CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Wednesday, October 1, 2025 6:30 pm

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Elizabeth El-Assadi Stan Eldridge Edward Burnett Ericka Vonyea

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Mark Yandrick – Planning Director Sally Elmiger - Carlisle Wortman Denny O. McLain - Township Consultant Attorney, McLain & Winters

• CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM

MOTION: Ms. El-Assadi called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. Ms. El-Assadi completed the roll call and confirmed a quorum was established.

• OFFICAL COMMUNICATION

None to Report

• APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Mr. Eldridge **MOVED** to approve the agenda as presented. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Vonyea and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

• APPROVAL OF AUGUST 6, 2025, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Mr. Eldridge **MOVED** to approve the August 6, 2025, Regular Meeting Minutes as presented. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Vonyea and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant: Antione and Johnita Porter

Location: 6070 South Miami Street, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Parcel ID: K-11-27-102-021

Request: Article 8– Sec. 802.5, Accessory Buildings and Accessory Uses, and Article 4, Sec. 406.3 District Regulation: Request for variances to expand an attached carport in the side yard, and to locate the outer edge of the carport less than the required setback to the side property line.

Sally Elmiger (Planning Consultant - Carlisle Wortman) informed the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) that the applicant has proposed extending an existing carport structure into the required side yard and locating the outer edge of the carport less than the required setback to the side property line. The R-4 zoning district requires that a structure be set back a minimum of five feet from the side property line.

Ms. Elmiger presented pictures of the property showing the carport built into the roof of the house. The proposed carport reduces the setback on the north side or towards the left of the existing house, requiring a variance, making the new "total" side-yard seatbacks equal to 7.1 feet.

Ms. Elmiger stated that she evaluated the proposal against the various criteria that are exceptional circumstances or conditions (e.g., narrowness, shallowness, or topographic conditions) applying to the property in question that does not apply generally to other properties or classes of uses in the same zoning district.

Ms. Elmiger stated that she did not find any unusual situation on the property. The applicant can provide additional information about an exceptional characteristic of the land that does not generally occur on other like properties.

This site does contain a two-car garage and a carport. Most homes on South Miami Street have a garage, either attached to the home or in the rear yard. There does not appear to be any other property that has both a carport and a garage. Ms. Elmiger stated that they do not consider having a carport to be a substantial property right, particularly since this site also has a garage.

The authorization of such a variance will not be a substantial detriment to the adjacent property and will not be harmful to or alter the essential character of the area. Ms. Elmiger stated that the proposal will place the carport approximately 7.7 feet away from the neighbor's house to the north. The Building Code requires a minimum of a 10-foot separation between residential buildings, unless special fire-rated construction is used. There is no information about whether the new carport will meet these construction requirements for fire ratings.

The problem and resulting need for variance have not been self-created by any action of the applicant: Ms. Elmiger stated that the problem was not self-created by the applicant.

The proposed variance will be the minimum necessary, and no variance shall be granted where a different solution not requiring a variance would be possible. Ms. Elmiger shared that the existing carport is not five feet away from the side property line. They could widen the carport by 1.5 feet. The ordinance does permit someone to increase an overhang into the setback that would provide another 10 inches of roof to the north of the edge of the base part of the carport to provide additional cover. This would provide almost two more feet of covered carport without a variance and would place the carport at least 10 feet away from the neighbor's house. Another alternative is that a typical barrier-free parking space is eight feet wide, and an access aisle is five feet wide, for a total of 13 feet. If the vehicle entered the carport from the street, the driver would have approximately four feet to exit the car and enter the house.

Ms. Elmiger informed the ZBA that she has requested the applicant to provide any additional information available that describes the unusual condition of this lot to meet the first criterion, illustrating exceptional circumstances with this property. The current proposal places the carport closer to the neighbor's house than the required 10-foot separation distance required by the Building Code without any special construction techniques; however, the applicant may also have additional information in this regard. The applicant would have to consider alternatives to the proposal offered by the Planning Department that would not require a variance and would keep a structure at least 10 feet away from the neighbor's house.

Ms. El-Assadi inquired if the neighbor to the north of the property was contacted. Ms. Elmiger stated that a public hearing notice was given, but has not received any feedback.

The applicant (Antione Porter) informed the ZBA that the reason for the carport and the extension of it is to cater to his wife, who had a major car accident. Under the carport is a door, leading to the kitchen with an accessible ramp. The ramp will be installed once the proposal has been approved.

Mr. Burnett talked about the existing neighbor's property line. Mr. Porter stated that the survey shows the property line, and the land does belong to him.

Ms. El-Assadi inquired about the dimensions of the ramp. The ramp is three feet and one inch wide by 15 feet and six inches long which is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Ms. Vonyea talked about the extension of the carport further into the fence that would make room for the installation of the ramp. The applicant stated that the contractors had suggested the extension of the ramp into the car, for easy access into the house. The applicant shared with the ZBA that they had one letter of support from the neighbor (north) and another letter from the neighbor across the street.

Ms. El-Assadi inquired with the planning staff if the applicant would require permits for the installation of the ramp. Ms. Elmiger stated that, since the ramp is ADA-approved, permits would be required.

Mr. Eldridge inquired if the applicant had considered the alternatives proposed by the planning staff. Mr. Porter stated that he had considered the options provided, but it does not suit his wife's condition.

Ms. Elmiger informed the ZBA that the variance was based on the land and not on the occupant of the structure. The planning staff did work on providing alternatives that would be beneficial to the applicant.

Mr. Porter requested that the ZBA speed up the process in order to have the concrete work and the ramp installed before winter.

Mr. Eldridge asked Ms. Elmiger if they could schedule a special meeting with notice of the scheduled date, to arrive at a solution to work with Mr. Porter. Ms. Elmiger stated that they would schedule a meeting.

The Commissioners discussed potential dates.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:04 PM

Hearing no comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:05 PM

MOTION: Mr. Eldridge **MOVED** to postpone the following variance requests from the Township Zoning Ordinance, at 6070 South Miami St., Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198, Parcel K-11-27-102-021: Article VIII – Sec. 802.5 Accessory Buildings and Accessory Uses, and Article IV, Sec. 406.3 District Regulations. Request for variances to expand an attached carport in the side yard, and to locate the outer edge of the carport less than the required setback to the side property line. As shown on the plans submitted with the Zoning Board of Appeals Packet dated August 22, 2025. This postponement is to provide the applicant with an opportunity to address the comments

made at this evening's meeting, meet with staff and return with a revised proposal that reflects those comments.

If there is a need for an additional meeting, the meeting would be scheduled for October 15, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Burnett.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Stan Eldridge (Yes); Mr. Burnett (Yes); Ericka Vonyea (Yes); Ms. Elizabeth El-Assadi (Yes).

MOTION PASSED.

• OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON AGENDA

• PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

Mark Yandrick (Planning Director) informed the ZBA that they received a site visit with the applicant from 840 Moss. The applicant had resubmitted the plan with a slight modification. Mr. Yandrick stated that he will try to schedule the meeting for October 15, 2025.

• <u>CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED</u>

None to Report.

• ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEMBERS

None to Report.

• MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE/PUBLIC

None to Report.

• OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY COME BEFORE THE ZONING BOARD

None to Report.

• <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

MOTION: Mr. Eldridge MOVED to adjourn at 7:08 p.m. The MOTION wa	as
SECONDED by Ms. Vonyea and PASSED by unanimous consent.	

Respectfully submitted by Minutes Services