



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Zoning Board of Appeals

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson: Kenneth Koluch; Vice Chairperson: Charles Tischer; Secretary: Jayson Graves
Members: Deborah Brnabic, Marvie Neubauer, Jason Sakis, and John Young

Wednesday, March 12, 2025

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Koluch called the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Deborah Brnabic, Jayson Graves, Kenneth Koluch, Charles Tischer, Jason Sakis, Marvie Neubauer and John Young

Others Present:

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Jeff Schultz, Manager of Inspection Services
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2025-0096](#) November 13, 2024 Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes

Approved.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Koluch noted that the latest edition of the Michigan Planner publication had been sent to the Board members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

[2025-0094](#) PUBLIC HEARING - File No. PVAI2025-0001

Location: 1080 Michelson Rd., located east of John R Rd. and north of M-59, Parcel No. 15-36-351-012, zoned R-3, One Family Residential

The applicant is requesting a variance from *Sec.138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures*, which notes that the maximum allowance for a detached accessory structure for a parcel under one acre in size is 1,000 square feet.

The recently constructed garage addition exceeds the maximum size allowance by 200 square feet when combined with the other accessory structures onsite. If granted, the variance would allow the detached accessory structure that has been constructed to remain onsite.

(Staff Report dated 3-5-25, Location Map, Plans, Applicant's Application and Submittal, most recent Building Plan Review, and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Chairperson Koluch introduced this item and noted that it is a request for a variance for a detached garage addition exceeding the permitted size, which is 1,000 square feet. He invited the applicant to the presenter's table and requested Mr. McLeod review the Staff Report.

Present for the applicant was Kelly Miller, 1080 Michelson. Jeff Schultz, Manager of Inspection Services for the Building Department was also in attendance.

Mr. McLeod explained that the request is for a dimensional variance for the size of overall accessory structures on a single family residential piece of property. He noted that as the property is under one acre in size, it is allowed up to 1,000 square feet of accessory structure; and he pointed out that the drawings show an accessory structure at about 1,200 square feet. He mentioned that there is one additional structure that does show up on the site; and he noted that in speaking with the Building Department, they had stated that they had a conversation with Mr. Miller about removing that structure. He summarized that tonight's request is for 1,200 square feet for the proposed building. He stated that the property itself is approximately 100 feet in width and approximately 265 feet in depth on average.

He added that the building is approximately 10 feet away from the western property line, approximately 33 feet from the rear property line, and 66 feet from the eastern property line. He pointed out that the rear of the property abuts the M-59 right-of-way. He noted that Jeff Schultz is in attendance from the Building Department and can answer any questions specific to the permit; and he explained that this really began in 2023 with a foundation and slab permit for an accessory structure. The process was ongoing and had gone through review for the foundation and slab minus the actual structure and was ultimately approved. That permit application was amended to then bring the structure into it and never achieved approval, and unfortunately the structure was constructed without the necessary structural approvals.

Mr. McLeod explained that although this started in late 2023 and most of the action was mid-2024. The building was constructed in November and December, and this is now before the Zoning Board of Appeals to determine what to do with it going forward. He displayed photographs pre-addition along with an aerial view, and described the surrounding area as single family. He added that M-59 provides a fairly large boundary. He reviewed the drawings noting that the building addition basically doubled the size of the structure to approximately 1,200 square feet, and he showed a photograph of the completed structure. He summarized that this is merely a question of whether a variance should be granted to allow for an additional size of an accessory structure on a

single family lot for a lot size under one acre. He reviewed the standards which the Board should consider and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Chairperson Koluch asked Mr. Schultz if he had been involved in granting the original permit for the slab and the subsequent denial once the structure was amended.

Mr. Schultz responded that he was, and explained that he met with Mr. Miller at the department front counter and discussed with him the importance of getting a foundation permit. He stated that as time was of the essence for Mr. Miller, he stated that it was important for him to get this done to apply for a building permit and later a revision to the building permit for the actual structure. He noted that Mr. Miller did apply for a revision initially in May of 2024, and that revision was disapproved. Mr. Miller reapplied again in November and again, the revision was disapproved. Mr. Schultz noted that there was never another revised drawing submitted and now there is a structure without an approval to build.

