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** ** **

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Like to call to order the regular Planning Commission Meeting of January 27, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

Good evening everybody.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chairperson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If we could stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member Baratta, could you lead us, please.

MR. BARATTA: Certainly.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Looking for a motion to approve the agenda or modifications.

MR. LYNCH: So moved.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There is a motion and second. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Seeing none, we have an agenda.

Come to our first audience participation. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to address to the Planning Commission other than public hearing in front of us tonight, please step forward
at this time.

Seeing no one in the audience wishing to participate, close that.

Correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Nothing.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Reading reports? Community Development?

MS. MCBETH: Good evening. I have a couple of introductions to make. Two people sitting to the left of me.

First of all, I want to introduce an attorney this evening, Dave Gillam, he's representing our City Attorney's office. Dave works closely with Tom Schultz and with Gary Doprin (ph) in the law firm of Johnson, Rosati, Schultz & Joppich.

You may remember, Chairperson, we met in 2005 or 2006, Dave had also previously served with the Planning Department and the Planning Commission. So we welcome him back.

Also, I'd like to introduce Kirsten Mellem. She is our new temporary planner that we have hired to assist us while
Sri is on maternity leave, so she will be with us for a few months.

Kirsten has a variety of a prior planning experience, mostly recently as a transportation planner with McHenry County in Northern Illinois. Prior to that, Kirsten worked with the Village of Carpenterville, where she assisted with permit review, ordinance and plans, fieldwork and customer service.

She also worked for the public -- private sector for two and a half years as higher education facility campus, master planning consultant.

So I know you want to know where she went to school. She has her masters degree, master of science in historic preservation and planning from Eastern Michigan University.

Her undergraduate degree, bachelor of science in urban and mutual planning with honors from Michigan State University.

MR. LYNCH: Perfect.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Welcome.
MS. MCBETH: Also, one more thing, this evening we have a court reporter, so if people from the audience come to speak, we would ask that they say their name and spell their name so we can get that correctly prefaced in the record.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:

Thank you.

We come to our first public hearing.

Item No. 1 is Arkin Building for Martin Technologies, states JSP15-74. It’s a public hearing to request the building of Arkin, LLC on behalf of the current occupant, Martin Technologies, for approval of a preliminary site plan, special land use permit, for a building for Martin Technologist JSC15-74.

The subject property is currently zoned I1, light industrial, is located in Section 26, east of Novi Road and north of Nine Mile Road.

The applicant is requesting a special land use permit for the proposed outside storage bin that is related to the
current use of the existing building on-site. No additional improvements for the site are being proposed.

Sri, good evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening, again. The subject property is located in the northeast corner of Nine Mile Road and Novi Road in Section 26. It is located next to Shiro restaurant and south of Saddle Creek Apartments. It is zoned I1, light industrial with RM-1 low density, multiple family on the north side and I-1 light industrial on all other sides.

The future land use map indicates industrial research development and technology for the subject property, and the surrounding properties on east, west and south, with multiple family on the north.

There are no existing natural features on the subject property.

The applicant, Irwin J. Arkin, LLC, was issued a temporary special land use for the subject property for outside storage, when new unlicensed operable vehicles, which expires on November 14 of
Historically outdoor storage has not been allowed in I-1 districts in the city. In early 2015, the applicant proposed a text amendment that would allow outdoor storage on I-1 properties through a special land use.

After public hearing, Planning Commission recommended to the City Council for consideration. On September 28 of 2015, council has approved the zoning board text amendment to amend the zoning ordinance in Article 3, Section 3.14, I-1 district of required conditions, in order to allow for access of the outside storage, as a special land use, in the light industrial district under certain conditions as detailed in the planning review letter.

The applicant is now currently requesting a full non-temporary special land use permit approval for the existing use of the building and outside storage that is ongoing on subject property.

This is for the current occupant of the building, Martin.
Technologies. They perform various engineering and assembly services on both reproduction and production vehicles, which include assembly installation or replacement of prototype parts on customer owned vehicles. Outside storage of up to the 200 vehicles of various volumes and types is expected at the site.

The site plan is not proposing any additional improvements to the existing conditions on the site. While the existing conditions were allowed as part of the temporary special land use, they do not meet the requirements with screening according to the recent text amendment. The ordinance requires that all storage should be completely screened from all adjacent properties, by appropriate structures, fencing, conforming to the applicable requirements in Section 5.11 or walls. The current screening is not grandfathered and additional screening will be required.

However, the ordinance allows the Planning Commission to review the application and allow modifications to the
screening requirements.

The applicant has provided multiple pictures of existing trees surrounding the site, which are shared with the Commission. The subject property is surrounded by multiple family rental community on the north, a restaurant on the west, and office uses on the other side.

The staff has selected a few pictures, we'd like to get your focus on that shows the adequate screening from the adjacent properties.

As you can see from the pictures, the majority of the plantings are not located on the subject property, but are on adjacent properties. The only screening provided on the property is the chain link fence and the retaining wall in certain locations.

This is the picture taken from the adjacent side of the apartment complex looking at the subject property. The outside regular storage is fairly visible. The existing chain link fence does not provide adequate screening. Landscaper
provided some suggestions in order to conform to the requirements. Landscape architect Rick Meader can explain on the topic, if needed.

For the reasons stated above, planning and landscape are not recommending approvals at this time and request the applicant to consider to provide additional screening. Traffic, engineering and fire also reviewed the application and are recommending approval.

