



City of Plymouth  
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, July 2, 2020 - 7:00 P.M.  
Online Zoom Meeting

---

City of Plymouth  
201 S. Main  
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

www.plymouthmi.gov  
Phone 734-453-1234  
Fax 734-455-1892

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Giummo called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

PRESENT: Scott Silvers, Ed Krol, Jim Burrows, Joe Elliott, Kara Giummo

ABSENT: Mike Devine

Also present was Assistant Community Development Director Greta Bolhuis and City Commission Liaison Tony Sebastian.

### 2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

### 3. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES

A motion was made by Comm. Burrows and seconded by Comm. Elliott for approval of the May 7, 2020 meeting minutes, as amended.

MOTION APPROVED 5-0

### 4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion was made by Comm. Burrows and seconded by Comm. Krol for approval of the agenda as presented.

MOTION APPROVED 5-0

### 5. OLD BUSINESS

None.

### 6. NEW BUSINESS

a) Z20-04, 235 Adams

Chair Giummo read the administrative review.

Peggy and Derek Caveney, owner, presented their case. She explained the existing deck needs repairs and they are hoping to expand the deck to accommodate a table that will fit their family. She explained the variance is for the expansion of the deck and that the deck area that currently exists will be repaired and will not change.

### Citizen Comments

None.

### Board Discussion

Comm. Silvers asked about the number of stairs from the house to the ground level. Ms. Caveney explained that it is four steps down from the kitchen door to the deck and five steps from the deck to the ground.

Comm. Burrows clarified the height of the deck. Ms. Caveney explained it is 3 feet above grade.

Comm. Burrows explained the existing rear yard setback of the house is non-conforming. Ms. Caveney explained the house was built in 1881 and was moved from behind the PARC pool area to its current location in about 1950. She explained the home was located in-line with the neighboring homes and she is unsure of what the setback requirements were at that time.

Comm. Krol clarified that the deck height will remain the same. Ms. Caveney confirmed that was true.

Comm. Elliott asked about the repair of the existing deck and how the required variance relates to that portion of the deck. Ms. Bolhuis explained that the Building Official is the person who determines if the scope of the work constitutes a repair or full replacement. She explained that generally, repairing deck board is considered a repair while replacement of the deck structure including deck boards would be considered a replacement and would require a variance.

Comm. Burrows asked for clarification on what exactly would constitute replacement and what would cause it to require a variance. Ms. Bolhuis explained that the ordinance classifies replacement as more than 60% of the market value of the structure, at which point a variance for the existing deck would be required.

Ms. Caveney explained that they intend to keep the footings and keep the deck work to repair only, but that they were unable to assess the structure of the deck while the deck boards were in place.

Comm. Krol asked when the deck was installed. Ms. Caveney explained City records were not available to clarify when the deck was originally installed.

Comm. Silvers felt that the impact of the proposed deck expansion was into the side yard, rather than the rear yard.

Comm. Burrows was concerned about the potential for the applicant to have to come back before the Board if the Building Official determined that the repair or replacement of the rear deck required a variance.

The Board concluded that if the repair or replacement of existing deck were necessary and required a variance, the applicant could amend their request and re-submit for consideration.

A motion was made by Comm. Elliott, supported by Comm. Krol, to approve Z20-04, 235 Adams. The variance is for 6.83 feet to project into the rear yard setback which accommodates a rear yard setback of 16.17 feet to the proposed deck expansion. The variance is conditioned to an uncovered deck that does not exceed 3 feet in height. The findings of fact are that proposed deck expansion has less encroachment into the rear yard setback than the existing non-conforming deck and the existing house was moved from another location which resulted in the non-conforming rear yard setback in general.

MOTION APPROVED 5-0

## **7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

## **8. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

Ms. Bolhuis explained that the Governor extended the permission for online meetings through the end of July 2020 and the August meeting might be via Zoom or in-person in a City park.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Burrows, supported by Comm. Krol to adjourn the meeting at 7:28 PM.

MOTION APPROVED 5-0