AGENDA
Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 7:00 pm

I. Call To Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of the May 29, 2019 ZBA Meeting Minutes

IV. Old Business
   A. ZBA Variance Application No. 19-04 - Martin

V. Reports

VI. Extended Public Comments (Limited To Four (4) Minutes Please).

VII. Adjournment
I. CALL TO ORDER
The regular meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Voss.

II. ROLL CALL
Board of Appeals members present: Slater, Loftis, and Hesselsweet
Board of Appeals members absent: Voss, Behm, and Rycenga (alternate)

Also present: Assistant Zoning Administrator Hoisington, and Community Development Director Fedewa.

Without objection, Fedewa was instructed to record the minutes for the meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Without objection, the minutes of the July 24, 2018 ZBA Meeting were approved.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
1. ZBA Case #19-01 – Dimensional Variance – Rust

   Party Requesting Variance: Dale and Mary Jo Rust
   Applicant Representative: Curt Hall, LandTechwmi LLC
   Address: 1939 Koehling Rd, Northbrook, IL 60052
   Parcel Number: 70-03-33-171-001
   Location: 18165 Shore Acres Road

Dale and Mary Joe Rust, represented by Curt Hall, are seeking a variance to construct a series of retaining walls and decks that would violate Sections 21.02, 20.22.1, and 20.22.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Hoisington provided an overview of the application through a memorandum dated May 24th.

Representative Hall summarized the full scope of work for the project, which is significantly more than what is being requested in the dimensional variance. Goal is to stabilize the aging house and make it safer. Permit from EGLE is ready to be issued after the engineering drawings are sealed, and submitted.

The Board discussed the application and noted the following:

- Inquired why the variance application was submitted prior to obtaining the EGLE permit.
- Site plan is difficult to read. Need to remove non-variance items, so the Township can review the application.

Motion by Hesselsweet, supported by Loftis to table the dimensional variance application for 18165 Shore Acres Road until the June 25th meeting, or when the applicant has addressed the items below:

1. Site plan for all variance components only—remove the other items within the scope of work that do not pertain to the variance application.
2. Height information for each retaining wall, including profiles.
3. Issued EGLE permits
4. Direct staff to contact the Township Attorney to determine what is required or necessary to address the western deck on the adjacent parcel.

Which motion carried unanimously, as indicated by the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Slater, Hesselsweet, Loftis
Nays: None
Absent: Voss, Behm

2. ZBA Case #19-02 – Interpretation – Griffeth

Party Requesting Interpretation: Paul and Michelle Griffeth
Applicant Representative: Dennis Dryer, Dryer Architectural Group
Address: 18301 Hillside Drive
Parcel Number: 70-03-32-177-015
Location: 18301 Hillside Drive

Paul and Michelle Griffeth, represented by Denny Dryer, are seeking an interpretation of the definition of a Story as found in Section 2.20 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Griffeth’s desire to build an additional story on the dwelling, but was denied by the Zoning Administrator because the proposal exceeded the 2½ story allowance.

Fedewa provided an overview of the application through a memorandum dated May 24th.

Representative Dryer offered the following:

- Describes the Township’s definition as the most explicit he has witnessed in his years as an architect. It is too complex and needs to be simplified.
- Per the definition, a story is the area between the surface of the floor (i.e., the walking surface) above the average grade and the surface of the next floor. This floor aka walking surface is 6-¾” below average grade.
- Believes the house has two basements. Very large and sturdy concrete foundation for the two lowest levels, and you only use that strong of a foundation for basements—so those two levels must be basements.
• Understands that zoning should not create “odd ducks,” but without building another story the Griffeth house looks so much smaller compared to the neighbors.

Applicant, Paul Griffeth, offered the following:
• From the road, house only appears to be one story, which looks out of place compared to the adjacent properties.
• Before purchasing the house it was in disrepair and used as a rental.
• Has trouble fitting all of his family into the house during the summer.

The Board discussed the application and noted the following:
• Reviewed applicable definitions of Story, Basement, Ground Floor, Maximum Height, and Average Grade.
• Confirmed that Average Grade measures the conditions of today, and not decades ago.
• Issue at hand is interpreting the definition of a Story, and not height.
• Agree that the definition of Story should be improved to remove the potential conflict of floor being interpreted as a “walking surface” instead of the “volume” of a livable space.

Without objection, the Zoning Board of Appeals affirms the Zoning Administrators findings outlined in the April 4, 2019 email to the applicant and representative, and the staff memo dated May 24, 2019. Further, staff is directed to improve the relevant definitions with the Planning Commission.