Chairperson Koluch invited Mr. Miller to address the Board.

Mr. Miller stated that he at most has used approximately eight percent of his yard and suggested that the code is contradictory. He mentioned that six or eight of his neighbors wanted to come in and it was determined that his next door neighbor Eva would attend the meeting. He stated that everyone loves the garage and said it looks brand new and helps block the sound of the freeway. He mentioned that he applied for a wall several times as the noise is so bad. He commented that he used 2x6s in the construction, and asked for consideration for his health. He added that he determined by installing the footings where the walls would go.

Chairperson Koluch asked if Mr. Miller had any conversations with the Building Department after the building permit was denied in November of 2024.

Mr. Miller responded that he dealt with a female initially who suggested he apply for a permit for the footings. He added that Angelo and Tim came to do inspections. He commented that he was told to ignore an email and continue building.

There was extensive discussion as to whether Mr. Miller was told to continue building prior to issuance of a building permit for the final structure.

Ms. Neubauer noted that she sees an approval for the foundation/driveway and does not see an approval for the separate structure. She asked Mr. McLeod to expand on the process for approving the driveway and the additional permit required for the structure.

Mr. Miller stated that he was told by a woman at the Building Department counter that he could obtain one permit for both.

Ms. Neubauer asked if this was verbally or in writing.

Mr. Miller responded that it was verbally told to him; and he was instructed that when he received the permit, he needed to display it on his door. He mentioned that a portion of the roof is smaller at eight feet versus 10 feet; and it is not one big garage.

Ms. Neubauer asked if he had another conversation after the denials to get additional clarification. She suggested that there was a miscommunication somewhere and she cannot determine where that occurred. She pointed out that previously he received an approval and then applied for something else and was denied. She noted that he reapplied again, and was denied again. She asked what steps he took after he received the second denial.

Mr. Miller stated that he called the Department and does not know who he talked to; however, he was told to ignore the email. He noted that he called for the rough inspection, and Angelo was sent out. He asked why they would send him out if it was not approved. He explained that subsequently Tim came out, and he stated that both Angelo and Tim stated that they loved it.

Ms. Neubauer commented that she would not necessarily assume that just because someone came out that everything was OK.

Chairperson Koluch asked for the total square foot of the current structure, noting that it looks like the add-on was 600 square feet.

Mr. Miller responded that it is 1,200 square feet. He stressed that he had the footings poured for the walls.

Chairperson Koluch noted that he has two different pictures from above the house, and asked if there was another wood shed or accessory structure in the backyard.

Mr. Miller responded that there was a makeshift shed there when he bought the house. He commented that it was a HUD house that had sat empty for three years, and he stated that it is now the most expensive house on that side of the street. He suggested that a number of people including the Mayor came out to his property and it was suggested that he replace the roof on that structure. He commented that the shed is solid.

Chairperson Koluch asked the size of the other structure.

Mr. Miller responded that it is 12 x 19.

Chairperson Koluch noted that Mr. Miller referenced the Ordinance section which indicates that he is allowed 30 percent lot coverage, explained that it depends on the size of the lot, and asked for clarification of total structures.

Mr. Miller responded that he has eight percent covered.

Chairperson Koluch noted that 30 percent would give Mr. Miller 6,200 square feet to build total structures; and commented that if he is correct, subtracting 1,000 square feet for accessory structures would allow Mr. Miller to construct

5,200 square feet for the residence. He commented that based on having a long narrow lot, he did not know how a 5,000 square foot house would be possible without going straight back.

Mr. Miller stated that his home is approximately 1,500 square feet.

Chairperson Koluch stated that in terms of accessory structures, it is based on the acreage of the lot, which is approximately two-thirds of an acre.

