2

(Wilson and Lovio)

Reason for No vote by Lovio - it is unnecessary and imposes a hardship on the petitioner.

Absent:

1

(Reece)

MOTION TO DENY REQUEST CARRIED.

ITEM #15. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Raymond Hanson, 5229 Allison, for relief of the front and rear yard setbacks.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to construct a single family residence on the southeast corner of Allison and Lila. The site plan indicates that there will be a 24 foot setback from Lila and a 38 foot rear yard setback. The petitioner indicates that they had mis-information from the Building Department in that someone told them, 24 feet would be acceptable as a side yard setback. This may be the case in some instances but on this particular site there is a requirement that a full 30 foot setback must be observed from both Lila and Allison. They also indicate that their chimney will encroach into the rear yard setback, resulting in a 38 foot rear yard setback where 40 feet is required.

Mr. & Mrs. Hanson were present and stated that their house plan was designed based on the setbacks quoted them. This was a custom designed plan and to change the setbacks would require a total change in the house plan. The architect has been paid in full and re-designing would become very costly. As far as the rear yard encroachment is concerned, the fireplace would have to be placed on the inside, rather than the outside. To do this would change the room and would not be as desirable.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

There is a letter of approval on file signed by 10 of the surrounding property owners.

There was also a letter of approval on file signed by William Jackson, 5164 Prentis.

The chairman closed the public hearing



## ITEM #15

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to grant Raymond Hanson, 5229 Allison a variance for a 24 foot setback from Lila where a 30 foot setback is required and a 38 foot setback from the rear lot line where a 40 foot setback is required.

1. Although the error does not relieve compliance, the variance is small in nature.
2. There are approvals and no objections from the neighboring property owners.

Ayes: 5  
Nays: 1 (Lashmet)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO APPROVE REQUEST CARRIED.

ITEM #16. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Elerious King, 2212 Livernois, for relief to erect an addition to an accessory building.

This item was withdrawn because it deals with a use variance and does not come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

ITEM #17. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Gordon Heidacker & Dan Sommer, 770 W. Maple Road, for relief of the minimum easement width, relief of the front setback and relief of the rear yard setback.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a split of properties on Maple Road just west of Heide. The site plan indicates that there are two buildings on a parcel of land and the petitioner is requesting that the buildings be separated through a lot split. This lot split would result in a multitude of zoning violations. The building would be accessible only through a 20 foot existing easement and the Zoning Ordinance requires that access to sites that do not have frontage on a public street be through a minimum 30 foot wide easement. The Zoning Ordinance also requires a minimum front yard of 50 feet; this property would have a front yard of 15 feet. The Zoning Ordinance requires that an industrial site have a minimum rear yard of 20 feet and in this case the rear yard would only be 10 feet. Also, we have requested that a complete detailed site plan be submitted so that we could ascertain that the parking complies with the ordinance. This site plan has never been received. Based on what we have received, the petitioner is requesting relief to have a 20 foot access easement where 30 feet is required - a 15 foot side yard setback whereas a 50 foot setback is required and a 10 foot rear yard setback where a 20 foot setback is required.

Gordon Heidacker and Dan Sommer were present. The petitioners stated that they presently lease the building but hope to purchase it and split the property due to some difficulties they have experienced. The site is used for their hobby, which is auto restoration. When they applied for a split of the property at the Assessing Department, they were told it could not be split because it did not meet the ordinance. The petitioner presented documentation which indicated there may be a 55 foot easement along the north property line and a possibility of 20 feet available on the rear.

Further questioning by the board and information presented by Mr. Heidacker indicated that it is possible they may have the land required for their split.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

There was one letter of objection on file: Robert M. Whalen, President of Electrical Research Corporation, 1903 Barrett.

The chairman closed the public hearing.

## ITEM #17.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to table the request of Gordon Heidacker and Dan Sommer, 770 W. Maple Road, for relief to have a 20 foot easement where a 30 foot easement is required - a 15 foot front yard setback where a 50 foot front setback is required and a 10 foot rear yard setback where a 20 foot rear yard setback is required; to give the petitioner the opportunity to submit further information. The information shall include a survey of the property showing easements available and a parking and landscaping plan.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #18. VARIANCE REQUESTED: Thomas Strat & Associates, 1150 Livernois, for relief of the front setback.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner had contacted him and asked for a tabling action on this item as he was ill and was unable to attend this meeting.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

The chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Milia  
Supported by Lovio

MOVED, to table the request of Thomas Strat & Associates, 1150 Livernois, for relief of the front setback until the next regular meeting (December 18, 1984).

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE UNTIL NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #19. VARIANCE REQUESTED: John A. Miltimore, 1026 Rankin, for relief of the front setback.

Mr. VandenBussche explained that the petitioner is requesting a permit to construct a 16'x24' office addition onto an existing industrial building. This office addition will result in a front setback of 25 feet. The Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum front setback of 50 feet in an industrial zoned district. The site has had previous approval for parking within 25 feet of the front setback but the approval did not include the construction of a building within this front setback. The petitioner is now requesting that he be permitted to construct his office addition in this required setback.

John Miltimore and Mr. Hayes the Contractor were present. The petitioner stated that he presently has a permit for an addition to the rear of his building and is now requesting a permit for an office addition to the front of his building. He presently operates his office out of his home and because of the increase in his business he needs more office and warehouse room. He stated that he has neighboring properties on the same street with 25 foot setbacks. The addition will only take the place of one parking space which is already in existence on the site. They do not desire to erect an office at the rear of the building. He indicated that if they are not permitted a variance, they would probably have to relocate.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the audience.

ITEM #19

The chairman closed the public hearing.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Giachino

MOVED, to deny the request of John A. Miltimore, 1026 Rankin for relief of the front setback.

1. The petitioner has not presented sufficient hardship or practical difficulty.

Ayes: 3  
Nays: 3 (Wilson, Lashmet, Milia)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to table the request of John A. Miltimore, 1026 Rankin for relief of the front setback until the next regular meeting (December 18, 1984) to give the petitioner the benefit of a full board.

Ayes: 5  
Nays: 1 (Milia)  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE REQUEST UNTIL NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #20. (Item #6) RENEWAL REQUESTED: Arthur Ranieri, 2973 E. Maple Road, for relief to use an existing structure in a residential zoned area as a sales/construction office.

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Lovio  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to table this item until the next regular meeting to give the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE REQUEST UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #21. (Item #7) RENEWAL REQUESTED: Federal Lawn Sprinkler, 2073 E. Maple Road, for relief to maintain storage in a fenced, obscured, and landscaped area.

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Bonham  
Supported by Wilson

MOVED, to table this item until the next regular meeting to allow the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE UNTIL NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984) CARRIED.

ITEM #22. (Item #9) RENEWAL REQUESTED: John R. Spring, 3009 John R., for relief to maintain a storage building within the future right-of-way of Big Beaver.

---

The petitioner was not present.

Motion by Giachino  
Supported by Bonham

MOVED, to table this item until the next regular meeting to allow the petitioner the opportunity to be present.

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Absent: 1 (Reece)

MOTION TO TABLE REQUEST UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING (December 18, 1984)  
CARRIED.

The Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

*9/17*