

**Village of Goodrich  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
October 23, 2023  
7:00pm  
Minutes**

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Christner at 6:00pm

Present: Hogness, Sasser, Christner, Whitefoot, Moore

Staff present: Administrator/Clerk Sheri Wilkerson

Absent: None

Approval of Agenda

**MOTION: To approve the agenda as written.**

**Moved by Moore, seconded by Whitefoot**

**All members present voting in the affirmative. Carried.**

Approval of Minutes of September 19, 2022

**MOTION: To approve the minutes as presented.**

**Moved by Moore, seconded by Whitefoot**

**All members present voting in the affirmative. Carried.**

**Public Comment:** None

**ACTION ITEM:**

A Variance located at 8363 meadow creek Dr. to place 16' X 12' shed in side yard rather than behind it due to many difficulties, including a steep slope and runoff from nearby properties during times of inclement weather with would lead to issues with the integrity of the shed and its content; Cody and Katelyn Dingman, petitioners

**MOTION: To approve a variance located at 8363 meadow creek Dr. to place 16' X 12' shed in side yard rather than behind it due to many difficulties, including a steep slope and runoff from nearby properties during times of inclement weather with would lead to issues with the integrity of the shed and its content; Cody and Katelyn Dingman, petitioners**

**Moved by Moore, seconded by Sasser**

**Hogness yes, Sasser yes, Christner yes, Whitefoot yes, Moore yes.**

**Motion carried unanimously**

**ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE**

*MOTION: FOR A NON-USE VARIANCE, CODY AND KATELYN DINGMAN, 8363 MEADOW CREEK DRIVE, IN THE MATTER OF ZBA CASE 02-22-677-025/02-22-677-026, I WOULD MOVE THAT THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE FROM THE VILLAGE OF GOODRICH CODE, ARTICLE IV, SECTION 35-552, ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND USES IN ALL RESIDENTIAL AREAS SECTION 36-552 "TO PLACE A SHED AT THE SIDE OF THE HOUSE RATHER THAN BEHIND IT USING A RECENTLY COMBINED ACCESSORY LOT" BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE PETITIONER DID DEMONSTRATE PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES EXIST IN THIS CASE IN THAT THEY DID SET FORTH FACTS WHICH SHOW THAT:*

- 1. COMPLIANCE WITH THE STRICT LETTER OF THE ORDINANCE WOULD UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE PETITIONER FROM USING THE PROPERTY FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH THE ORDINANCE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME.*
- 2. THAT GRANTING THE VARIANCE REQUESTED WOULD DO SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE TO THE PETITIONER AS WELL AS TO THE OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS IN THE DISTRICT OR THAT A LESSER RELAXATION THAN THAT RELIEF APPLIED FOR WOULD GIVE SUBSTANTIAL RELIEF TO THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY INVOLVED AND BE MORE CONSISTENT WITH JUSTICE TO OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS.*
- 3. THAT THE PETITIONER'S PLIGHT IS DUE TO THE UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROPERTY*
- 4. THAT THE PROBLEM IS NOT SELF-CREATED*

*Moved by Moore, seconded by Sasser*

*Hogness yes, Sasser yes, Christner yes, Whitefoot yes, Moore yes.*

*Motion carried.*

**MOTION: To adjourn.**

**Moved by Sasser, seconded by Moore**

**All members present voting in the affirmative. Motion carried unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Pat Schierup, Recording Secretary