3. ZBA Case #19-03 – Dimensional Variance – Griffeth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Requesting Interpretation:</th>
<th>Paul and Michelle Griffeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Representative:</td>
<td>Dennis Dryer, Dryer Architectural Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>18301 Hillside Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>70-03-32-177-015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>18301 Hillside Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul and Michelle Griffeth, represented by Denny Dryer, are seeking to construct an additional story to the dwelling. This would result in a building height of 3 stories where only 2½ stories is permissible. This is in violation of Section 15.08 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Hoisington provided an overview of the application through a memorandum dated May 24th.

Representative Dryer offered the following:
• Summarized the same positions noted in Case #19-02.
• Constructing a half story is not feasible because it cannot be more than 50% of the floor area in the story below. Would still have to tear off the whole roof, and found it would be just as expensive as building the full 3rd story.
• Although over 2½ stories, the overall height is proposed at 29 feet, which is less than the 35 feet maximum.

The Board discussed the four standards and noted the following:

• Reviewed the ordinance language for a practical difficulty and hardship.

**Standard No. 1 – Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances:**

• Exceptionally small lot.
• Exceptional changes in topography.
• Located within the Critical Dune Areas.

Ayes: Slater, Loftis, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 2 – Substantial property right:**

• Allowing a larger house will make it more consistent with the neighbors.
• Adjacent homes appear much taller than the applicants.

Ayes: Slater, Loftis, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 3 – Will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent parcels, or material impact on the intent and purpose of the Ordinance:**

• The Board noted that no opposition was received from adjacent parcels.

Ayes: Slater, Loftis, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 4 – Request is not of such a recurrent nature as to make reasonably practical the formulation of a general regulation:**

• Case is unique, and does not present a concern that the situation will reoccur and make reasonable the formulation of a general regulation.

Ayes: Slater, Loftis, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Motion** by Hesselsweet, supported by Loftis, to **conditionally approve** a dimensional variance from Section 21.02 to construct an additional 772 sqft story to remain within the existing footprint of the house at 18301 Hillside Drive that will result in a building height of 3 stories. Approval of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have been affirmatively met. Approval is conditioned upon the applicant providing an EGLE permit or a Letter of No Authority prior to a building permit being issued. **Which motion carried unanimously**, as indicated by the following roll call vote:
4. ZBA Case #19-04 – Dimensional Variance – Martin

Party Requesting Variance: John and Holly Martin, and Elsie Sillman
Parcel Number: 70-03-26-380-008
Location: 15297 Vintage Avenue

John and Holly Martin are seeking a variance to construct a three-seasons room that would result in a rear yard setback violation of Section 21.02 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Hoisington provided an overview of the application through a memorandum dated May 24th.

Applicants John and Holly Martin offered the following:

- Were unaware of the setback issues when initial project began.
- Proposing a raised three-seasons room, where it essentially sits on a deck. Requesting the room be equal to the size of the existing deck.
- Septic system location has been problematic for other projects considered in the past.
- Primary reason for room is to have shelter from mosquitos. Two of their grandchildren are allergic to mosquito bites. Further, does not believe in using poison to eliminate mosquitos.
- Willing to trade remaining accessory building allowance in exchange for the variance.
- If unable to build three-season room, likely to use accessory building allowance to construct a large “she shed.”
- The whole neighborhood has the same size lot and house, so this issue is impacting many residents.
- Received several letters of support.

The Board discussed the application and noted the following:

- Inquired if spraying poison to kill mosquitos had been considered.
- Reviewed information compiled by the applicant, and extrapolated by Hoisington—vicinity of Vintage Avenue to Kevin Street has a handful of structures with non-conforming setbacks.
- Directed staff to contact the Township Attorney and inquire if trading the accessory building allowance in exchange for the variance could be utilized to meet Standard 1.
- Based on information at hand there is a conflict between Standards 1 and 4.

**Motion** by Slater, supported by Loftis, to **table** the dimensional variance application for 15297 Vintage Avenue, until the June 25th meeting, or when the applicant and staff have addressed the items below:
1. Applicant:
   (a) Provide a revised site plan with three-season room only.
   (b) Consider other exceptional or extraordinary conditions that may be unique to the subject property.

2. Staff:
   (a) Contact Township Attorney and inquire if a *quid pro quo* is acceptable for meeting Standard 1.
   (b) Request Planning Commission review the neighborhood and R-2 requirements.