The applicant, Irwin Arkin, is here tonight with his engineer, Craig Bennett, and the presentation from Martin Technologies, and they would like to make a small presentation, further explaining their application.

The Planning Commission is asked today to review and discuss the applicant's request. The Commission shall consider the factors listed in Section 6.1.2.C of the zoning ordinance regarding the special land use request. In addition, they should also consider items listed in Section 3.14.1.B of the zoning ordinance with regard
to the new text amendment.

All always, I will be here
to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank
you, Sri. Does the applicant wish to address
the Planning Commission?

MR. ARKIN: Good evening, I'm
Irwin Arkin of 43100 Nine Mile Road.

I arranged purchase of the
Nine Mile parcel in 1971. The Arkin building
was originally constructed in 1973 and we
occupied it in 1974. It included a masonry
wall and fence along the majority of the west
property line, with barbed wire fences along
the north and east property lines. At that
time, the property to the west had existing
houses, properties to the north and east were
undeveloped and vacant. The existing house
and property to the west were redeveloped
into a restaurant in 1980. Over the years
the house as a restaurant has had several
different operators.

While the land has remained
under the Arkin ownership, Shiro restaurant
has been in existence for over 15 years.
It's like a joint venture, my joint and their venture.

In 1987 the land to the east was developed as light industrial and is currently known as Novi Commons. In 1989, we expanded our building with an addition on the north end. As a part of that expansion, we extended the wall and fence along the west property line. We extended the barbed wire fence on the east property line.

Along the north property line, we added the required landscaping which included a masonry wall and barbed wire fencing.

The Saddle Creek Apartment complex was in the planning stage, and at that time, not yet under construction.

Since the early 1990s our light industrial building, Novi Commons, the light industrial building to the east, the restaurant sat to the west and the Saddle Creek Apartment complex have existed in their current state with masonry walls, barbed wire fencing, landscaping new place.
For several years our building sat mostly under used and vacant. But in late 2014, we secured Martin Technologies as a tenant. Martin’s business requires temporary parking of new cars and trucks while they wait various scheduled modifications inside the building.

Most vehicles are moved a minimum of two times during the three to four month average processing time before shipping out.

We secured a temporary special land use permit on Martin’s behalf which expired in November 2015 and recently extended to November 2016.

Since outside storage was not permitted in the light industrial district over the past months, we have worked closely with Novi officials while they drafted an ordinance to amend and allow such storage.

Various drafts were provided for my comments. And I responded that my primary concern was with provisions for screening of adjacent properties for the
outdoor storage.

I felt provisions were too restrictive and extensive especially when adjacent to properties which are not zoned for single family residential use.

The screening language was essentially left in the ordinance. However, during consideration of the zoning ordinance, text amendment, Item M was made a part of the final ordinance. That item read as follows.

"The Planning Commission may modify the minimum standards of the subsection as listed above. If it finds that the proposed use will be compatible with will not have a material negative impact on existing and planning uses located on the adjacent and surrounding properties, taking into consideration the size and configuration of the site and any other relevant aspects of the site provided, however, that the Planning Commission shall not have the authority to approve a storage area closer than 150 feet to any single family residential zoning district, as required under subsection F."

I'd like to point out that
Saddle Creek is not single family, but apartments. Ordinance No. 18.275 was adopted by City Council on September 28, 2015.

That brings us to the point where we have submitted the accessory outside storage planning before you.

We also have available a series of photographs of our building and the surrounding properties for your review. Some of these photographs are aerial views.

With me tonight is our land development consultant, Duane Bennett. His department has prepared a plan before you.

I would like with your permission at this time to have Duane give you an overview of the plan and the site photographs. Thank you.

MR. BENNETT: Good evening to you all. My name is Duane Bennett and I'm the project manager for Land Tech Consultants. We prepared the plan and compiled most of the photographs on Mr. Arkin's behalf.

Can you get the plan up for me on the screen.
The plan that we have currently you can -- I will try to run through this quickly, with your permission, if we go over my time limit, Mr. Chairperson, I would request that we can have a little extra.

The plan shows the existing Arkin building in the middle of the site. You can see the grayish areas around the perimeter are the existing asphalt, parking lots around the building, they have got two driveways that go out to Nine Mile Road. We have shown the proposed outside storage areas and we've sort of designated them as east, west and north.

We have three storage areas on the east side of the building. One runs essentially along the frontage area here. There is one in the back, and there is the major one runs up and down pretty much the easterly property line.

On the west side of the building, we have three areas, two small areas immediately adjacent to the building here, and the majority, there is a big one
here, and another larger one along this area.

The W1, the one that's the west side that's here in the front portion of the building, we have it designated as a double stack.

Essentially what happens there, there is enough room between the fire access road, which is the dotted line that runs all the way around, there is enough room between the fire access road to where technically you could park a double row of cars there.

One would be your normal perpendicular parking and then adjacent to those parking, you could do parallel -- you could do parallel parking in front of those, so that's the -- that's why the term double stack is on there.

Double stack is also noted just on a small area on the front of the building in this area right in here.

Again, there is sufficient room to pull cars forward into the building, and then put another row behind them. There is -- we have done some typical cross
sections with some typical vehicle heights.

There is -- the E3 cross section is essentially right in this area here, the W1 cross section is essentially right in through here.

This is a good visualization of how the double stack would work, where you have the cars backed in and then potentially you have another row of -- parked in front of them. All still -- all without affecting the fire access road.