Mr. Miller responded that he is just one-tenth under one acre and everyone else has an acre if not more. He added that his neighbor across the street has eight acres that backs up to Thelma Spencer Park.

Chairperson Koluch added that less than one acre allows 1,000 square feet of accessory structure and it only goes up to 1,200 square feet up to two acres. He noted that this shows an intention of the City that they do not want too many accessory structures on the property regardless of the property size. He commented that he can understand how it can be a little confusing or contradictory to be approved for the cement and basic fixtures and not be approved for the subsequent building. He noted a similar situation approximately a year ago where a long narrow lot existed and a large addition was built onto a very small garage; however, that owner did not approach the City at all. He explained that the ended up requiring that the front part of the garage be cut off to get it under 1,000 square feet. He stated that in this case, if the variance is going to be approved, at the very least within the regulations they would have to approve something that would be the least amount of variance.

He suggested that if the total square feet of accessory structures brings the total to perhaps 1,400 or 1,500 square feet, the Board should consider whether it should be reduced as much as possible without having to chop into the garage.

Ms. Brnabic asked about the approval granted on September 27, 2023.

Mr. Schultz responded that the original drawing was just a slab and footings. He explained that he met with Mr. Miller at the counter and talked about how they could save him some money by taking the structure in a revision rather than pulling a separate building permit.

Ms. Neubauer asked whether there is an accessory structure coming down or whether there would be 1,500 or 1,600 square feet between the different structures.

Mr. Miller responded that there are two makeshift structures behind the garage. He explained that they are to keep the materials dry.

Mr. McLeod noted that there is a separate structure in question.

Mr. Miller responded that the structure was there when he moved in and contains his landlord things. He noted that he updated it.

Ms. Neubauer stated that if her question is whether reducing the accessory

structures in the yard could be made a condition of the variance if approved. She suggested that he might be able to keep the 1,200 foot structure if he was required to remove the other structure. She noted that if all of the square footage of the accessory structures is calculated Mr. Miller is not in compliance by nearly 1,000 square feet, and not just 200 square feet. She asked if Mr. Miller would be agreeable to that.

Mr. Miller stated that it would be difficult.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she understands Mr. Miller backs up to M-59; however, with 80,000 residents the City must make sure that it applies the ordinances as written. She suggested that if it were her, she would want to get something in writing rather than just verbally. She commented that it would be difficult and burdensome to chop 200 feet off of a structure as it is already built; however, according to the regulations the problem cannot be self-created. She stated that if there was a lack of communication, the communication should be clarified. She asked if Mr. Miller would be willing to take down the structure in question and the other structure hidden behind the trees so that the variance is truly only the 200 extra square foot for the garage.

Mr. Miller responded he would, as he does not have much of a choice. He asked how long he would have to do this as he must have surgery on both knees.

Chairperson Koluch stated that he could work with the Building Department and noted that it is usually something in the range of 60 days.

Ms. Neubauer suggested he get help, and stated that if agreeable to the Board it could be made a condition of the variance.

Mr. Miller asked about the footings that were there when he bought the house.

Ms. Brnabic asked for clarification if the Board is considering this because they believe there truly was some sort of miscommunication or lack of understanding, noting this application needs to be distinguished from other similar applications.

Ms. Neubauer responded that she can understand the disconnect and also understand when Mr. Miller is trying to calculate the percentage of the area of the property he is allowed to build on. She pointed out that he did get approved for the footing and there should probably have been more due diligence done from the applicant and communication in writing. She stated that while she does not want him to tear down his garage, she wants to find a way to make this so the ordinance is fairly enforced. She pointed out that right now he is not in violation by 200 square feet but by almost 1,000; and needs to determine if that can be reduced so that the intent of the ordinance is preserved fairly for everyone.

Ms. Brnabic noted that back in May of 2024 the overage was noted as 200 square feet.

Chairperson Koluch commented that as the original permit was granted he does not think it is entirely a self-created problem. He stated that with the original foundation being approved, it is reasonable that someone might assume that it would be the size of the garage.