*Which motion carried unanimously*, as indicated by the following roll call vote:

**Ayes:** Slater, Hesselsweet, Loftis
**Nays:** None
**Absent:** Voss, Behm

E. Housekeeping

*Without objection*, existing officers are reappointed to their current positions:
- Chair   Voss
- Vice    Slater
- Secretary Loftis

*Without objection*, the 2019 Meeting Date Schedule is approved as presented.

V. REPORTS – None

VI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*Without objection*, the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacey Fedewa, AICP
Acting Recording Secretary
Community Development Memo

DATE: June 20, 2019

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals

FROM: Cassandra Hoisington, Assistant Zoning Administrator

RE: 15297 Vintage Avenue – Dimensional Variance Application No. 19-04

---

**PARCEL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/Applicant</th>
<th>John &amp; Holly Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>15297 Vintage Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>70-03-26-380-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>0.3 Acres (13,068 sqft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Type</td>
<td>Typical Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-2 Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Setbacks for R-2 Zoning</td>
<td>Rear – 50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Setbacks for R-2 Zoning</td>
<td>Rear – 42 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicants are requesting a dimensional variance from section 21.02 of the Zoning Ordinance for an addition of a 12’ x 16’ three-season room. They recently received a building permit to construct an attached deck and a detached deck to access the pool. If this variance is granted, the three-season room will be built instead of the attached deck.

The applicants believe the addition of the three-season room will enable them to better enjoy their property without being subjected to the elements and mosquitos.

**Applicant’s Proposal**

The applicants are proposing a trade—in exchange for a variance to build the three-season room, they would give up their right to construct another accessory building. The applicants have 480 sqft available to construct another building, but would prefer to exchange that allowance for the 192 sqft three-season room instead.

To compare, a 480 sqft accessory building could be as close as 10-feet to the rear property line, whereas the three-season room would be setback 42-feet from the rear lot line. In this case, the side yards for the three-season room and possible accessory building would have the same side yard setback requirement of 10-feet.

Furthermore, the applicants believe it would be difficult to place an accessory structure in a compliant location due to the location of the septic system and existing pool.

**Staff’s Response**

The proposed trade can only occur if the detached deck is attached to the house in the future. Otherwise, the deck counts as an accessory structure and no additional structure would be permitted. As staff understands, their builder is currently updating the construction drawings to modify their deck permit to attach the two now.
If the ZBA is willing to consider the applicant’s proposal, staff recommends members consider Section 26.07 that enables reasonable conditions to be imposed, or the ZBA to modify the request. See inset:

The Township Zoning Board of Appeals **may impose reasonable conditions** in conjunction with the approval of a variance. The conditions may include conditions necessary to ensure that public services and facilities affected by a proposed land use or activity will be capable of accommodating increased service and facility needs caused by the land use or activity, to protect the natural environment and conserve natural resources and energy, to insure compatibility with adjacent uses of land, and to promote the use of land, in a socially and economically desirable manner. Conditions imposed shall meet the requirements of the Zoning Act.

**Attorney’s Opinion**

The Martins offered to give up a right they already had under the zoning ordinance, to build an accessory building, in order to obtain a setback variance for a three-season room. That is a legitimate consideration. If the concern of the ZBA is lot coverage, or the impact of construction close to a neighboring parcel, then an applicant’s willingness to forego the ability to construct an accessory building allowed under the zoning ordinance in return for the right to construct a building extension that violates the required setback is a legitimate consideration for the ZBA.

**VARIANCE STANDARDS**

To authorize a dimensional variance from the strict applications of the provisions of this Ordinance, the ZBA shall apply the following standards and make an affirmative finding as to each of the matters set forth in the standards.

**STANDARD 1**

There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning classification.

If the proposed exchange occurs, the Martins will forfeit the right they have under the Zoning Ordinance to build an additional accessory building in order to receive the reduced building setback. Other properties will maintain the right to build accessory buildings as stated in the Zoning Ordinance.

The ZBA will need to make a determination as to whether this standard is met given the circumstances of this case.

**STANDARD 2**
The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and in the vicinity, provided that possible increased financial return shall not of itself, be deemed sufficient to warrant a variance.

Staff conducted an aerial survey of the neighborhood was able to verify three properties that had non-conforming additions. One was permitted in 1990, the two others appear to have been constructed before building permit records were archived or the owner did not obtain the required permits.

It should be noted that the neighborhood, consisting of the Vintage Ridge Subdivision, Lost Channel Subdivision, and South Channel Subdivision, primarily consists of lots that *just* meet the minimum setback standards. Kevin Street, part of the South Channel Subdivision has a notable number of legally non-conforming structures.