In the back, we have storage area. There is N2 cross section. Those are essentially a cross section against that property line, our north property line, where it abuts Saddle Creek.

Now, if I may, this is a series of photographs -- I will -- Sri showed a couple of them in her presentation. I have quite a few of them. Some of it might seem a little redundant. I will blow through them very quickly, then if we want to come back later, if that's okay with you.

So this is essentially the -- along the west property line, the gate
that goes into the entrance at the building.

   Again, this is the west
property line, you're seeing the -- this is
the Shiro restaurant here, here is where that
gate was, there is a wall along here. Again,
this is just the view down the west property
line, again, Shiro is up in here, you can see
some of the outside storage up against the
wall.

   This is a view from the top
of our building looking into the west
property line, and this is the Shiro parking
lot adjacent to us.

   Again, this is another view
for the building looking a little bit into
the northern portion of the west property
line.

   Now we have moved to the
east side. This is the gate on the east side
entrance along east side of the building.

   This is a view, the gate is
to the left there, the fence. And this is on
the -- to the east over here, this is Novi
Commons. This is the Novi Commons building
on the east side. This is their parking
edge, there is a little green belt there
between our fence and the property line, the
Novi Commons parking area.

These are again, the
photographs from our roof looking into the --
to the east, early to the north -- I'm sorry,
to the southeast. You can see the Novi
Commons building in the background. Their
parking area, one of the -- that area that
you're seeing with the cars backed in would
essentially equate to what we refer to as the
E3 storage area, the proposed E3 area.

From the roof looking
northeast, essentially the same view, same --
you can see the cars backed in. Another shot
of the parking lot for the Novi Commons
behind their building.

And this is a shot looking
from the northeast corner back to the south.
You can see where the parking area is and our
fence, the existing chain link fence.

This is pretty much the
northeastern corner of the property, where
the driveway starts to wrap around the
building.
And what this is is the island that's at the very northeast corner, the existing island. There are a few evergreen trees that were planted originally.

This is one of the areas where the wall ends, and the fence that runs from here is running east and essentially the northeast corner of the property is right here.

This is just a detail, kind of into that, off -- from the building corner towards the rear, towards Saddle Creek.

This is a photo from the roof looking at the north property line.

Again, you can see the cars are backed into the wall, the fence, all the existing landscaping, that's for Saddle Creek with the heavy trees, et cetera.

This is another shot. You can -- looking to the west. This is looking across the back edge of the building from east to west. You can see the -- our storage area which we equate to what we refer to as N2 right along the north property line. This is a detail of one of the areas. There is a
fuel tank there. There is a hydrant there.

You can see the cars backed up into the Saddle Creek landscaping, the wall, the fence, ours, of course.

This is shot down the north line looking to the west. Here is a view of the rear of the property line essentially looking from the northwest corner of the building, along the back of the building.

There is -- you can see the landscaping for Saddle Creek.

Now we are starting to make the turn around the rear of the building, at the northwest corner and sort of heading back towards the front.

This is just a shot from the end of our truck well. You can see here is the building. This would equate to what we were refer to as W -- storage area W3 and/or W1.

Again, you can see there is a lot of room in between here, where the fire access can still get in.

Again, this would be the double stack area.
At the time we took the photos, the car -- I'm sorry, the cars were not parked in a double stack fashion, so I don't really have one to show you for that.

Now we move into the back. This is Saddle Creek. Essentially, looking to the east, the drive -- rear driveway of Saddle Creek.

These are a few shots from the Saddle Creek development looking into the back of our building. There is -- you can see there is the rear of the building back there. That's the N2 storage area with the houses, backed in. You can see the trees landscaping, the fencing.

This is one of the photos I believe Sri showed. We refer to it as the gap. This is the -- pretty much the only section of Saddle Creek where the existing plantings don't screen our proposed storage areas from the Saddle Creek looking in from their property.

This is shot from our roof, from our roof, looking north into Saddle Creek area. That's that same quote, unquote,
gap area where there is no existing landscaping to help us screen.

This is another shot from Saddle Creek looking into that same gap. And these are just some shots along -- from Saddle Creek looking into our building.

This is one -- one of the buildings is relatively close to our north property line. You can see the screening, the existing plantings.

This is another one, kind of down near the -- what would be the northeast property corner looking back in towards the site.

This is one along the north property line from one of the existing Saddle Creek buildings.

And I believe that's it. So those are the photos.

With that, you know, we would be happy, I know we have a public hearing, any questions or comments, or we are, of course, available and can respond and can have any conversations you would like to have.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. That is the public hearing.

If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward. No one in the audience.

Do we have any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. First one is from Irwin Arkin, 43100 Nine Mile Road, in support. "We as an occupant of the building located at 43100 Nine Mile Road familiar with the Martin Technologies usage and recognize the open view, necessity for security purposes. We adamantly support the land use for Martin Technologies without the need for any additional screening. Thank you."

The next one is also from Irwin Arkin, property owner, of the vacant land, northeast corner of Nine Mile and Novi Road. This vacant land is -- in support. "This vacant land starts 272 feet west of 43100 Nine Mile Property and continues 470
feet to the corner of Novi Road and Nine Mile Road. We feel that the land use has not and will not negatively impact any neighbor or alter the character of the land. We support the total approval of this special land use. Thank you."

In support, Eugene Newman 43155 Nine Mile Road.

