



**VILLAGE OF SUTTONS BAY
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

Wednesday, August 13, 2025, 5:30 PM

Suttons Bay Village Hall
420 N. Front Street
Suttons Bay, MI 49682

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call and Notation of Quorum
3. Conflict of Interest
4. Approval of the Agenda
5. Approval of Meeting Minutes – July 9, 2025
6. Public Comment/Written Communications (concerning items not on the agenda)
7. Adjournment

If you are planning on attending this meeting and are disabled requiring any special assistance, please notify the Village Clerk by calling 231.271.3051 or by email suttonsbay@suttonsbayvillage.org as soon as possible.



VILLAGE OF SUTTONS BAY
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES OF July 9, 2025

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Chairperson Popke.

Present: Bahle, Hassevoort, Smith, Popke & Cheadle. Quorum present.

Absent:

Staff present: Petroskey and Patmore

Guests: Michael Sanocki, Rick Andrews, Alan Harris

Conflict of Interest: None

Approval of Agenda

Smith moved, Hassevoort seconded, CARRIED, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 5, No: 0.

Approval of Meeting minutes

Bahle moved, Smith seconded, CARRIED, to approve the ZBA meeting minutes of June 11, 2025, as presented. Ayes: 5, No: 0.

Public Hearing-Continuation

Variance Request: The applicant, Michael Sanocki, is seeking a variance to construct an addition for property located at 379 S. Shore, Parcel ID# 043-828-036-00, located in the Single-Family Waterfront District. Specifically, the request is for an 8.33' variance from the 13.33 required front yard setback and a 7' variance from the 33.33 required Lake Michigan Setback.

At the previous meeting, the Board asked that the decision on the variance be tabled until the impervious lot coverage calculations were determined. The zoning administrator stated he went onsite and determined that the applicant was slightly over and determined the impervious service to be at 32% with the proposed addition. Zoning Administrator Patmore stated that removing roughly 288 sq feet could be a condition of this variance. Patmore also noted that any variance would have to take into consideration the eave line and apply a one-foot overhang.

Public Comment: Rick Andrews spoke in favor of the applicant and felt it would be doable to adjust his coverage to 30%.

Alan Harris stated he was the applicant's neighbor and he supported the garage addition and was happy it would no longer be a short-term rental.

Member Smith asked zoning administrator Patmore who will confirm that the applicant has met the 30% and Patmore indicated he would prior to issuing a land use permit.

Bahle moved, Hassevoort seconded, CARRIED, to approve the General Findings of Fact presented, the application and drawings submitted, and the zoning administrator reports from the June 11, 2025 and July 9, 2025 meeting.

Ayes: 5, No: 0.

Following review of the Findings of Fact the Village of Suttons Bay Zoning Board of Appeals finds the following:

- a. The need for the requested variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property involved, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, or topography and not due to applicant's personal or economic hardship:
- There *is* a unique circumstance associated with the property.
 - The request is not primarily for economic reasons.
 - There *is not* another alternative available to the owner.
 - The request *does not* affect properties in the area and district.

After discussion, the VSBZBA finds that the application meets this standard. Consensus 5-Yes.

- b. That the need for the requested variance is not the result of actions of the property owner.
- The property owner *did* not create the difficulty as the previous garage was converted prior to his purchasing the property.

After discussion, the VSBZBA finds that the application meets this standard. Consensus 4-Yes. 1-No

- c. That strict compliance with regulations governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density, or other dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

Smith noted that it is hard to live in this climate without a garage. Hassevoort agreed that it would be a good improvement. Cheadle noted that a strict interpretation would state that the property is being enjoyed without the variance. Both Bahle and Popke stated that the property is being used for its permitted purpose.

After discussion, the VSBZBA finds that the application does not meet this standard
Consensus 4-No 1 Yes

- d. Whether granting the requested variance would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether granting a lesser variance than requested would give substantial relief to the property owner and be more consistent with justice to the other property owners

After discussion, the VSBZBA finds that the application meets this standard. Consensus
4-Yes. 1-No

- e. That the requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood or zoning district.

After discussion, the VSBZBA finds that the application meets this standard. Consensus
4-Yes. 1-No

Bahle moved, Cheadle seconded, to deny the application for a variance as the applicant cannot meet the standards for # C as strict compliance with regulations governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density, or other dimensional requirements will NOT unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, and will NOT render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

Ayes: 5, No: 0.

Public Comment: Michael Sanocki stated he wanted to build a garage to clean up the property and install an EV charging station.

Next meeting: August 13, @ 5:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Meeting minutes submitted by Dorothy Petroskey, Village Clerk.