REGULAR MEETING – ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY OF NOVI

January 10, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Tuesday, January 10, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS

Cindy Gronachan, Chairperson
Jonathan Montville, Secretary
David Byrwa
Brent Ferrell

ALSO PRESENT:

Beth Saarela, City Attorney
Lawrence Butler

Coordinator: Monica Dreslinski, Recording Secretary

REPORTED BY: Jennifer L. Wall, Certified Shorthand Reporter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ16-0034</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ16-0061</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ16-0062</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuesday, January 10, 2017
Novi, Michigan
7:00 p.m.

** ** **

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good evening. I'd like to call the January 2017 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order. Would you please all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?

MR. BYRWA: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger is absent, excused.

Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina is absent, excused.

Member Sanghvi is absent, excused.

And Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Present.

Thank you.

This evening as you entered into our chambers, you noticed that there were some Rules of Conduct on the back table. I am going to ask everyone to please turn off all your cellphones at this time during the meeting.

And we will move right to the agenda.

Is there any changes to the agenda at this time?

MS. DRESLINSKI: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor of the agenda as it stands say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The agenda is approved for this evening.

There were minutes in our packet for November 2016.

Are there any changes, additions, subtractions?

Seeing none, all those in favor of the November 2016 minutes say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Minutes approved.

At this time, if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment to the Board in reference to any topic that is not in front of us this evening, you may do so now.

Is there anyone in the audience that has anything to share with the board this evening?

Seeing none, we will move right into our first case, Grand Promenade, LLC PZ16-0034.

This applicant is returning to us requesting a variance from the Novi Code of Ordinance to allow construction of a second monument sign. Good evening.

MR. PENA: Good evening, Commissioners. Anthony Pena from Moore, Pena and Associates, 38600 Van Dyke, Sterling Heights, Michigan, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Grand Promenade, LLC.

We have both principles of the entity here, Mr. Sinich, Mr. Pascaris.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may
proceed. I know you're coming back from a postponement. There was some additional information and you had some homework to do, I guess. There was some questions.

Did you get everything resolved?

MR. PENA: Yes, you could say, yes.

I think we have come to the conclusion that this board has to make a determination.

You know, it was my understanding that possibly that wouldn't be necessary, given the unique set of circumstances we have here, but I think that's the very reason why variances are requested.

So, again, we are here because the code or city ordinance at issue here prohibits more than one monument sign.

And as explained at the last meeting -- get that on the overhead.

As explained at the last meeting, there currently is a sign on my client's property. That sign is owned by
Target. It's not owned by my client.

It happened to be on my client's property, but my client has no use of that property because there was an easement that was recorded back in 2002 that my client had no part of.

So our position was do we really need to seek a variance request. Because technically, this sign is not -- number one, the sign is not my client's, it's Target's. And number two, it's not on property that he could use.

So the city attorney did look into it and I think they made -- they looked at the statute or the ordinance, it didn't address this type of circumstance.

There was no other precedent out there. Apparently this is the first time this has -- this type of issue has come up with the city.

So I think the city attorney would take a position that it truly is a unique set of circumstances that we are dealing with tonight.

And hence that's why we are
seeking this variance request.

So as you know, there is a bunch of standards that we have to fulfill in order to have our variance granted.

One of them is -- yes, you need some sort of unique set of circumstances. I think we meet that clearly.

The second is whether or not it was self-imposed.

And as I explained before, this sign arose due to a consent judgment that occurred back in 2001. There are other pieces of property that were part of that consent judgment, you have the Target piece, you had the Sam's Club piece, there was a bunch of outlots.

Although this may be in dispute, I mean, we would take the position that the Star Group previously owned this property, and they weren't part of that consent judgment, which was filed in 2001.

In 2002, the Star Group did grant this easement to the Landon Development Group, okay, for an ingress, egress at this exact location, and for this sign -- to
So, again, my client wasn't part of the Landon Group or the Star Group. And thereafter, when you take a look at the building records, Target somehow, they took the position, well, this was their property, although they're not the Landon Group and they erected the sign.

