

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

June 28, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, June 28, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacobetti

Tony Anthony

Ted Zuchlewski

John Avdoulos

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect

Theresa Bridges, Construction Engineer

Certified Shorthand Reporter, Diane Szach

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Novi, Michigan.
Wednesday, June 28, 2017
7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to
call to order the June 28th Planning Commission
meeting.

Kirsten, call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Present.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, if

1 we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 (Pledge recited.)

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

4 With that, we'll look for a motion to approve or amend
5 the agenda.

6 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve the
7 agenda.

8 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
10 motion and a second. Any other comments? And a
11 third. All those in favor?

12 THE BOARD: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
14 opposed?

15 We have an agenda.

16 We come to our first audience
17 participation. If there's anyone in the audience that
18 wishes to address the Planning Commission on any
19 matter, please step forward at this time.

20 Seeing no one in the audience,
21 we'll close the first audience participation.

22 Any correspondence?

23 MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee
25 reports? I don't believe.

1 City Planner report. Ms. McBeth,
2 good evening.

3 MS. McBETH: Thank you. Good
4 evening. Nothing to add tonight.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Beautiful.

6 No public hearings, so we come to
7 the matters for consideration. Item Number 1,
8 Bolingbroke JSP 17-34. It's a consideration at the
9 request of Singh Development, L.L.C. for the approval
10 of the Preliminary Site plan, Site Condominium,
11 Woodland Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan. The
12 subject property is located in Section 10 at the
13 intersection of Novi and Old Novi Roads, north of
14 12 1/2 Mile, and is zoned R-4, One-Family Residential.
15 The applicant is proposing to develop the 19.78 acre
16 parcel to 46 single-family, detached residential site
17 condominium.

18 Kirsten, good evening.

19 MS. MELLEEM: Good evening.

20 So the subject property is located
21 at the convergence of Novi Road and 12 1/2 Mile Road
22 in Section 10. The applicant is proposing a 46-unit
23 single-family detached residential site condominium on
24 19.78 acres.

25 The subject property is zoned R-4,

1 One-Family Residential. The properties to the west
2 and north are zoned RA, Residential Acreage. The
3 properties to the east are zoned R-4, One-Family
4 Residential, and the properties to the south are zoned
5 RM-1, Low-Density Multiple Family.

6 The Future Land Use Map indicates
7 Single Family for the subject property and all
8 properties to the west and north, a private park to
9 the east, and PD1 to the south.

10 The site contains wetlands on the
11 north, west, and south edges of the proposed combined
12 parcel.

13 The proposed project is focused at
14 the intersection of Old Novi Road and Novi Road.
15 There are two entrances, one from Old Novi Road and
16 another from 12 1/2 Mile Road. The project proposes
17 46 single family units in a site condominium. There
18 is a detention basin at the southeast corner of the
19 site and a small park which is mostly a berm near the
20 cul-de-sac at the west side of the project. There is
21 one wetland near lots 2, 3, and 4 where the 25-foot
22 wetland buffer is proposed on these lots. Planning is
23 asking for signage, boulders, fencing, that will
24 protect this buffer from encroachment by the
25 residents.

1 There are also two woodland
2 easements proposed along the north and south proposed
3 parcel lot lines that maintain existing wooded areas
4 as a buffer between residential to the north and the
5 natural beauty road to the south. Planning has asked
6 that these easements be provided with signage,
7 boulders, fencing that will protect this buffer from
8 encroachment by residents to protect the trees in the
9 easement.

10 So to review the history of the
11 project, the site plan was reviewed in 2005 and 2015,
12 which have both since expired. So this review was a
13 combined preliminary/final site plan. Planning did
14 not recommend the final site plan at the time, but
15 after conversations with the applicant, the changes
16 can be made on the electronic stamping set after
17 preliminary consideration and discussion by the
18 Planning Commission. The current site plan complies
19 with all applicable regulations of the Zoning
20 Ordinance except for a couple minor deviations
21 requiring landscape waivers, which are supported by
22 staff. The public hearing was held on June 14, 2017
23 where the applicant had requested to hold the public
24 hearing but postpone the decision.

