

**CITY OF KEEGO HARBOR
ZONING BOARD of APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, August 21, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Fletcher called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mayor Fletcher, Mayor Pro Tem Ross, Council Member Kalman, Council Member Shimansky, Council Member Dahl

Staff Present: City Manager/City Clerk Tammy Neeb, Deputy Clerk Stacy Goodall, City Attorney Tony Chubb, and City Planner Emily Huhuman

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Council Member Shimansky; supported by Mayor Pro Tem Ross to approve the agenda for the ZBA meeting on August 21, 2025.

Unanimous Vote Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion carries

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Council Member Shimansky; supported by Mayor Pro Tem Ross to approve the meeting minutes from August 15, 2024.

Unanimous Vote: Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion carries

PUBLIC COMMENTS

OLD BUSINESS

1784 Cass Lake Front (Parcel #18-02-276-010): Fence and Patio Variance

The applicant is requesting a variance of three feet from the required three-foot setback. City Planner Emily Huhuman reviewed the five criteria and her findings.

1. A variance from Section 15.11(c): A terrace/patio may project into the required front yard or open space for a distance not to exceed eight (8) feet or into the required side yard for a distance not closer than three (3) feet from the property line or into the required rear yard or waterfront yard for a distance not to exceed thirty (30) feet.

- a. Strict compliance with restrictions governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, or density will unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render ordinance conformity unnecessarily burdensome.**

The Planner determined that compliance with the zoning ordinance would not affect the applicant's ability to use the home as a single-family home. The applicant did not explain why the patio should be granted.

- b. A grant of the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, and a lesser variance will not give substantial relief to the applicant as well as be more consistent with justice to other property owners in the zoning district.**

Allowing the variance for the patio could potentially cause excessive runoff into the adjacent properties. The fence may impede normal sight lines and views for surrounding properties. The applicant stated that a lower fence would not be acceptable. The applicant did not provide complete information regarding the patio encroachment.

- c. The plight of the applicant is due to the unique circumstances for the property.**

The applicant did not provide evidence that this standard is met. A patio could have been constructed in the rear yard that would comply with the standards of the ordinance.

- d. The problem is not self-created.**

The applicant took affirmative action to construct a fence that does not comply with ordinance requirements.

- e. The spirit of this ordinance will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done.**

The City Planner explained that granting the variance would not contribute to the compatibility of size and style of fences in the neighborhood.

The applicant, Ronnie Antoon, was present and responded to the ZBA board. Mr. Antoon stated it was for his own safety. He also said he would not take it down, and the city would have a lawsuit by the end of the week.

Motion by Mayor Fletcher; supported by Council Member Shimansky to deny the request because none of the five required criteria were met.

Unanimous Vote: Ayes: 5 Nays:0

Motion Carries

2184 Park Circle (Parcel#18-02-428-021): Driveway

The applicant is requesting a variance from the required configuration of front yard parking areas. The driveway was constructed without a building permit. City Planner Emily Huhuman reviewed the five criteria and her findings.

1. A variance from Section 4.06(e): The parking area shall be more or less perpendicular, sixty (60) to one hundred twenty (120) degrees to the street right-of-way and shall not be placed in that portion of the front yard between the principal dwelling and the front lot line except in front of the garage..
 - a. **Strict compliance with restrictions governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, or density will unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render ordinance conformity unnecessarily burdensome.**

It is possible that there may have been alternative driveway configurations that would have complied, but they were not considered by the applicant.

- b. **A grant of the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, and a lesser variance will not give substantial relief to the applicant as well as be more consistent with justice to other property owners in the zoning district.**

Allowing the variance will remedy some of the harms to the applicant caused by the large driveways on both adjacent properties and would allow the applicant to utilize their property in the same manner. Other properties on this street were granted similar variances, so allowing the variance may be consistent with similar difficulties experienced. A lesser variance is not possible without requiring the applicant to remove existing pavement, as the driveway has already been constructed.

- c. **The plight of the applicant is due to the unique circumstances for the property.**

Many adjacent properties on this street have almost completely paved front yard which could be contributing to the applicant's yard flooding. The property is also narrower than others on the street.

d. The problem is not self-created.

The drainage problem is not self-created; however, the applicant could have constructed a driveway closer in compliance. Therefore, the City Planner found the problem to be self-created.

e. The spirit of this ordinance will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done.

Section 4.06 of the zoning ordinance allows the zoning administrator to work with the applicant to identify alternate driveway configurations if the property does not accommodate one of the options in section 4.06(h). The request variance does not provide substantial justice to the surrounding property owners, who went through the proper process to obtain a variance.

The applicant, Brian Schnurr, was present and responded to the board members' questions. The mayor stated it was a hardship due to the lot size. Mr. Schnurr stated the drainage issue has been fixed, and neighbors are very pleased with the driveway.

Motion by Council Member Shimansky; supported by Mayor Pro Tem Ross to approve this variance because it meets all the five criteria.

Vote: Ayes: 4 Nays: 1

Motion Carries

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Fletcher adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

John Fletcher
John Fletcher (Nov 30, 2025 11:29:00 EST)

John Fletcher
City of Keego Harbor, its Mayor

Stacy Goodall

Stacy Goodall
City of Keego Harbor, its
Deputy Clerk





August 21, 2025 ZBA Meeting Minutes

Final Audit Report

2025-11-30

Created:	2025-11-26
By:	STACY GOODALL (goodall@KEEGOHARBOR.ORG)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAvme-4csTbQ_qO8ujr2Ajn6wl19WaFSa4

"August 21, 2025 ZBA Meeting Minutes" History

-  Document created by STACY GOODALL (goodall@KEEGOHARBOR.ORG)
2025-11-26 - 3:38:32 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to John Fletcher (fletcher@keegoharbor.org) for signature
2025-11-26 - 3:38:40 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by John Fletcher (fletcher@keegoharbor.org)
2025-11-26 - 3:38:47 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by John Fletcher (fletcher@keegoharbor.org)
Signature Date: 2025-11-30 - 4:29:00 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.
2025-11-30 - 4:29:00 PM GMT