Be that as it may, the reason I go through that history is because I want to layout the fact that this wasn't something that was self-imposed by these gentlemen. That's one of the requirements of the variance that we are seeking.

So the other requirements are -- I think if this board doesn't grant the variance, there would be an unreasonable limit on the use of this property.

Every piece of commercial property is entitled to at least one monument sign, that is why you have the statute, right.

I would argue that they would certainly be entitled to a monument sign on their buildable properties. So if you
prohibit that, I think it wouldn't be something that would be reasonable.

The other requirement is that the failure to grant the variance will simply will result in my client not getting as much for the rent, then it's not a requirement that they would meet for the variance. That's really not the case here.

There has been representations that were made, as you see the building, the shopping center is beautiful, it's already been erected.

The problem here is in today's commercial market, these retailers, they want to be front and center, they want to be on Grand River, and they want a monument sign. I mean, these gentlemen, if they didn't have to, they certainly wouldn't put a monument sign, but these commercial tenants have come to expect a monument sign.

So there were representations that were made, so this is not something where my clients get a few extra dollars if they get this monument.

This is something where there
might be some serious litigation and, you
know, there might be serious issues with the
tenants leaving, with that space going dark.
So there are some very large -- I mean, there
could be a very large impact on their
operations, if this request isn't -- or
variance isn't met.

So then finally, you know,
the question is, is the spirit of the
ordinance met if, in fact, you approve this
variance.

I think absolutely it is. I
think although the ordinance doesn't read
that you're entitled to one monument sign on
buildable property, or on property that my
clients can use, that's essentially what we
are talking about here.

You know, my clients don't
have a sign on their property, a monument
sign. I think that the spirit of the statute
would clearly be met if you granted this
variance.

Aside from those
requirements, there are no other variances
that we would be seeking.
It's my understanding you should have a rendering of what the sign is going to look like. It's very visually pleasing. It's not going to create -- it's going to be harmonious with the surrounding area. It's not going to impact the neighbors. It's the correct size, dimension. The structure is all conforming, so we truly think that -- we think that there is a tremendous amount of merit for this variance and we respectfully ask for your approval.

If you have any questions, we are here to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case?

Seeing none, I know -- happy new year.

MS. SAARELA: Happy New Year.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you like to offer something?

MS. SAARELA: So I took a look at the consent judgment that applies to the Novi
Promenade parcel, which is the bigger parcel, which our interpretation of the document shows that that property in question today was part of that at one time, at the time the consent judgment was put in place.

What happened then was that the parcel was sold off to -- by the owner of the overall consent judgment property to another owner. At that time, retained an easement on that property for the sign.

So that's our interpretation of the history of how the sign got to be on this parcel.

The other aspect of this is that the consent judgment does limit the overall property that was subject to the consent judgment to two monument signs, which there currently are, but does not allow for the city, the ZBA to consider a variance request with -- specifically with respect to signage, so that is why there -- we said that.

This is the proper venue for them to be today, if they're looking for a variance for the signage because the consent
judgment says allow that consideration.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Thank you. Building department?

MR. BUTLER: No comment.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: 29 letters mailed, seven letters returned, one approval, from Dan D. Valentine at 48705 Grand River. And he notes his approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members? Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

For the city attorney, if it was a consent judgment on an easement, why are even asking for a variance?

MS. SAARELA: Well, okay, so the easement is not right on -- is on their property, but the sign that's in the easement is not their sign.

So because their property is limited to one sign, there is already an easement with the sign on their property, that's why they're seeking the variance.
Because it would technically then be two signs on their property, which is not permitted.

And in addition that --

MR. FERRELL: Even though it's on an easement, you still consider it?

MS. SAARELA: Yes, there is no legal interpretation or any prior interpretation in the sign ordinance that would lend support to the argument that an easement isn't part of your property on the same property.