25 The applicant is seeking three

1 waivers from the Planning Commission and two variances
2 from City Council:

3 1. A landscape waiver for
4 insufficient berm along Novi Road.

5 2. A landscape waiver for
6 insufficient berm along 12 1/2 Road.

7 3. A landscape waiver for less
8 street trees along 12 1/2 Mile Road.

9 4. A DCS waiver for the eyebrow
10 design.

11 5. And a DSC waiver for meandering
12 sidewalk along 12/12 Road.

13 The first waiver for insufficient
14 berm along that portion of Novi Road fronting the
15 stormwater detention basin, the second and third are
16 to preserve the natural wooded buffers along 12 1/2
17 Mile Road in lieu of a berm and less street trees.
18 The DCS variance for the meandering sidewalk is to
19 preserve the trees in the path of the sidewalk along
20 12 1/2 Mile Road, which are all supported by staff.

21 The last item of concern is
22 regarding the Woodland Permit and the proposal for the
23 treatment of the woodland replacement tree credits.
24 The applicant is proposing to plant 50 credits on
25 site, which is 9 percent of the total 588, and to

1 plant 537, which is 91 percent of the total, off-site
2 at the Ballantyne site.

3 The Ballantyne site plan is set
4 to expire on December 22, 2017, and there has been no
5 application for building permits. There is fairly
6 significant uncertainty as to whether the Ballantyne
7 site will be built. ECT, our woodland consultant, has
8 recommended the applicant pay into the tree fund for
9 that 537 credits should either of the following
10 conditions occur:

- 11 1. no building permits applied
12 for prior to site plan expiration or
- 13 2. if the current owner sells
14 the property.

15 It is ultimately the Planning
16 Commission's decision regarding the woodland permit,
17 but the woodland consultant and planning staff are
18 concerned about the future of these credits and do not
19 encourage placing them off-site.

20 The reviewers are all
21 recommending approval; some with conditions to be met
22 with the next submittal.

23 The Planning Commission is asked
24 tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan with
25 Site Condominium, Woodland Permit, and the Stormwater

1 Management Plan. The applicant, staff, and
2 consultants are here to answer any questions you may
3 have regarding the proposed project.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
5 Kirsten, appreciate it.

6 Does the applicant wish to
7 address the Planning Commission?

8 MR. KAHM: Good evening, Mike
9 Kahm of Singh Development Company. I just wanted to
10 give the Planning Commission a brief historical
11 perspective on the subdivision.

12 As Kirsten mentioned, we
13 originally submitted this plan for approval back in
14 2005, and actually we started construction on this
15 subdivision. We built the basin, we installed the
16 sanitary sewer, we installed a portion of the storm
17 sewer, and we had -- we took down the trees which have
18 been guaranteed. In fact, we have a letter of credit
19 with the City of Novi for almost \$875,000 that you've
20 had for 12 years, and it's still current. And at the
21 time we thought we were going to sell the lots to a
22 builder, that didn't work out, and then the recession
23 came, and one thing led to another.

24 So we would like to continue to
25 propose to plant the woodland replacement trees off --

1 site, you may recall that you granted that approval
2 when we submitted our Oberland Subdivision on Eleven
3 Mile Road. And at that time those replacement trees
4 were approved to be placed in the open preservation
5 area of our proposed Ballantyne Subdivision at the
6 corner of Eight Mile and Garfield.

7 Since that time Pulte bought
8 that subdivision. They chose to post the money into a
9 tree fund. So we're simply proposing that we take the
10 trees we were originally going to put until Ballantyne
11 from Oberland and take the trees we now have to
12 replace for Bolingbroke to Ballantyne. We understand
13 that that site plan is nearing expiration, and we do
14 intend to come in with a request that that be
15 extended. It's a gated community, Ballantyne is, and
16 it's been a little slow in that particular market, so
17 we haven't reached a point where we're ready to do
18 something with that yet, but we do intend to come in
19 and bring that approval current with obviously
20 Planning Commission's approval.

21 Some of the waivers that Kirsten mentioned
22 again were in existence way back in 2005 for the same
23 reason. As you know 12 1/2 Mile is a natural beauty,
24 very nice canopy. We want to preserve that, so we
25 would like to in lieu of the berm, we want to preserve

1 those woodlands and meander the pathway around those
2 trees. Again, that -- this design for the most part
3 is the same as it was 12 years ago. The only minor
4 differences are to bring it current with city
5 ordinances, but I would say 99 percent is the same as
6 it was 12 years ago.

7 So anyway, we're hoping that the Planning
8 Commission will see their way clear of approving the
9 variances we're asking for, including planting the
10 woodland replacement trees off-site. George Norberg
11 is here with me. If you have any questions, we'd be
12 happy to answer them.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
14 sir, we appreciate that.

15 We'll turn it over to the
16 Planning Commission for their consideration.

17 Member Anthony?

18 MR. ANTHONY: To staff, so the
19 Ballantyne site, it's sold to it sounds like another
20 developer, Pulte owns that?

21 MS. McBETH: No, not that we're
22 aware of. Mr. Kahm was referring to Oberland.

23 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So my
24 concern is that if we then replant all the trees on
25 the Ballantyne site, what controls do we have that in

1 the future development they're just not removed again?

2 MS. McBETH: So the -- through
3 the chair, the Ballantyne site I believe was approved
4 as an RUD, and there's an RUD agreement that would
5 indicate the responsibilities for the woodland
6 plantings.

7 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So we would
8 have controls on that property in order to maintain
9 the woodlands and the trees?

10 MS. McBETH: I believe so. That
11 in addition to the woodland permit and how it's
12 written would indicate that.

13 MR. ANTHONY: So Kirsten, did I
14 hear that you preferred the payment into the tree fund
15 over the Ballantyne planting or --

16 MS. MELLEEM: That's what our
17 woodland consultant was recommending that we don't --
18 we don't know what the status of that site is and what
19 will happen to it in the future, and it may happen
20 just like Oberland where then we have to redo all the
21 site plans again and redo all the woodland permits two
22 or three times to get them right because they're
23 changing around where the woodland replacement trees
24 are going.

25 MR. ANTHONY: So is that

1 following the same logic that I was concerned about
2 before, that we could plant those trees, and then if
3 the plan changes, we may be looking at waivers to
4 remove those?

5 MS. MELLEEM: I don't believe
6 that occurred with the Oberland and moving it about.
7 We're just concerned that -- where they'll go. And so
8 the woodland consultant prefers not to have them
9 off-site, prefers to have them either onsite or into
10 the tree fund.

11 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. I'm
12 actually fine with either one. Those are my
13 questions. I just wanted to see that we had controls
14 for the trees.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
16 Anyone else?

17 Member Anthony.

18 MR. ANTHONY: I'll make a
19 motion. In the matter of Bolingbroke JSP 17-34,
20 motion to approve the preliminary site plan with site
21 condominium based on and subject to the following,
22 Items A through H. This motion is made because the
23 plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3,
24 Article 4, and Article 5 of the zoning ordinance and
25 all other applicable provision of the ordinance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Anthony, second by Member Greco.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPEPPI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MR. MELLEEM: Motion passes six
to zero.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
Bolingbroke JSP 17-34, motion to approve the woodland
permit based on and subject to the findings in
compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and
consultant review letters, and the conditions and
items listed in those letters being addressed on the

1 electronic stamping set. This motion is made because
2 the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of
3 the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable
4 provisions of the ordinance.

5 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
7 Member Anthony, second by Member Avdoulos.

8 Any other comments?

9 Kirsten, please.

10 MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

12 MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

13 MR. GRECO: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

19 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six
23 to zero.

