



Located at: 11120 Musbach Rd. Munith, MI 49259

Mail to: P.O. Box 130 Munith, MI 49259

517-596-8200 office/517-596-8600 fax

Hours: 8 AM - 3 PM Monday- Friday

www.waterlootwpmi.com

Waterloo Township Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting

May 15, 2008 at 7:30 PM

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Consent Minutes - January 17, 2008 meeting
6. Old Business - None
7. New Business – Variance for Allison and Nancy Bates
8. Adjournment

Waterloo Township
Zoning Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes – May 15, 2008

Meeting called to order at 7:35

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call – J. Honderich, S. Opp, A. Walz, L. Clark, G. Hannewald
(Bill Richardson in attendance)

Absent – None

Public Comment – G. Hannewald; This meeting is only to discuss the variance for this property; we are not here to discuss kennels, if at any time I fell we are getting off track I will stop the discussion immediately.

Accept Minutes – Minutes – January 17, 2007. Move L. Clark, support S. Opp – motion carried

Variance Request – Allison Bates and Nancy Bates

New Business – Discussion of variance; Alternate areas discussed; each side of house, (north and south east) and back of the house (east). Allison Bates explained that on the east side of the house there is a raised septic field and the building would not fit here, as the new building is going to have it's own septic field and tank. Ms. Bates also explained that the north side of the house is to wet, and that the flow of water would go directly at the building. We discussed filling in the area with more dirt. It was also brought up that the water level here might be too high, so it would not perk anyway. Allison Bates explained that the south east side of the house is also wet, surrounded by wet lands, and many trees would have to be removed to place the build here. It was discussed that a certain placement of the building could decrease the amount of trees taken out. Filling in some of the wet areas was also discussed. Discussion followed that if this was considered a wetland, and how close you could build to it; and also if it could be filled in. The height of the fence needed was also discussed, as this is part of the variance request. Allison wanted us to know that the pitch of the building is low, and that its

placement is with the 20' side of the building facing the road for minimal obstruction.

There was a move by L. Clark to deny request as presented, with alternative options being investigated, to be presented back to us. Supported by S. Opp 4 yes, 1 no – motion carried.

I have learned in discussion with the MTA, and our attorney Eric White, that the wrong wording was used in the above paragraph. We should have motioned to recess, and to reconvene at a later date; after alternative options were investigated. As this was our intention, I would like to move that the wording “deny as presented” be taken out, and have “recess” be put in its place.

“Move by L. Clark to recess, with alternative options being investigated, to be presented back to us. Supported by S. Opp, Motion carried.”

It was also brought up that there should be no cost, when presented back to us, if a meeting is needed.

Public Comment – Woody Harrington, and Floyd and Jackie Riethmiller (Neighbors); both had no issues with the placement of building.

Old Business - None

Adjournment – Move L. Clark, support S. Opp – Motion carried 8:55 p.m.