Ms. Neubauer stated that if this passes, it would be based on the fact that the original permit for the footing is a distinguishable factor in this case.

Chairperson Koluch noted that in the suggested motion to approve language be incorporated between paragraphs 3 and 4 regarding the problem not being self-created for the reasons stated on the record.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet to approve the variance, noting to add an additional condition as number 4, that this problem was not self-created due to the applicant's communication with the Building Department and the initial permit being approved for the footing granting 1,200 square foot for the building structure. She noted that the condition indicating that the property is adjacent to M-59 is huge because it distinguishes the property from other properties elsewhere in the city. She added a final condition that specifies the removal of the two other ancillary structures that were described on the record to be in compliance with building regulations. She asked if the substructures had to be removed as a part of tear-down.

Mr. Schultz responded that he could just remove the structures themselves and leave the substructure.

Mr. Tischer seconded Ms. Neubauer's motion.

Mr. Miller asked how long he had to remove the structures.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that Mr. Miller work with staff, and stated that it would behoove him to get it done within the time he is given.

Chairperson Koluch noted that the entire motion is conditioned upon the removal being completed.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Koluch stated that the motion passed unanimously and the variance was granted.

Ms. Neubauer stated that future communications need to be in writing.

Mr. Schultz suggested that Mr. Miller should contact Ordinance Manager Jodi Welch.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Tischer, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischer, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PVAI2025-0001, that the request for a variance from Sec.138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures, which notes that the maximum

allowance for a detached accessory structure for a parcel under one acre in size is 1,000 square feet for 1080 Michelson Rd., Parcel No. 15-36-351-012, be **APPROVED** to allow for the recently constructed garage addition which exceeds the maximum size allowance by 200 square feet when combined with the other accessory structures onsite to be maintained because a practical difficulty does exist on the property as demonstrated in the record of proceedings and based on the following findings. With this variance, the property shall be considered by the City to be in conformity with the Zoning Ordinance for all future uses with respect to the setbacks for which this variance is granted.

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the Zoning Ordinance would prohibit the reasonable use of the property and will be unnecessarily burdensome.

2. Granting the variance will preserve a substantial property right for the applicant and thus substantial justice shall be done.

3. A lesser variance will not provide substantial relief, and would not be more consistent with justice to other property owners in the area.

4. This problem was not self-created due to the applicant's communication with the Building Department and the initial permit being approved for the footing granting 1,200 square foot for the building structure.

5. There are unique circumstances of the property that necessitate granting the variance as described in the above criterion, specifically, that the property is approximately 0.61 acres (based on assessing records) in size, making it significantly larger than many lots throughout the city, particularly those lots within the R-3 One Family District which requires lot sizes of 12,000 square feet. Further, the lot abuts the M-59 right-of-way and does not provide significant impact to those residents abutting the subject site. These factors distinguish the subject property from other properties elsewhere in the City with respect to compliance with the ordinance regulations.

6. The granting of these variances would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or existing or 1080 Michelson Rd.-Variance Request for a Detached Garage Addition future neighboring uses.

7. Approval of the requested variances will not impair the supply of light and air to adjacent properties, increase congestion, increase the danger of fire, or impair established property values in the surrounding area.

8. That all necessary building permits and inspections be applied for by the applicant within the next 30 calendar days.

9. The granting of these variances is subject to the removal of the two other ancillary structures that were described on the record in compliance with building regulations.

2025-0095

PUBLIC HEARING - File No. PVAI2025-0002

Location: 1984 Ansal Dr., located east of Old Perch and south of Walton, Parcel No. 15-16-151-015, zoned R-1 One Family Residential.

The applicant is requesting a 15 ft. 7 in. variance from *Sec. 138-10.103 Corner Lots*, which requires the proposed accessory structure, a garage, to meet a 40 ft. setback along Old Perch since adjacent houses have a front yard relationship with Ansal Dr. and Old Perch Rd.