24 MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
25 Bolingbroke JSP 17-34, motion to approve the

1 Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the
2 findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the
3 staffing and consultant review letters, and the
4 conditions and the items listed in those letters being
5 addressed on the electronic stamping set. This motion
6 is made because it's otherwise in compliance with
7 Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other
8 applicable provision of the ordinance.

9 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a
11 motion by Member Anthony, second by Avdoulos.

12 Any other comments?

13 Kirsten, please.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

21 MR. GRECO: Yes.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

23 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

24 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

25 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

1 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes six
2 to zero.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.
4 Thank you.

5 Item Number 2 is to introduce
6 Text Amendment 18.285, off-street parking spaces. And
7 it's to set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.285
8 to update Section 5.2.12, Off-Street Parking Spaces,
9 to modify the minimum off-street parking requirements
10 to better meet the needs of the City's current and
11 future land uses.

12 Kirsten or Barb?

13 MS. McBETH: No.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone?

15 MS. MELLEEM: So the proposed
16 ordinance amendment addresses the off-street parking
17 requirements under Article 5: Site Standards, Section
18 5.2: Off-street Parking Requirements.

19 So periodically staff reviews
20 different sections of the ordinance for update in
21 order to make sure the ordinance meets the needs of
22 the City's current and future land uses. The Planning
23 staff has done extensive research of neighboring
24 communities, comparison cities, and industry standards
25 from the Institute of Transportation Engineers in

1 order to identify areas of improvement.

2 The proposed changes are
3 detailed in the memo in the Planning Commission
4 packet, which was available for review. The changes
5 are proposed to make it easier for applicants and
6 staff to calculate the minimum parking requirements
7 and to be consistent with industry standards and
8 neighboring communities. Additional clarification
9 will be made to the ordinance regarding some of the
10 definitions that may also be proposed with the public
11 hearing.

12 The Planning Commission is asked
13 tonight to discuss the proposed amendments, and if
14 acceptable, to set a public hearing. At that time the
15 Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the
16 City Council, who will ultimately approve or deny the
17 amendment and may propose alterations as well. Staff
18 is available to answer any questions you may have
19 regarding the proposed amendment.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

21 Submit it to the Planning
22 Commission for consideration.

23 Member Giacobetti?

24 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a
25 question. In your research of like other ordinances

1 from other cities, did you come across any language
2 concerning maximum parking spaces?

3 MS. MELLEM: Yes.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: And how is
5 it -- it's not addressed in this ordinance?

6 MS. MELLEM: It is not. There
7 are communities that we had information on that do
8 have parking maximums, some are 20, 25 percent over
9 what the minimums are, and then it has a section
10 basically where the Planning Commission has the
11 discretion if they can prove that they need the extra
12 spaces, that the Planning Commission can make that
13 allow -- they can allow the additional spaces beyond
14 that 20, 25 percent. But we did not put that in this
15 proposed amendment.

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm not going
17 to put staff on the spot, but --

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Oh, go
19 ahead.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: Do you -- do
21 you think a maximum would be a good idea in Novi?

22 MS. MELLEM: I think based on
23 planning trends nationwide that is being seen in
24 communities, but it's up to your discretion whether or
25 not a maximum would be suitable for Novi.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: It's just
2 unusual. I don't support -- can I not support the
3 public hearing, or we just set the date and voice --

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have to
5 set the public hearing, and then at the public
6 hearing --

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: That's fine.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And we can
9 make recommendations for modification to the document
10 between now and then, too.

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: I don't know
12 how the other members of the committee feel. I would
13 like to see some maximums, proposals so that we would
14 have discretion over or the opportunity to say no,
15 that the parking you're proposing is excessive. There
16 have been some projects recently where I feel that the
17 parking proposed was, you know, and this is not total
18 parking. I mean, when you build a building, you can
19 build a garage as well, you know. This is in terms of
20 paving over entire plots of land to just, you know,
21 it's the least expensive way to provide parking.

22 So I personally would like to
23 see some language concerning maximums. What I had
24 seen before was I think 50 percent over, which is
25 much, much more generous, but I think maybe 25 percent

1 is a better standard. So that's just my guidance or
2 suggestion.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Perfect.
4 Thank you, appreciate that.