The ZBA will need to make a determination as to whether or not this standard is met given the circumstances of this case.

**STANDARD 3**

Authorization of such variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property, and will not materially impair the intent and purpose of this Ordinance or the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

One letter of objection and two emails in support were received for this application (*as of June 20th*).

A property of this size is entitled to two accessory buildings up to a total combined area of 600 sqft. Provided the applicant can attach the deck to the existing structure under the new ordinance, a remaining 480 sqft of accessory structure area would be available. The applicant is proposing to forfeit the remaining 480 sqft of allowable area in exchange for the 192 sqft three-season room. With a rear setback of 42-feet, the proposed addition would be located farther from the lot lines than the minimum standards (10-feet) for an accessory building.

Based on the opinion of the Township Attorney it is legitimate to consider the lot coverage and setback encroachment of main building additions compared to accessory buildings in regards to impact on neighboring properties.

The ZBA will need to make the determination as to whether this standard is met given the circumstances of this case and the findings on standards 1 and 2.

**STANDARD 4**

The condition or situation of the specific piece of property or the intended use of said property for which the variance is sought, is not of so general or recurrent a nature as to make reasonably practical the formulation of a general regulation for such condition or situation, a part of this Ordinance.

The ZBA will need to make the determination as to whether this standard is met.
If the ZBA determines each standard has been affirmatively met, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to conditionally approve** a dimensional variance from Section 21.02 for a 12’ x 16’ three-season room at 15297 Vintage Avenue that will result in a Rear Yard setback of 42-feet. Approval of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have been affirmatively met. Approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. The detached deck being attached to the main building, so the principal structure is compliant with the R-2 setbacks.
2. Direct staff to consult with legal staff to draft an agreement to be recorded with the property to prohibit any additional accessory buildings.

However, if the ZBA determines each standard as not been affirmatively met, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to deny** a dimensional variance from Section 21.02 for a 12’ x 16’ three-season room at 15297 Vintage Avenue that will result in a Rear Yard setback of 42-feet. Denial of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have not been affirmatively met.

If the ZBA determines that more information is needed to make an affirmative finding, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to table** the dimensional variance application for 15297 Vintage Avenue, and direct the applicant and/or staff to provide the following information:

1. *List items.*

Please contact me prior to the meeting with questions or concerns.
REAL ESTATE TRANSFER EVALUATION REPORT

Permanent Parcel # 70-03-26-380-008
15297 Vintage Ave., Grand Haven Twp.

Submit Report To:
Re/Max Grand Haven
Sandi Gentry
133 Washington
Grand Haven, MI 49417

Dear Sandi:

On 12/17/13, the undersigned representative of the Ottawa County Health Department conducted an evaluation of the water supply and/or wastewater disposal systems of the above listed property. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Ottawa County Environmental Health Regulations. Portions of the facilities referenced in this report are not readily accessible for observation and evaluation. Water tests were conducted for limited types of contamination. While every effort has been made by the Ottawa County Health Department to provide a careful disclosure of available facts and observations, this report does not signify "approval" or "non-approval" and does not constitute a guarantee concerning future performance. This report is valid for six months.

Inspection Findings:

Water Supply System

- Dwelling is connected to municipal water.
- The irrigation well has an insufficient isolation distance of 14 feet from septic tank. 50 feet minimum isolation distance is required. This well is to be used for non-potable use only.

Wastewater Disposal System

- Snow cover prevented a complete visual inspection of the system.
- See attached septic final dated 1/16/01 for site plan.

Conclusion:

Water Supply System – Dwelling is connected to municipal water.

Wastewater Disposal System – Acceptable – Conformance – System has been determined to conform to current standards. System may continue to be utilized.

Stacy Wilson, R.E.H.S.

INSPECTED BY

DATE

12/19/13
REAL ESTATE TRANSFER EVALUATION INSPECTION RECORD

Ottawa Co. Department of Public Health
Environmental Health Services
12251 James St., Suite 200
Holland, MI 49424

Address: 15297 Vintage Ave

SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM

- Date of Installation: 1/16/01
- Permit of File: Yes No
- Number and Volume of Septic Tank(s): Tank 1 1000g Tank 2 800g Tank 3
  (Determined By: Final Permit Observation Other:)
- Drainage System Type: Drainbed Block Trench Drywell Trench Unknown
- Drainage System Absorption System Area: 600 sq ft
  (Determined By: Final Permit Observation Other:)
- Distance to Surface Water: NA
- Soil/System Boring Observations: Stone, dirty, damp, no suds
- Discharge To: Storm Drain Surface Water Not Determined None
- Footing Drains Provided? Yes No
- Discharge to SDS? Yes No Unknown
- Water Softener Provided? Yes No
- Discharge to SDS? Yes No Unknown

WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

- Date Installed: 
- Well Log: Yes No
- Diameter: ___________ In.
- Depth: ___________ Ft. (Determined By: Well Log Other:)
- Well Head Termination: Pitless Adapter Above Grade Basement
  Approved Pit Unapproved Pit Buried Other:
- Well Head Protected Against Flooding: Yes No
- Pump Type: Submersible Deep Jet Shallow Jet Other:
- Pump Location: Well Casing Basement Pit Above Grade Other:
- Suction Line: NA Protected Not Protected Improperly Protected
- Casing Vent Screened? Yes No
- Well Grouted? Yes No
- Well/Septic System Isolation: NA Ft.
- Well/Fuel Storage Tank Isolation: NA Ft.
- Water Treatment Equipment Used: No Yes (Type:)
- Water Quality Observed: Turbidity: Yes Odor: Yes
- Water Quality Tests: Date Sampled Sample Location Result
  Bateria: ____________________
  Partial Chemical: ____________________
  Other: ____________________
I certify that the inspection findings reported above are accurate and are the result of personal observations and measurements made by me on the inspection date indicated, unless otherwise specified.

Inspector: Stacy Wilson     Inspection Date: 12/17/13
Wastewater Disposal

- Dwelling is connected to municipal sewer.
- Size of septic tank/drainage system /sewage disposal system does not meet current standards. Tank/drainage system/sewage disposal system was installed prior to present standards. No observed problems noted with the system at the time of evaluation.
- The exact size and design of sewage disposal system is unknown; however, no evidence of any health hazard was observed at the time of inspection.
- Size of sewage disposal system does not meet current standards. A ____________ was added to the home.
- Snow cover prevented a complete visual inspection of the system.
- The dwelling has been vacant since ____________.
- We recommend that the water softener discharge be routed into a system separate from the septic system.
- The septic system was found to be in a state of failure as evident by ____________.
- System age exceeds average life expectancy, which is 20 years.
- It is recommended that a new system be installed.
- No records on file.

Other Comments: ____________________________

Water Supply

- Dwelling is connected to municipal water.
- The well does not meet present standards because of:
  - A buried well seal.
  - Well is not grouted.
  - An improperly protected suction line.
  - A nitrate level of ___ parts per million (ppm), which exceeds the maximum level of 10 ppm.
  - Its location in an undrained pit/pit/ basement/basement offset.
  - Insufficient isolation distance of _____ from ____________. _____ feet minimum isolation distance.
  - Lack of properly screened vent on the well casing.
- The well depth is unknown.
- The well casing depth is ____ feet, which is less than the minimum requirement of 25 feet.
- It is recommended that a new well be installed.
- No records on file.
- Old drinking water well must be properly plugged by a licensed well driller or used for irrigation. Complete attached abandoned well response form and return to this office.
- The irrigation well has an insufficient isolation distance of ____________ from septic tank. 50 feet minimum isolation distance is required. This well is to be used for non-potable use only.

Other Comments: ____________________________

Acceptable—Conformance: System has been determined to substantially conform to current standards. System may continue to be utilized.
Acceptable—Substantial Conformance: System has deficiencies which prevent it from Substantially conforming to current standards; however it was installed prior to the current standards and was functioning properly at the time of the inspection. System may continue to be utilized.
Unacceptable—Non-Conformance/Failure: System presents a health hazard and continued use is not permitted. Correction required.
Undetermined: An adequate assessment of the condition of the system could not be made.

Inspector: ____________________________  Date of Inspection: ____________

Stacy Wilson REWS
REAL ESTATE EVALUATION APPLICATION

APPLICATION CANNOT BE PROCESSED UNLESS ALL
REQUESTED INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED
AND IS ACCOMPANIED WITH REQUIRED FEE.

Ottawa County Health Dept,
Environmental Health Services
12251 James St., Suite 200
Holland, MI 49424

CASH, CHECK, MONEY ORDER
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
MASTERCARD AND VISA - HOLLAND OFFICE ONLY

HOURS: Hudsonville
Monday, Wednesday, Friday 8 - 12 and 1 - 5
Grand Haven Monday, Wednesday, Friday 8 - 12 and 1 - 5
Holland Monday through Friday 8 - 5 open during lunch

NOTE:
Both On-Site Sewage Disposal & Water Supply Systems $205.00
Only On-Site Private Sewage Disposal System $115.00
Only On-Site Private Sewage Disposal System

DEDUCT $40.00 LAB FEE IF WATER WILL BE SAMPLED & ANALYZED BY A PRIVATE LAB

This Evaluation is requested for __ Real Estate Sale __ Re-Financing

PROPERTY LOCATION:

Property Tax Parcel #70-03-36-380-008
Address Location 15297 Vintage Ave
Township Grand Haven
Owner’s Name David Halladay
Address 15297 Vintage Ave
City Grand Haven Zip 49417
Owner’s Phone (616) 393-3900

Type of Structure: X Single Family Home __ Duplex __ Apartment __ Commercial Business __ Industrial Bldg

If structure currently occupied? X Yes __ No If yes, how many occupants ___ If no, structure has been vacant since __________ 

Municipal Water Available X Yes __ No If yes, is it utilized __ Yes __ No
Municipal Sewer Available X Yes __ No If yes, is it utilized __ Yes __ No

ON-SITE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM(S) - INCLUDE ALL SOLIDS & GREY WATER DISCHARGE

DO NOT PUMP TANKS PRIOR TO INSPECTION

Location of System (indicate on sketch below) __ Age of System ___ years Is there any discharge to ground surface ___ Yes __ No

Structure is served by ___ One ___ Two Three sewage disposal systems. Give recent date septic tank(s) pumped ___

Number and capacity of septic tank(s) ___

Plumbing fixtures in basement ___ Washing Machine ___ Laundry Tub ___ Shower ___ Bath Tub ___ Toilet ___ Sink ___ Not Applicable

If applicable, the fixtures in basement discharge to ___ Number of Bedrooms ___

ON-SITE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Water well is located in ___ Basement ___ Outside Yard ___ Well Pit ___ Is water treated? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, type of treatment ___ Softener ___ Water Softening Unit(RO) ___ Filtration ___ Other ___

IN THE BOX, PLEASE IDENTIFY AND SKETCH THE LOCATION OF:

-SEPTIC TANK(S) ___ -SEWER(S) OUTLET FROM STRUCTURE ___
-SOIL ABSORPTION SYSTEM(S) ___ -DRAINFIELD ___
-WATER - WELL(S) ___ -NEAREST STREET OR ROAD ___

NOTE TO PERSON REQUESTING SANITARY FACILITY EVALUATIONS

Any additional services requested by the Health Department to enable thorough evaluations of water supply/wastewater disposal systems must be arranged for and paid for by the owner or applicant. Additional inspections or reports requested from the Health Department more than 60 days after the date of the original report will be subject to additional fees. Additional water sampling visits can be made at the request of the owner/applicant at the cost of $115 plus applicable lab fees.

I hereby authorize the Ottawa County Health Department to collect water samples and to conduct necessary evaluations at the above location. Application fees are non-refundable upon initiation of any field activities.

Applicant’s Signature ____________________________ Date _______________________

12/11/13
On-Site Water Supply System and/or On-Site Sewage Disposal System

**Property Location**

Address: 15297 VINTAGE
City: GRAND HAVEN
Name of Owner: ANDREW NESBITT
Address: 717 COLUMBUS AVE.
City: GRAND HAVEN

**Municipal Water Available:**

- 

**Municipal Sewer Available:**

- 

**Water Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Date Sampled</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>MCL</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrates (NO₃ as N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 PPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriological (1st)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriological (2nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriological (3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Comments:**

- 

**ON-SITE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM**

- System saturated & working under pressure
- Very small absorption area compared to present requirements
- Evidence of tree roots
- Unconventional design/ construction
- Portion of system appears to be under driveway/structure

**Observations noted during the Evaluation**

- Evidence of tree roots
- System receives less than normal use
- Unconventional design/ construction
- Portion of system appears to be under driveway/structure

**Record of Pertinent Information**

- Sewage Disposal Final
- Sewage Disposal Permit
- Well Final
- Well Permit
- Well Record / Log
- Real Estate Evaluation
- Abandoned well info
- Other:

**Date of Inspection:**

**Visual Evidence of Malfunction:**

- Yes
- No

**Explanation of Malfunction:**

- 

**Date tank last pumped:**

- NEVER
- Stone is wet/saturated
- Very little or no stone present
- Stone is coated with black sludge
- Subject to effects of high groundwater table and poor drainage

**Sanitarian:** Bob Marz

**Date:** 2-6-03

**Note:** Items checked above may contribute to accelerated system failure.

**EVALUATION RESULTS**

- ( ) Acceptable
- ( ) Not Acceptable
- ( ) Unable to Sample

**SEWAGE SUPPLY**

- ( ) Acceptable
- ( ) Not Acceptable
- ( ) Unable to Determine Due to:
  - Vacancy prior to inspection
  - Septic tank pumped prior to inspection
  - Lack of system location
  - Impermeable soils

**Date:** 2-6-03

**THIS EVALUATION EXPIRES SIX (6) MONTHS FROM DATE OF ISSUANCE.**
REAL ESTATE EVALUATION APPLICATION

APPLICATION CANNOT BE PROCESSED UNLESS ALL REQUESTED INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED AND IS ACCOMPANIED WITH REQUIRED FEE.

CASH, CHECK, MONEY ORDER, MASTER CARD AND VISA ACCEPTED

- BOTH On-Site Private Sewage Disposal & Water Supply Systems $113.00
- On-Site Private Sewage Disposal & Water to include Load Test $129.00
- ONLY On-Site Private Sewage Disposal System $60.00
- ONLY On-Site Private Water Supply $78.00
- On-Site Private Water Supply + Lead Test $94.00
- Lead Test ONLY $56.00
- Additional Well Construction Evaluation $20.00

This Evaluation is requested for ______ Real Estate Sale ______ Re-Financing

DECRUCT $26.00 LAB FEE IF WATER WILL BE SAMPLED & ANALYZED BY PRIVATE LAB.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

Property Tax Parcel #70-03-26-380-008
Address Location 15297 Vintage
Township Grand Haven
Owner's Name Andrew J. Nesbitt
Address 15297 Vintage
City Grand Haven, MI Zip 49417
Owner's Phone (616) 296-0214

Type of Structure: □ Single Family Home □ Duplex □ Apartment □ Commercial Business □ Industrial Bldg

Is structure currently occupied? □ Yes □ No If no, structure has been vacant since ____________________

Municipal Water Available □ Yes □ No If yes, is it utilized □ Yes □ No
Municipal Sewer Available □ Yes □ No If yes, is it utilized □ Yes □ No

ON-SITE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM(S)

DO NOT PUMP TANKS PRIOR TO INSPECTION

Current Number of Occupants 3 Age of System ___ years Is there any discharge to ground surface □ Yes □ No structure is served by □ One □ Two □ Three sewage disposal systems. Give recent date septic tank(s) pumped O-NEVER

Plumbing fixtures in basement: □ Washing Machine □ Laundry Tub □ Shower □ Bath Tub □ Toilet □ Sink □ Not Applicable

□ applicable, the fixtures in basement discharge to __________________

ON-SITE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Water well is located in □ Basement □ Outside Yard □ Well Pit Is water treated? □ Yes □ No

□ yes, type of treatment: □ Softener □ Nitrate Removal Unit(RO) □ Filtration □ Other __________________

OTE: For sampling purposes, water must be available at outside faucets.

THE BOX, PLEASE IDENTIFY AND SKETCH

LOCATION OF:
EPTIC TANK (S)
EWR(S) OUTLET FROM STRUCTURE
OIL ABSORPTION SYSTEM(S) / DRAINFIELD
WATER - WELL (S)
EAREST STREET OR ROAD

IMPORTANT: THIS FORM WILL BE TURNED IF THE REQUESTED SKETCH FORMATION IS NOT PROVIDED AND IS AT AVAILABLE IN OUR FILES.

___ __________ __________ __________ __________

Signature

2002
REMARKS:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

Shrubs or trees should not be planted close to the sewage disposal system as they would interfere with pumping of tank. The yard grade in the disposal area should be such that surface water does not collect on the drainfield. Do not excessively water the lawn in the drainfield area.

Footing drainage and downspouts should not be connected into the septic system or discharged into the drainfield area.

The septic tank itself should be PUMPED EVERY THREE TO FOUR YEARS depending on the habits of the family, the number of fixtures in the house, and the amount that a garbage disposal is used. Pumping at the right time will avoid the risk of injuring or destroying the drainfield due to solids carrying over into the drainfield. Call the Ottawa County Health Department for a list of licensed septic tank pumpers in your area. The pumper can serve you best if you show them this record.

Heavy trucks or equipment should never be driven over the tank or drainfield. Consult this record in case any buildings, driveways, swimming pools, or extensive grading or filling are later contemplated.

This record is not a guarantee of performance. A septic system is not a municipal sewer. However, with proper maintenance and careful use of water, it can give many years of trouble-free service. Many problems with septic tanks are caused by flushing excessive amounts of paper, cloth and plastic materials down the drain, or by large amounts of water from leaky faucets or faulty fixtures.
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT AND PLAN OF SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM

Ottawa County Health Department
Environmental Health Division
12251 James Street, Suite 200
Holland, MI 49424

Phone: (616) 393-5645 Fax: (616) 393-5643

Water Supply: Private ( ) Septic: New ( ) Municipal ( ) Repair ( )

NOTE: Commercial/Industrial floor drains shall not be connected to this sewage disposal system. Residential floor drains must receive prior approval.

Sanitarian

Insurance: Required

INSPECTION: The parcel shall receive the following: PER MIT

The parcel shall be constructed in accordance with the following:

Grading:
• The grade of the parcel must be determined by the Sanitarian before the lot is occupied.
• The parcel must be excavated to the required grade.
• The parcel must be backfilled with clean, loose fill.

Drainage:
• The parcel must be equipped with a properly functioning drainage system.
• The parcel must be designed to prevent runoff from entering adjacent properties.

Waste Disposal:
• The parcel must be equipped with a properly functioning waste disposal system.
• The parcel must be designed to prevent leachate from entering adjacent properties.

Sanitarian

Date Issued: 9-14-00

THIS PERMIT EXPIRES TWO (2) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF ISSUANCE

NOTE: Since many factors contribute to the failure of a sewage disposal system, this department cannot guarantee any length of service from the sewage disposal system required by this permit.

# 00-638
PLEASE INDICATE DESIRED PERMIT(S):

SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM

- Private (Single Family) NEW ($110)
- Private (Single Family) REPAIR ($75)
- Semi-Public NEW/REPAIR Discharging:
  - Up to 400 Gallons Per Day ($125)
  - Between 401 & 2,000 Gal./Day ($150)
  - Between 2,001 & 10,000 Gal./Day ($200)
- Permit Re-newal with no changes ($25)

WATER WELL

- Private (Single Family) NEW and REPLACEMENT Well ($90)
- Test/Monitor Well ($90)
- Type III Well ($90)
- Permit Renewal-no changes ($25)

**Required $15.00 MDPH Lab Fee Included**

PERSON FURNISHING INFORMATION

Owner: [Name]
Bldr: [Name]
Installer: [Name]
Well Driller: [Name]
Address: [Address]
City: [City]
Zip: [Zip]
Phone: [Phone]
Fax: [Fax]

SITE LOCATION:

Property Tax Parcel #70-03-26-000-045
Township: [Township]
Was property split? Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, was property split before April 1, 1997 [ ] After April 1, 1997 [ ]
Address & Directions to proposed site: [Address & Directions]
Subdivision Name: [Subdivision Name]
Lot #: [Lot #]
Parcel #: [Parcel #]
Acres: [Acres]
Road Frontage: 99 ft. (width) by 132 ft. (depth)

SEWAGE DISPOSAL

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

Garbage Disposal proposed: Yes [ ] No [ ]
Indoor Whirlpool/Hot Tub: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please indicate what plumbing will be roughed in/already exists in the basement:
- Washer __ Laundry Tub __ Shower __
- Sink __ Toilet __ Sump Pit __
- None [ ] Other [ ]

SEWER PUBLIC

Proposed use: Commercial [ ] Industrial [ ] Institutional [ ]
Other: [ ]
Maximum # of persons/employees served per day: [ ]

DUPLEX # OF BEDROOMS/LIVING UNIT:
- Duplex [ ]
- # Bedrooms Per Unit: [ ]

NOTE: Scaled site & floor plan must accompany application.

WATER SUPPLY

Status of Utility Connection: Municipal Water [ ] Private Well [ ] Proposed Well Depth [ ]
To be installed by: Driller [ ] Owner [ ]

NOTE: A site plan must be included for all new/replacement water wells.

NOTE: THE HOUSE LOCATION (4 CORNERS) MUST BE STAKED OUT ON NEW HOME SITES.

In box for site plan, please SKETCH with DISTANCES the location of:

* House, Well, Public Water Line, Septic Tank, Drainage Area
* Streets, Other Sources of Contamination (i.e. gasoline/fuel oil tanks), Proposed or Existing Neighbor’s Sewage Disposal System and Well

PERMIT FEES PAYABLE TO: OTTAWA COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

TOTAL $ [ ]

Applicant’s Signature

NOTE: THIS IS NOT A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT!