

<p>Meeting called to order by Chair, Sawicki at 7:00 p.m.</p> <p>Pledge of Allegiance</p> <p>Roll Call: Steve Aguinaga, present; Mark Baranowski, present; Doug Pratt, present; Florence Sawicki, present; Mark Turo, present.</p> <p>Accept Agenda: Motion by Baranowski to accept the agenda as presented, seconded by Pratt.</p> <p>Approve Minutes from June 13th, 2019: Motion by Aguinaga to accept the minutes as presented, seconded by Baranowski.</p> <p>7:01 p.m. Open Public Hearing Variance Case #2019-03 Patricia and James Berger, 11534 Smiths Creek, Riley, MI 48041; Parcel ID # 74-29-027-3002-500: Sawicki read property request from variance application received 09-24-2019. The request is for a variance from the Riley Township zoning ordinance #33, section #1122-Commerical Kennels and fencing setbacks.</p> <p>Comments from the Audience -The property owners were present, and stated that they do not consider themselves a kennel, the dogs that they have are considered house pets. They explained how the dogs are housed and taken care of. Discussion followed regarding the current placement of the existing fence, as well as the proposed new fence that the property owners are considering placing. The current fence has existed for 11 years, and the property owners are asking that they maintain the set up that they currently have. The neighbors were also present, and stated that they have no problems with the dogs. Sawicki motioned to close the public hearing at 7:35 pm.</p> <p>Zoning Board of Appeals Action:</p> <p>Baranowski, Yes; There will be a financial hardship imposed if they decide to come within compliance because it is a pre-existing structure and there is not a viable place to build, and there are no objections from the neighbors.</p> <p>Sawicki, No; I feel that the variance request does not meet the criteria of a hardship or unique circumstances pertaining to the property at this time.</p> <p>Pratt, Yes; The condition has been in existence for a large number of years at this point, and I don't see a reasonable way that they would be able to meet the ordinance otherwise. I am voting yes for a variance for both the front and side setback requirements.</p>	<p>Call to Order</p> <p>Pledge</p> <p>Roll Call</p> <p>Accept Agenda</p> <p>Approve Minutes</p> <p>Public Hearing Case #2019-03</p> <p>ZBA Action for Case #2019-03</p>
--	---

<p>Turo, Yes; I am voting yes on both the front and side setbacks because of the neighbors being present and having no objections, and all of the detailed explanations given by the property owners. Also, because it is a pre-existing fence.</p> <p>Aguinaga, Yes; There is a financial hardship, the structure is pre-existing, and the township does not have a clear definition of whether or not a DBA is needed.</p> <p>Vote Results: Baranowski-Yes, Sawicki-No, Pratt-Yes, Turo-Yes, Aguinaga-Yes</p> <p>Sawicki stated that the variance has been approved.</p> <p>Old Business – N/A.</p> <p>New Business – N/A</p> <p>Motion by Baranowski to adjourn at 7:44 p.m., seconded by Pratt.</p> <p>Adjournment at 7:44 p.m.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by, Rachel Reid, Acting ZBA Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Vote Results</p> <p>Old Business</p> <p>New Business</p> <p>Adjournment</p>
--	--