5 Anyone else?

6 Member Avdoulos?

7 MR. AVDOULOS: I'll let go that
8 the concern was from a project that we saw about a
9 month or so ago that was just very, very excessive,
10 and I think even though we can engineer it, I believe
11 it creates stress on the systems, and then we could
12 also be looking at trying to be good stewards of our
13 land and the environment and trying to limit the
14 amount of pervious surface, and I think it would be
15 just a good thing to take a look at it, because it
16 just creates the large areas of blacktop that aren't
17 really doing us any good.

18 And I understand it from the business point
19 of view from the developer trying to get the maximum
20 that they can and provide for their lease tenants, but
21 in the same token I think it does get over excessive,
22 and instead of really planning it out, they'll just
23 pave it all and provide a thousand parking spots and
24 be done with it. So I think that would be something
25 that would be a good thing to take a look at.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

2 Anyone want to make a motion?

3 MR. GRECO: I will unless you
4 have another comment.

5 MR. ANTHONY: I was just going
6 to ask what the motion would be that we would make.

7 MR. GRECO: Well, okay. I'd
8 like to make a motion to set a public hearing for Text
9 Amendment 18.285 to update Section 5.2.12, Off-Street
10 Parking Spaces as indicated.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: They'll
12 take our consideration and add that to the information
13 they provide back to us so we don't need to belabor it
14 by a motion.

15 Any second?

16 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Zuchlewski
18 wins. He has the deep voice.

19 Kirsten, can you call roll,
20 please.

21 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

22 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

23 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

24 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

25 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six

to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Matters
for consideration. Anything else?

Supplemental issues?
Our last audience participation.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I'm
sorry, I have to cut in front of Mr. Kahm. I just
wanted to briefly mention one item, and then we'll
have the audience participation.

So as you recall last fall the
Planning Commission held a public hearing prior to the
consideration of the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use.
At that meeting a full quorum was not present, and the
plan was not adopted at that time.

Staff has been anticipating an
opportunity to bring the plan back to the commission
once a full quorum of the members is present. As you

1 know, we've had a number of meetings in the first half
2 of this year where we've not had a full quorum.

3 We've now set the public hearing
4 for the Master Plan for Land Use for the meeting of
5 July 26th, since the survey of the Planning Commission
6 members indicated that everyone would be present at
7 that meeting.

8 Staff and the city's planning
9 consultant look forward to bringing the plan back with
10 just minor changes to the plan and two additional
11 maps. The recommendations will remain the same as has
12 been developed with the Master Plan and Zoning
13 Committee, and as had been reviewed by the Planning
14 Commission. I'm going to send you all a link to that
15 plan so you can take a look at it, and feel free to
16 let us know if you have any comments.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
18 Barb, appreciate that.

19 Our last audience participation?

20 MR. KAHM: I'm sorry, I just
21 need clarification. I might have misunderstood. Was
22 the approval received allowing us to put the woodland
23 replacement trees at Ballantyne, or it did not?

24 MR. ANTHONY: Yes, it did.

25 MR. KAHM: Okay. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Oh, wait.

2 Go ahead.

3 MR. SCHULTZ: A yes and a no. I
4 thought it was subject to the terms and conditions of
5 what's in the woodland -- yes.

6 MS. McBETH: Yes. The motion as
7 written did not have Ballantyne in it.

8 MR. SCHULTZ: So I think the
9 answer to the question is you accepted the woodland
10 consultant's recommendation that they not be placed in
11 Ballantyne.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Correct.

13 MR. KAHM: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

15 With that we'll close the audience participation and
16 look for a motion to adjourn.

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Motion to
18 adjourn.

19 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second and
21 third. All those in favor?

22 THE BOARD: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Meeting
24 adjourned.

25 (The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Diane L. Szach, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of (26) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

Diane L. Szach

Diane L. Szach, CSR-3170
Oakland County, Michigan
My Commission Expires: 3/9/18

July 10, 2017.