The next one in support, 43180 Nine Mile Road, the Shiro restaurant is adjacent to the west of the subject property. We "have never experienced any adverse issue with our neighbor to the east. We support the special land use without any additional screening. Thank you."

The final one is also in support. From looks like Saddle Creek Associates, James Bensis, 31731 Northwestern Highway, Suite 250, Farmington Hills, Michigan. In support. It is an appropriate use for the property.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate that. With that, we close the public hearing on this particular matter.
Turning it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The applicant or Mr. Bennett?

MR. BENNETT: We will try not to tag team you.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Usually, when we grant a waiver of provision in an ordinance, as I believe, you're requesting of us concerning screening adjacent properties. We usually take into account some special consideration. Logically it would make sense for you to not -- you know, have a reason for non-compliance.

Other than cost, is there some particular reason for non-compliance for -- because from your presentation, I appreciate you walking us around the property, but I didn't catch any reason why it couldn't be screened other than security concerns.

MR. BENNETT: Essentially, this --

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm sorry.
The issue is that it's adequately screened?

MR. BENNETT: In certain areas, along the east and west property line, where we have walls and existing fences, between the Shiro restaurant and the Novi Commons, essentially, when the building was built, the walls and the fences were built right on the property line.

So, like this is just an example of the -- like I said, the Shiro, if you can see the gap that's in here between the wall and Shiro's parking lot. This is not -- it's not our property to put screening on.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I think we -- couldn't screening be placed where the chain link fence is, wouldn't that be an appropriate place for screening, so that it's -- so that it's --

MR. BENNETT: I suppose. I believe even the landscape plan might make reference to it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I think the tradeoff the city is proposing, the way ordinance was rewritten was, okay, makes
sense, to allow outdoor storage, but there is a condition that it must be screened. And I mean, other than expense, I'm not quite sure I understand your case.

MR. BENNETT: I guess our contention would be that along the east and west property lines, because we have I-1 zoning next to us, we have the Shiro restaurant on the west, we have the Novi Commons on the east, their industrial buildings that just essentially have parking lots next to them.

I guess I will speak for Mr. Arkin, if I'm wrong, he'll correct me. But on those particular areas, we feel that those areas are screened by the walls and by the fences. There is not visual screening, but the open space areas are, if you will, protected from the adjacent property owners.

I know one of Mr. Arkin's big issues is the concern about, you know, we could potentially go in and put some plastic fence -- instead of the broad -- sorry, instead of the chain link, we could put up some kind of plastic fencing that would
visually impair the view from the east and
the west.

Cost is an issue, and there
is some security concerns.

I should let Mr. Arkin tell
you. There is some security issues about not
being able to see into the site.

The storage outside, the
cars outside, if all these areas were
walled-off, if you will, visually walled off,

it would be difficult for security purposes.

There is some concerns

about people could get in there, you wouldn't
be able to see them, when they were walking
around.

So I guess our contention

would be, yes, we don't have visual landscape
screening along the east and west property
lines. We would ask that you allow it to
remain the way it is because of the
surrounding -- the existing conditions around
it, we don't really feel like planting a
whole row of trees or putting up a plastic
fencing to cut down the visual, we would
rather not -- we would -- don't want to do
that, and we don't really feel like we would be comfortable with that from a security standpoint.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Not even on the north side?

MR. BENNETT: The north side -- yes, the whole -- the north is a whole different consideration.

Again, this is the -- I guess our thought -- I know this goes contrary to the landscaper view we talked about.

I think our thought is the existing vegetation that Saddle Creek planted is significant. And again, the wall and the fence are on our property lines, so there is not an area back there where we could go in and do some more plantings except on Saddle Creek's property, which presents a whole series of logistics issues.

But I think that our feeling is that the existing screening and plantings that are there are more than sufficient to screen the residents of Saddle Creek., be they single family houses or
apartments, that they can't really see into the site.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Previously though what they saw into the site wasn't storage. It was just a building, parking lot.

MR. BENNETT: Yes, I would agree with that. I mean, I guess the only thing we could say is that in the roughly, it's a little less than a year and a half. But in the year, Martin Technologies has been in there doing these things for about a year and a half.

To our knowledge, there has never been any complaints from any of the residents who live in Saddle Creek what about noise or lights or any of that kind of a situation.

And again, if this were your standard light industrial building, theoretically if we had a workforce that was sufficient enough, they would be parking during the day anyway, they would be parking back there anyway.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I agree. But
not double, not with the additional parallel parking.

MR. BENNETT: The north property line, the north property line, there are no double stacked areas along the north property line.

What you see along the north property line, you see -- there is only one row of parking back there. Between this -- this is the rear wall of the building. This is the north property line. You have got a single row of your traditional perpendicular storage and then the rest of it is fire lane. So there is no -- there would be no double stacking along the north property line whatsoever.

Those areas are limited to the front of the west area exclusively.

So our feeling is with the existing landscaping that Saddle Creek has in place, except for the one little area that granted we refer to as the gap. There is no visual where the people from Saddle Creek can see into the site at all currently.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Minimally?
MR. BENNETT: Yes, I will accept that. Except for this one area.

Again, I don't -- we would be open to suggestions.

We really can't -- again, it's a logistics issue about it, we could agree with Saddle Creek, we could go in there and do some plantings along this area to close off that gap, but I know Mr. Arkin doesn't want to get involved in any fencing you can't see through.

MR. GIACOPETTI: What about a decorative fence that you could see through, that was more esthetic than chain link with barbed wire?

MR. BENNETT: I would have to defer to Mr. Arkin.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I wasn't sure if that was considered. I mean, that would be see through and more sightly than what's currently existing.

MR. BENNETT: I guess we would --

MR. GIACOPETTI: I think that would be a great expense than what the
landscape planning staff is asking, but just
a suggestion.

I don't see any -- there is
no -- usually when we get requests, there is
some sort of natural feature or some other
soil condition or some other reason other
than the nature of your request. That's all
my questions. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Mr. Bennett,
just a question. Would you have any -- back
to that picture.

Would you have an objection
to putting in a vinyl screening or vinyl
slats or something in that fencing in that
area there to screen from the apartments as
opposed to planting on somebody else's
property, or doing something like that or in
the alternative not having it as a park area?

MR. BENNETT: Well, I
believe -- I'm not sure what Mr. Arkin's
contractual obligations with Martin are, but
if we had to designate that area there you
can -- is only going to handle maximum six
If we remove that area from consideration for outside storage, and left it as it is, would the esthetic then be acceptable?

MR. BARATTA: I guess, standing in our shoes, I'd probably say, how about if I just screened that area. It would be a vinyl screen against the fence or what have you, that's relatively inexpensive.

And frankly, I think with the wall you are partially screened anyway. So really what -- what I have gained from this information is that basically screening isn't high enough.

So if we could screen it a little higher, you could keep the cyclone fence. You know, obviously everybody has a little different opinion of whether they like barbed wire or cyclone, but if we could screen it, where they don't see the cars, at least of the top of the cars, maybe that would be sufficient.

So would you have an objection to something like that?
MR. ARKIN: I think we could
do either one. We could either do the vinyl
on that particular area.

I think Saddle Creek is a
good neighbor and they would probably welcome
us to come over there at our expense to put
some shrubbery there, that would solve the
whole thing.

Regarding fencing, 5.11.2
covers non-residential fencing to be
permitted, if you check that ordinance. I
think there is -- I think the other thing
that should be considered really is the
importance of security. Cameras can only
take pictures. They don't stop a thief.
Blocked views encourage thieves. Once in the
area, they have ample time to strategically
steal and make an easily timed getaway.

Visibility discourages.

One of the attractions of
our site to current and potential tenants is
the security offered by the way of the
enclosed fencing, locked gates, walls,
landscaping, and the ability to view into the
area from all four sides. Everything but a
mote. We have had tenants park cars and
trucks in our property for over 41 years.
Most of that time abutting residential
apartments to the rear, without ever having a
problem. If it isn't broken, why fix it.

Why I understand the
stringent requirements for the overall text
amendment, I appreciate the board's
recommendation that the Martin use of the
Arkin building at 43100 Nine Mile Road
located is one of uniformed, neatly
positioned vehicles scheduled to be
retrofitted, creating jobs, hardly one need
for the additional screening.

But we would be glad to do
one of the two things as you recommended
there.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you.

Rick, I have a couple of questions for you.

So based on the reading of
the information that you put together, and
listening to what Mr. Arkin has said about
his willingness to put in some landscaping,
or screening in that area, adjacent to the
apartments, would that solve some of the
issues?

MR. MEDER: It would certainly solve most of the issues. That's the biggest area of exposure.

You know, the wall doesn't meet the current standard for height. But, yes, that's obviously the biggest area for visibility from the residential side. I would say, if you're satisfied with that, I think that would solve most of the problem.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: I was going to recommend or indicate that, you, you know, speak with the neighbors to the north to see if we could do plantings there.

I like Member Baratta's providing the alternatives, but I think do -- I would like the natural plantings that would look better there, if you could work that out with them.

The other question I have is, with regards to the double stacking.
We don't have any pictures of the double stacking. I understand what it is from the renderings, but how often is that necessary?

MR. ARKIN: We just wanted to --

MR. GRECO: Is it possible to do without it?

MR. ARKIN: Most of the time.

MR. GRECO: The reason why I asked this, as I was looking at the site, and thinking about the outdoor storage and what we require and what the ordinance is, it also depends on, at least in my mind, what I'm looking at this, what exactly is being stored outside. Here we have these are basically at least to the naked eye complete vehicles, correct?

MR. ARKIN: Cars and trucks.

MR. GRECO: Complete vehicles. And so if your at the restaurant or if you're at the neighboring, let's just say the restaurant, that's where individuals will be going in and out, it looks like a parking lot with probably employees going there.
It may not look like storage, but it's neatly -- you know, neatly parked vehicles, all new, they all look like nice vehicles.

But the double stacking would change that because then it looks like -- well, double stacking of vehicles rather than a more -- I don't want to say natural, but I guess, natural for us living in modern society as far as cars being parked and double stacking looking unnatural.

Would doing away with the double stacking be okay?

MR. ARKIN: If that's the deal breaker, yes. We could eliminate that.

I want to point out that every person that used my building in the past, the parking looked worse with the cars and trucks that they had.

If you look at Novi Commons, and their parking lot, it looks worse.

What Martin does -- so the cars are parked so neatly, they are looking to save space, everything is so uniform. It
looks better than anything adjacent --

    MR. GRECO: That's what I'm saying, the nature of my comments, it looks, you know, kind of together and neat, if you're going into the restaurant and not something that stands out rather than things being stacked, you know, other materials, so I think I would be inclined to support this with the working out of putting in shrubs or trees on the apartment complex property and the elimination of the double stacking, which I think is mostly on the west side of the building.

    MR. ARKIN: That's correct.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Any other comments?

    What's the difference between this particular application of outside storage versus if this building were occupied with some industrial something or other commercial operations and those spaces were filled with those actual people coming into work every day? So that the look was there, and had the same idea. I don't see -- I didn't see it in the ordinance, is that
something that is carried forth?

   MS. MCBETH: So to answer your question, how would it be different if it were just vehicles parked in the business?

   So the vehicles would only be there certain hours of the day, most likely, they wouldn't be double stacked, as being proposed.

   They might be -- completely fill in the parking lot or they might be just partially filling the parking lot. It's hard to tell. They probably wouldn't be all brand new vehicles, which is what we see out there right now. But the difference would be the people coming and going probably quite a bit more.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Unless it was a 24 hour operation.

   MS. MCBETH: That's true.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'm trying to differentiate because the ordinance talks about racks and things that are maybe a little bit more of an eyesore than a 2015 Jeep sitting there, kind of thing.

   I understand the spirit of
the ordinance, but in trying to work with the applicant, given the things that worked -- or have been built around him, I think the suggestions that have been made relative to the north side and the removal of the double stacking makes sense, but there is also the condition that if this were a fully occupied building, working 24 hours day, this is what it would look like.

So, I will wait to hear anyone else's comments or see what we have.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm initially not inclined to support this proposal, but I think I would be if that section, that gap was addressed with screening and/or landscaping.

I don't know -- I guess this is a question for staff, could the special land use permit specify an exception for vehicles as opposed to a broader set of materials that can be stored outside because -- you know, like I said, I agree, it looks like a parking lot in these pictures, to be double stacked, it would then start to look like storage, but -- I'm okay with
double stacking, honestly, but as long as it's all vehicles outside, not a mixture of vehicles and equipment.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I think that was the intent of the ordinance as well, to allow special land use for this particular use.

If a different use comes in, then we go back to square one, start over if they wanted to have something stored outside, they come back to Planning Commission. It's a different use.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Can we specify vehicles only?

MR. LYNCH: Passenger vehicles.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If we could, I would support the motion.

MR. GILLAM: I think as a condition of the special land use approval, you can certainly make that a condition, yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Appreciate it.

MR. LYNCH: Just one thing, these are going to be passenger vehicles,
right?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Not airplanes?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. GRECO: I'm ready.

MR. BARATTA: One more thing.

If it were to change, the vehicles are you saying they come back -- they come back to the Commission or they would provide screening?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If the use the changes. If the use changes, they have to come back to the Planning Commission.

MR. BENNETT: We would certainly agree to that.

I mean, that's why we did the plan the way we did, exclusively for cars and some of the general notes on the plan now talk about no outside storage and no -- stuff like, so --

MR. ARKIN: Cars and trucks.

MR. BARATTA: I'm okay with that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion. I was working it out here.

In matter of the Arkin Building for Martin Technologies, JSP155-84, motion to approve the special land use permit, based on the following findings: A, the requested use will not cause an detrimental impact on the existing thoroughfares.

B, the proposed use will not cause a detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities.

C, the proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land.

D, the proposed is compatible with adjacent uses of land.

E, the proposed use is consistent with the goals and objectives and recommendations of the city master plan for land use.

F, the proposed use will promote the use of the land in a socially economically desired manner.
G, the proposed use is one listed among the provisions of use of the special land use in harmony with the purposes and conforms with the applicant's site -- uses set forth in various zoning districts in this ordinance, and, two, is in harmony with the purposes and conforms with the actual site design, regulations in the zoning district in which its located, and because this is made -- otherwise complies with Article 4.4, Article 4, Article 5, Article 6, of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

And add the additional conditions. Number one, that the special land use be used for passenger cars only and trucks.

Next, that the gap section on the north section of the property, that the applicant will work with the apartment complex to the north to provide landscapes for screening.

The next is to eliminate -- no double stacking of vehicles as described in the application on the west side.
MR. BARATTA:  Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  We have a motion by Member Greco and a second by Member Baratta.

MR. GIACOPETTI:  Friendly amendment to clarify the addition of -- the vehicle provision.

The motion should read light duty -- up to light duty class three vehicle, less than 14,000 pounds, so that would be up to the size of a size of a 450 -- would be smaller than say a school bus, or a large vehicle.

MR. GRECO:  I will accept the amendment.

MR. BARATTA:  I would second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  Any other comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  Sri, will you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  I have a quick question to ask.

When you said no double stacking on the west side, we're essentially
saying no double stacking anywhere on the site or just limited to that?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No double stacking on the site.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes seven to zero.
MR. ARKIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: One more.

MR. GRECO: Next, in the matter of Arkin Building for Martin Technologies, JSP15-74 motion to approve a preliminary site plan based on and subject to the Planning Commission's approval of modifications requested by the applicant to permit the absence of adequate screening, other than the conditions that we listed in the motion for the special land use permit for all adjacent properties, as listed in Section 3.141B IV, given the Planning Commission finds that the proposed use will be compatible with and will not have a material negative impact on existing land uses located on adjacent and surrounding properties, taking into consideration the size and configuration of the site and any other relevant aspects of the site, which are hereby granted.

The findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the stack of (unintelligible) letters and conditions and
items listed in those letters being addressed
on the final site plan and this motion to
(unintelligible) otherwise in compliance with
Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the
zoning ordinance and all those applicable
(unintelligible) of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Just one
question. In that, are we modifying the site
plan as submitted, talking about the double
stacking in this?

If so, I think that
reference should be made in the motion.

MR. GRECO: Fair enough. I'll
accept that addition.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion
made by Member Greco, seconded by Member
Baratta with that condition.

Any other comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri,
call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes seven to zero.

MR. BENNETT: I'll address this to Sri, I suppose. So should we revise the plan and resubmit it for the record, so there is a clean plan that reflects all of this?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Yes. With you're being approved for the preliminary
site plan, you will be coming back to get approval for final site plan. So all modifications should be reflected in that.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, gentlemen.

Next on the agenda is an item for consideration, Pavilion Shore Park, restroom shelter area, JSP60-02.

Consideration of -- request to the City of Novi for approval for a preliminary site plan for Section 9, (unintelligible) waiver, storm water management plan for Pavilion Shore Park, restroom and shelter area.

The subject property is located in Section 3, north of Thirteen Mile Road and east of South Lake Drive.

The applicant is proposing to construct approximately 1,870 square foot building that will function as a rest area and picnic shelter area for the Pavilion Shore Park.

Sri?
The subject property is most popularly known as Pavilion Shore Park. It is located abutting Walled Lake on South Lake Drive at the northeast side of Thirteen Mile Road and Old Novi Road intersection.

It is zoned R4, one family residential with similar zoning on all sides and Walled Lake on the north.

The future land use map indicates public park use for the subject property and single family residential for surrounding properties.

There are no regulated woodlands or wetlands on the subject property.

The City of Novi Parks and Recreation is proposing to add a small service building to the existing park for the benefit of the park visitors. The proposed building will host public restrooms and picnic tables.

Planning, engineering landscaping and facade reviewed the preliminary site plan and are recommending
approval with additional comments to be approved for the final site plan.

The plan is in general conformance with the zoning code. However, the legal descriptions denoting the road right-of-way of South Lake Drive and the actual park boundary are still being formalized through the plat amendment process.

Planning staff calculated the required setbacks from the right-of-way which is calculated at about 30 feet from the center line of South Lake Drive.

Staff calculated that the front and the side yard building setback does not meet the minimum required of 75 feet for non-residential buildings and is short by approximately 10 feet.

Staff understands the location is determined to avoid conflict with the existing underground utilities and supports the deviation.

In the past, Planning Commission has approved similar deviations supported by staff for city projects.
The architect has stated that the design objective was to be reminiscent of the Walled Lake casino that once stood on the same side. Facade review states that it has been accomplished in an exemplary fashion. However, objective led to certain deviations from facade ordinance.

The proposed building will require a waiver to allow underage of brick, overage on cementitious siding, overage of wood trim, asphalt shingles on various sides as listed in detail in the motion sheet. Facade review suggests the deviations are justified on the basis of the historical context and that Section 9 waiver be granted.

The architect, Dan Durkee is here tonight and would like to give a brief presentation explaining the design objective and the building program and answer any other questions you may have.

We also have a Park and Recreation and culture services department, Jeff Monk representing the building project.

Our landscape architect, Rick Meader, is here, created the landscape
plan for the proposed building.

Staff is on standby for any questions you have for us.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the preliminary site plan for Section Nine facade waiver and storm water management plan. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri, appreciate it.

MR. DURKEE: Hi. My name is Dan Durkee. I'm an architect with the Michigan (unintelligible).

With me tonight, in addition to Jeff, is Katarina Collier, who is our civil engineer on the project, so we wanted to make sure if there were questions relating to the building or the site, we were here to answer them.

So there is a short presentation, and Sri, there is still the photo of the previous applicant up.

I'm not sure how to -- I don't want to make you move again.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Are you going to double stack cars?
MR. DURKEE: No. Well, we have been working with Jeff and his staff here for the last -- well, couple of three months, and as Sri had mentioned, the design really prerogative and direction that we were given was to really emulate what was the structure originally on the site.

We have got a couple of photos that show that.

Originally built in 1917 and then burned unfortunately five years later in 1822, then was immediately rebuilt, then burned yet again in 1965.

But the building on the left and our design really takes on that sort of arced, arched roof configuration and motif. And the second building had a clear -- added at the top along the ridge line we thought added a certain feature as well.

So, this is a shot from the inside that shows the wood silk lamps that they used. It's really a wonderful looking space.

This then this is really a
view from what would be, as you enter the
parking area that is already been placed,
looking at the facility.

It really is -- it serves
two functions. It is both a restroom
facility to serve the needs of the park and
then also a picnic shelter or shelter area
that's really on the eastern end of the site.

We will go to the floor
plans. We can come back to these, if we need
to during discussion.

So you see there
essentially on the right-hand slide the block
structures of the restrooms and then the
picnic or seating area in front of that.

We have also identified an
area in that wall that we would use for the
assembly of photographs to sort of pay amage
(ph) to the original building as well.

The site is a little bit
dark, but you can see there, how it's been
sited immediately north of the parking area
and at a convergence of the walkways.

This is the overall site
plan. It shows the entire footprint of the
concrete slab, and then there are eight foot bays for the structure itself, which would be a pre-engineered blue laminated structure built in that arc.

Then the restroom structure on the left, which has entry and exit from the left side, what would be the west side. Then screen walls that protect that visually from people exiting or people just surrounding the building.

This is the restroom block itself, it has a total of five water closets or fixtures. Two both the men and the women, and then on the right-hand side, the lower right-hand side is an additional family single occupant restroom facility.

And then upper right is the utility room to the utility room to house slop sink and other equipment for cleaning and possibly even public address system that would be housed in there as well.

That's again that shot from -- looking from the street towards Walled Lake.

The other thing we have
here, I will jump around in front, maybe you
can see it from there. Our sample board that
I know is required as a part of this
submission.

It really identifies both
the wood, which be exposed for the structure,
the cementitious board, which really looks --
it's a ship lab board looks like a little
bit, somewhat marine and nautical in nature.
But it is not a vinyl. It's a hard pressed
product that really doesn't -- it withstands
the weather and any woodpeckers if they
approach it. It's actually a hard
cementitious board, works really well and
looks just like wood siding.

Then at the sill area, we
have got sill that happens at about two foot
above the finished floor, and then below that
is a cultured stone product that, again,
emulates the fireplace, some of the other
moments at the original Walled Lake casino.

That's pretty much it. I
don't know if you have more, Jeff, that you
wants to add at this point.

MR. MONK: I'd just like to
say it's been a pleasure to work with
Mr. Durkee and his team.

Again, members of Parks,
Recreation, Cultural Services, our
engineering department, our facility
department, have all met with Dan and his
team and that's how we became about with this
design.

Again, looking at very
vandal-resistant materials, doing something
very unique.

As you can see, this isn't
a cinder block, drop-in place, stone
structure. This is something that's really
been worked on hard, getting back to the
history of the site, being a fixture point
for the north end of Novi.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very
nice.

That concludes that part of
the presentation. Turn it over to the
Planning Commission for consideration.

MR. BARATTA: Jeff, question,
if you wanted to expand this facility, the
utility room, could that be expanded into a
restroom and utility room constructed?

MR. MONK: Yes, it could be. The plumbing would be in place for it. It's one of those things, if it might want to happen, we probably want to make sure that we extend the drain, especially to the location and cap it, but that would be a pretty simple thing to do if that were to be converted in an additional single occupant.

MR. BARATTA: Just a suggestion, I think we talked about something similar to that at walkable Novi, meaning, but I would think at some point in the future you may want to consider expansion. So you want those utility lines to be in the right spot. Thank you. That's all my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have two questions. We have bicycle racks incorporated into --

MR. DURKEE: We do, yes. I'm not sure that they show on the plan, but --

MR. MONK: I believe that's -- we have had those conversations with Sri and
that would be incorporated into that site plan. And we haven't settled on final fixtures underneath the building either, so that would come in at a later stage.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Light fixtures you said?

MR. MONK: No. Tables, seating areas.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: How about lighting, what type of lighting? We didn't see anything. I didn't see anything on lighting.

MR. DURKEE: Our intent is to, for the most part, light the underside of that roof, and in fact, provide some glow for the (unintelligible).

So that in an ideal world, you seat lit surfaces rather than bulbs themselves so that reduces the amount of glare. That would be our intent. And the internal lighting of the space and then that would essentially spread out and provide surrounding lighting as well.

So there really isn't intended -- you can see that there is
lighting right there at the -- street
ing, you can see one post there.

    So there is something in
place there, but are intent is to have more a
less like a glow to the space, and then it
would be lit very softly.

    MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. That's
it. Thank you.

    MR. GIACOPETTI: Couple of
questions on the facade.

    Did you consider alternate
materials to the asphalt singles, which takes
you about 6 percent of the facade?

    MR. DURKEE: We looked at a
metal roof as a potential. The problem there
is, getting the arc in the metal is a very
difficult condition to achieve.

    It would be costly, on the
order of four times the cost of the shingle
or asphalt single.

    So outside of that, we
really didn't go beyond that. We sort of
settled on the asphalt in a reddish tone,
again, to emulate the original casino. It
fits well with the curve and linear nature of
the roof.

MR. GIACOPETTI: And the siding, the continuous siding, is there a reason why that's not brick, to be more consistent with the facade ordinance?

MR. DURKEE: I think -- again, it was, I think more in line with kind of harkening back the original building, which had that ship lap siding and really to essentially try and emulate that.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The substance of the past facade ordinance, you know -- because it's -- I appreciate the intent. I don't feel like the city is holding itself to the same standard that it would expect of a developer. So I cannot support this part of the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Any other questions?

(No audible responses.)

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: In the matter of the Pavilion Shore Park restrooms, slash, shelter area, JSP16-02, motion to approve the
preliminary site plan and Section 9 waiver
based on subject two, the item listed on A
through C in the motion sheet and because
this motion and because of the plan is
otherwise in compliance with Article 3,
Article 4, Article 5 and Article 6 of the
zoning ordinance and all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion
by Member Greco, seconded by Member Baratta.

Any other comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri,
will you please call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair
Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes six to one.

MR. BARATTA:

MR. GRECO: In the matter of Pavilion Shore Park, restroom slash shelter area, JSP16-02, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on a subject two finding of compliance of ordinance standards and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because this motion is made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances an all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta. Any other comments? (No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, please call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MR. BARATTA:

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes seven to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set, gentlemen.

Next matter for discussion?

Any special matters, supplemental issues?

Audience participation?

There is one and only person in the audience that doesn't want to say hello.

We will close the audience participation and ask for a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)
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