(Staff Report dated 3-5-25, Location Map, Plans dated 2-14-25 and Revised Site Plan dated 3-11-25, Application, Building Department Reviewed Plans, Original Mortgage Survey and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the Applicant was John Cialone, Italy America Construction.

Chairperson Koluch introduced this item noting it was a request for a 15-foot seven-inch variance pertaining to corner lots requiring that a proposed accessory structure, in this case a garage, has to meet a 40-foot setback along Old Perch. He explained that because of the orientation of the lot, a front yard setback must be utilized instead of a side yard setback. He requested the staff report.

Mr. McLeod explained that the applicant is requesting the variance for the placement of the structure approximately 23-1/2 feet or so from the right-of-way or property line along Old Perch Road. He pointed out that the house already sits relative to that same setback, and commented that this is what the applicant is proposing to do in continuing the setback. He noted that to have a full 40-foot setback along Old Perch Road the accessory structure would have to sit basically right in the middle of the backyard of this parcel. He stated that the applicant's request is to mimic the setback line of the existing structure, and he explained that a revised agenda had been sent out showing the original submission and a revision that shows that the applicant is now requesting that the garage structure itself be set back 23.5 feet from Old Perch and be parallel to the road right-of way, with no additional setback or requirement or offset from the Old Perch right-of-way.

He showed how the structure would be set if the setback was fully applied, and it would take up the majority of the yard. He reviewed the criteria that the Board must consider in making its decision whether to grant the variance.

Chairperson Koluch noted that an email had been received from Wally Koenig in support of the project. He mentioned an illustration for three situations that were highlighted in the staff report and asked if Situation B applied - where there are adjacent and nearby houses that have front yard relationships to streets 1, 2 and 3 so a front yard setback is required for accessory buildings from streets 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. McLeod stated that this was correct. He noted that the idea is that the buildings on the corner lot would not sit in front of the house immediately to the north in this case. He stated, however, that it is a question of whether in this particular instance since the existing structure already has a similar setback, is it warranted to continue to the same setback for the proposed structure, or should the full current ordinance requirement be applied.

Chairperson Koluch stated that if anyone is looking at that parcel, no matter where the garage is placed it would block the house next to it because the adjacent house sits so far back. He pointed out that the traffic views are not blocked. He asked the applicant if he had any additional comments.

Mr. Cialone explained that they first applied for a permit in December, plans were submitted and approved, and it came back that with the other detached structure on the property they were approximately nine feet over the 1,000 square foot limit. They subsequently approached the City and stated that they would take six inches off the length of the garage and are now at 997 square feet for accessory buildings. He commented that the biggest thing is that the homeowners did not create the situation with the house and are simply asking since the garage is within the Ordinance size that they can put the garage where it does not block the center of their backyard.

He stressed that they would even have it surveyed to make sure that the overhangs are no closer than 23 feet 5 inches and no further than the northwest corner of the house. He pointed out that there are a couple of houses in the neighborhood that are within the 40 foot setback a block or two away from this home. He stated that they do not want to take up the center of their yard and also want it to be convenient for them to get from the house to the garage. He mentioned that they currently have a one car garage and between the garage door and entry door is a wall separating a family room from the single car garage. He noted that the plan is that if this is approved, they will take down the center wall so that they can have a larger living space; and therefore, they have the need for a larger garage. He stated that they like to work on their own personal cars and need more storage.

Chairperson Koluch asked if the entrance to the garage would be facing the side street so that a car would have to turn to enter it.

Mr. Cialone stated that was correct.

Chairperson Koluch commented that was one of his concerns noting that there are school children who could possibly walk in front, and having a turn would give people a bit more of a head's up. He mentioned the neighbor next door and asked if they considered attaching the garage to the back corner of the house.

Mr. Cialone commented that if they tried to do that, it would lead to a greater expense for the homeowner for concrete to get a driveway back there. He stated that he believes the biggest factor is that the house already encroaches on the 40 foot setback and they are just asking to build it even.

Chairperson Koluch asked when the home was built.

Mr. Cialone responded it was built in 1946.