MR. FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else, Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: No, Madam Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: A couple things. I would say clearly this is a unique non-self-created situation that we are dealing with. With that said, my opinion too, from a safety concern and visibility, given this is zoned general business, the way
the building is currently set up, it is fairly far back from Grand River, again, high traffic area, high volume traffic area, high speed relative to a lot of the other streets within the city, so I could see a couple reasons why I wouldn't have any problem approving this.

And then again as far as affecting the neighboring, surrounding properties, the signs within the size requirements, it's professionally been designed from an esthetic standpoint, so I would be in full support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?

I have no problem supporting this. And I think that the presentation cleared up any confusion, unlike the first time, when it was presented, and it was very confusing.

I am glad that we took the extra steps to clarify everything. Actually, to help the property owner and the businesses.

I concur with Member
Montville that given the current layout of Grand River, and all that you have going on there, I think that it is important to identify that business separate from Target and Sam's Club.

And the reason I would support this is because of the uniqueness of the lot, the uniqueness of how you got here and that basically that it's not under your control.

It's not like you can put your name onto Sam's Club's sign or to Target, and that would be, in my opinion, a disservice to you as a business, coming into Novi and trying for proper identification.

Also, given the lay of the property, especially when you're going east on Grand River, it's pretty difficult to identify that that strip mall is there.

And it is unfortunate that the Target and Sam's Club sign is there, but I think with the added sign and your mockup has been there for a while now, so we have had ample opportunity to stare at it -- well, not stare at it, but look at it, sorry.
I think that it proves the point that it needs -- it brings to the forefront that there is a business there.

And for many years that there hasn't been a business, I think it's important that this variance be granted to help the identification.

So I am in full support and I promise I won't be long-winded on the rest of the cases, but I felt this case was very unique and whatever we could indicate on your behalf, needed to be said this evening.

So I would entertain a motion. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance requested in Case No. PZ16-0034, sought by Grand Promenade, LLC, for a sign variance of a second monument sign.

The petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the second sign on their property. Without this particular variance request, the business will be prohibited from using their property zoned as general business due to poor
visibility and also safety concerns of the high traffic volume on Grand River Avenue.

This property is unique due to the pre-existing historical content that created the initial variance request, and also due to the setback of the building requiring additional visibility for consumers and traffic, again, traveling on Grand River.

The petitioner did not create this particular condition, due to the historic context arising that created the necessity for the variance request in the first place.

The relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties as the sign is esthetically, professionally designed and is harmonious to the surrounding buildings as presented by the petitioner. And the relief when granted is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

For those reasons, I move that we grant the variance as it has been requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Is there any further discussion on the case?

Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted and good luck and welcome to Novi.

Our next case is Sign Art PZ16-0061, 27200 Beck Road, north of Grand River and east of Beck.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow an increase height of an
existing ground sign.

Is the petitioner here?

Would you please state your name, and if you are not an attorney, raise your right hand and be sworn in by our secretary.

MR. CONROY: Mitch Conroy, C-o-n-r-o-y.

MR. MONTVILLE: Raise your right hand, sir. Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you are about to provide?

MR. CONROY: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. CONROY: So we are -- we were here a few months ago to request a variance on a number of tenants for the monument sign that we put in, for the multi-tenant complex at 27200 Beck Road.

We reduced it from four tenants, which is required, down to three. We met all of other requirements about the zoning code, restrictions on a six foot maximum height, and then the 30 square feet area. We needed 35. I don't have it in
here. But we stayed under the allowance, and kind of an unforeseen issue at that time, was that a retaining wall was being put in, so the sign staying at six foot height is actually just a little short, where to me setback requirements we had to put it behind the wall. We couldn't put it in front of the wall.

And basically the lower tenant, half of the Starbucks phase is partially blocked.

So for the future use, I guess, so that one of the tenants down the road is not -- doesn't have a sign face that is invisible to traffic, we are asking for a variance to raise the height to eight feet, so two foot variance from the six foot requirement. That will put the sign up over the wall by about one foot.

The property next door is the Shell gas station, their sign is at a height of eight foot five inches, from what I understand, they were granted a variance to basically go above the six foot requirement as well.
So we are not really asking for anymore than I guess the height that they have.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else?

MR. CONROY: I believe that is it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case.

Seeing none, building department?

MR. BUTLER: No comments.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 15 letters mailed, two letters returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Board members? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: So I drove by over the weekend and again this morning, and that retaining wall kind of messes things up a little bit.

You can't move the sign
because of the distance away from the street
and you need an alternative. I think two
feet is the minimum to get it over that wall.
I would be in full approval
at this point.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anyone else?

It's unfortunate that that
happened. I know that when you were here,
the retaining wall was not an issue at the
time, and there has been a great deal of work
and time put into this business, and I have
no problems supporting this request.

I think that this is not
self-created and I will save the rest for the
motion.

I will entertain a motion at
this time, if there is no further discussion.

Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we
grant the variance requested in Case No.
PZ16-0061, sought by Mitchell Conroy, Sign
Art, Incorporated for a sign height variance,
as the petitioner has shown practical
difficulty requiring the 2 feet heightening
of the sign.

Without the variance the petitioner will be prevented and limited to use of their property due to limited visibility, and again, potential safety concerns due to a high traffic intersection.

The property is unique due to the additional retaining wall specific to that sign requiring the two feet addition at the bottom.

The petitioner did not create this condition, and was not self-created due to the retaining wall being developed.

The relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, as it is the minimum height necessary, the sign is designed to be succinct with all the surrounding properties, and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

And for those reasons, I move that we grant the variance as it has been requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion?

Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted. Good luck.

MR. CONROY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our last case of the evening is David and Colleen Bouren at 1391 East Lake Drive, Case No. PZ16-0062.

The applicant is requesting a variance for a new residence to allow reduced
rear yard setback, side yard setback, reduced aggregate total and a couple of other requests, based on the zoned R4, one family residential.

Good evening. Are you both giving testimony this evening?

MR. BOUREN: YES.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please state your names, spell them for our recording secretary and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.

MR. BOUREN: David Bouren, D-a-v-i-d, B-o-u-r-e-n.

MS. BOUREN: Colleen Bouren, C-o-l-l-e-e-n, same last name.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you're about to give?

MS. BOUREN: Yes.

MR. BOUREN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. BOUREN: We were here a couple months ago requesting the same variances.
The picture we showed though was a misrepresentation of what the house was going to be.

We wanted to add a shed dormer to allow a habitable attic, and that's why we are back here today, showing the different picture and different floor plan.

All the variances are the same as requested two months ago.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else?

MR. BOUREN: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. There is no one in the audience to make comment at this time. Building department, do you have anything to add?

MR. BUTLER: What is your definition of habitable space for your attic?

MR. BOUREN: It's the city's definition. It's a bonus room. It has minimum ceiling heat. The habitable part has to be a minimum of five feet tall. I think less than seven feet at the center of the roof.

MS. BOUREN: Less than 50 percent
of the footprint. That's what Chris Weber
has been talking about.

MR. BUTLER: This is not designed
as sleeping area?

MS. BOUREN: No, because the
house is so narrow, the only way we get
storage in the attic is if we have 12 -- we
have a very steep pitched roof. The picture
we showed before, we were going back and
forth with the building department on how to
make like a storage area up there with
dormers that would work with not doing it as
a third story. We don't want a third story.

We just showed a stock photo
from the company's website, and then the next
day we went in and talked to Chris, and I
think Charles. I think he talked to the city
attorney. They said that the picture that we
showed that we had to build that roof line.
We didn't want that roof line because it's a
6/12, and we can't have storage with a 6/12,
only have about three feet up there.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. I just
wanted a clear definition of your intentions.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Does the city attorney have anything to offer?

MS. SAARELA: I don't think I was involved in this. It must have been Tom Schultz from my office, if the discussion was had with our office.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members? Member Byrwa. Communications.

MR. MONTVILLE: Fourteen letters mailed, one letter returned, one objection, from Brent Brashears at 1395 East Lake Road. He comments on his opinion of concern the city is not addressing the illegal storage structures that sit on the east edge of the property, that they are in encroaching on the woodlands, that they are larger than the code allows.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Byrwa.

MR. BYRWA: Yes, I was concerned with the side yard setbacks that were shown on the one side, that it's approximately three feet?

MR. BOUREN: Correct.

MR. BYRWA: Were you aware of
some special requirements that when you build
that close to a lot line the fire ratings and
I think you're limited or no windows, things
of that sort?

MR. BOUREN: I think at three
feet you are still allowed windows, less than
25 percent. I think is what the building
department told us.

MR. BYRWA: If you are
interested, I got a copy of the rules on
that, if you care for a copy of that. It's
the 2015 Michigan Residential Code, which is
the law of the land throughout the state. As
long as you're aware of it, there are special
requirements when you build that close to the
lot line. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Anyone else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I want to make
sure I am organized. On the carport side of
the current structure, which specific
variance is that, so is that --

MR. BOUREN: On the carport side
we are asking for one and a half foot off the
lot line.
MR. MONTVILLE: How far is the carport from the lot line right now?

MR. BOUREN: Less than six inches probably.

MR. MONTVILLE: That was one thought. It is narrow over there. I just want to make sure you're pulling back. Okay. Gotcha. That's all I have right now. I would open it up to further discussion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Member Ferrell, do you have anything to add?

MR. FERRELL: I do not, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think the question was the fact that the original house that we looked at was one story that you showed or was it two stories?

MS. BOUREN: It was two stories.

MR. BOUREN: It was the same structure without this dormer and the pitch of the roof was a little bit lower.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: By adding all of that, that's what -- because we didn't get to see that, that's why we had to do this again.
MS. BOUREN: True.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And I don't recall that I had any issues back then. I think that the property is unique, as to the size and the shape, and as long as you're addressing all the regulations with the building department, I can be in full support of this. So I have no problem with your request.

I would entertain a motion if the board has no further discussion.

MR. MONTVILLE: I am prepared to make a motion at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variances requested in Case No. PZ16-0062, sought by David and Colleen Bouren for setback variances, as the petitioner has established that the property in this particular case is unique due to the pre-existing non-compliant lot.

The need for this variance is not self-created, as the lot again was already pre-existing, non-compliant and the
structure being proposed with the variances is a reduced structure based on size compared to what is currently in place.

Strict compliance with the regulations of the current ordinance as written would prevent the petitioner from using the lot as currently zoned.

The petitioner has established this variance is the minimum necessary as a lesser variance would prevent the petitioner from using the lot as a residential buildable lot.

The requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding properties, as it is an improvement, and the esthetic presentation and value of the property, and again is a reduced structure size, reduced dimension size compared to the current structure.

For those reasons, I move that we grant the variances as they have been requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Is there any further
discussion?

Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variances have been granted. Let's hope you can get it done this time.

Is there anything further to discuss this evening? Anybody have anything to add?

We will have some changes at the board next month. I am anticipating a new alternate being appointed hopefully.

And so I think that probably
by March we should entertain elections. Historically I think they were done in February, but given the switch and change and everything, I think by March we should be able to entertain the thought of elections.

Just so you all know, nominating me Chair will not be an option this time. I think I have served two years. It's been great. I love it. I'd like to take a seat to the left or the right, and open the chair to someone else, just so they can gain experience and knowledge. I would be here to help if asked. So something to think about.

Having said that, is there anything else to be added?

Is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. FERRELL: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meeting adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.)

** ** **
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