Chairperson Koluch stated that he might surmise that the road may have been dirt at the time of construction and they lost a bit of room when it was changed over to paving. He commented that he would support a motion to approve just for the reasons that have been stated. He pointed out that it is really not practical to build the garage elsewhere and it is a relatively small variance in terms of how far back it is going. He stated that the way the lot is positioned and the way that the streets are situated there is really nothing else quite like it. He noted that he is not too concerned that this is something that will come up again and be an unwarranted request way out of bounds that someone could point to,

and stated that it is a pretty unique property.

Ms. Neubauer noted that for the reasons stated on the record, the uniqueness of the property and the size of the variance she would support the variance and move to approve.

Ms. Brnabic seconded the motion.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Koluch noted that the motion passed unanimously and the variance was granted.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischler, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PVAI2025-0002, that the request for a variance of 15'-7" from Sec. 138-10.103 Corner Lots, which requires the proposed accessory structure, a garage, to meet a 40 ft. setback along Old Perch since adjacent houses have a front yard relationship with Ansal Dr. and Old Perch Rd. in the R-1 One Family Residential zoning district, Parcel Identification Number 15-16-151-015, be **APPROVED** to allow for the proposed detached accessory structure to be constructed at a setback of 23'-5", because a practical difficulty does exist on the property as demonstrated in the record of proceedings and based on the following findings. With this variance, the property shall be considered by the City to be in conformity with the Zoning Ordinance for all future uses with respect to the setbacks for which this variance is granted.

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the Zoning Ordinance would prohibit the reasonable use of the property and will be unnecessarily burdensome.
2. Granting the variance will preserve a substantial property right for the applicant and thus substantial justice shall be done.
3. A lesser variance will not provide substantial relief, and would not be more consistent with justice to other property owners in the area.
4. There are unique circumstances of the property that necessitate granting the variance as described in the above criterion, specifically that the existing residence is built 23'-5" from the property line along Old Perch. The applicant notes that there are other corner houses in the neighborhood that share a similar front yard relationship as this house that also appear to encroach into the 40 ft. setback, but that the main difference is that the placement of the house on Ansal is skewed. The applicant notes that the tilt of the house is unique to this property since it puts the rear of the house further into the front yard setback along Old Perch. These factors distinguish the subject property from other properties elsewhere in the City with respect to compliance with the ordinance regulations.
5. The granting of this variance would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or existing or future neighboring uses.
6. Approval of the requested variance will not impair the supply of light and air to adjacent properties, increase congestion, increase the danger of fire, or impair established property values in the surrounding area.
7. That the applicant will need to ensure that any driveway replacement will comply with all applicable ordinances and regulations.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2025-0099

Request for Approval of the 2025 Meeting Schedule

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Tischer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischer, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Zoning Board of Appeals hereby establishes its 2025 meeting schedule at the March 12, 2025 Regular Meeting as follows:

ROCHESTER HILLS ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 2025 MEETING DATES*

(January 8, 2025 was cancelled)
(February 12, 2025 was cancelled)
March 12, 2025
April 9, 2025
May 14, 2025
June 11, 2025
July 9, 2025
August 13, 2025
September 10, 2025
October 8, 2025
November 12, 2025
December 10, 2025

*Meetings will be held on the second Wednesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. The Zoning Board of Appeals reserves the right to add Special Meetings or Workshops as necessary. Meetings may be cancelled if no applications are received in the appropriate timeframe. Meetings will be held in the Auditorium of the City Municipal Offices at 1000 Rochester Hills Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309.

Agendas are available on the City's Web Page at www.rochesterhills.org.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- April 9, 2025, Regular Meeting, 7 p.m.

Mr. McLeod noted that at this point while there had been some inquiries, there were no imminent applications for that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, it was moved by Chairperson Koluch to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Jennifer MacDonald.

*Minutes were approved as presented/amended at the _____
2025 Regular Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.*

*Kenneth Koluch, Chairperson
Rochester Hills
Zoning Board of Appeals*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary