

REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY OF NOVI

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2018 7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road

BOARD MEMBERS:

Linda Krieger, Chairperson

Brent Ferrell, Deputy Chairperson

Cynthia Gronachan, Secretary

David M. Byrwa

Thomas Nafso

Siddharth Mav Sanghvi

Joe Peddiboyina

ALSO PRESENT:

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

Lawrence Butler, Comm. Development, Dep. Director

Katherine Opperman, Recording Secretary

Reported by:

Darlene K. May, Certified Shorthand Reporter

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

Novi, Michigan

Tuesday, September 11, 2018

7:00 p.m.

- - -

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good evening. And welcome to the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals. This is for Tuesday, the 11th of September. If we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, and if Member Gronachan can lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. And Katherine, if you can, call the role, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Bywra?

MEMBER BYRWA: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Olson is absent, excused.

Member Nafso?

1 MEMBER NAFSO: Here.

2 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

4 MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Sanghvi?

5 MEMBER SANGHVI: Here.

6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. We have a
7 full board. It's a public hearing format and our Rules
8 of Conduct are back with the agenda.

9 And speaking of agenda, do we have an
10 approval for our current agenda? Are there any
11 additions or deletions?

12 None?

13 MS. OPPERMAN: None at this time.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.

15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I move that the agenda be
16 approved as stands.

17 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. We have a
19 motion and a second. All in favor say "Aye."

20 Aye.

21 MEMBER BYRWA: Aye.

22 MEMBER FERRELL: Aye.

23 MEMBER OLSEN: Aye.

1 MEMBER NAFSO: Aye.

2 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.

3 MEMBER SANGHVI: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: None opposed? Okay.

5 So we have an agenda.

6 Minutes, we have none for this month.

7 Public remarks. If anyone has any comments
8 regarding anything except the cases that are to be
9 presented, you may come up and speak. If not, then
10 we'll go on with our meeting.

11 Public hearings. We have four cases tonight.
12 And our first one is PZ18-0029 for Hillside Investments
13 for 25540 Seeley Road.

14 If the petitioner could come up and state
15 their case.

16 MR. HARDIN: Good evening. I'm Dave Hardin,
17 development manager for Hillside Investments. I'm here
18 tonight to discuss what we're calling Novi Tech Center.

19 MEMBER NAFSO: Could you also state your
20 address as well and I'm going to ask that you raise
21 your right hand and be sworn in.

22 MR. HARDIN: Sure. My address is 39475 West
23 13 Mile Road, Suite 203, Novi, Michigan 48377.

1 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you. Can you please
2 raise your right hand?

3 Do you swear to tell the truth in this
4 matter?

5 MR. HARDIN: Yes.

6 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

7 MR. HARDIN: So, as I said, I'm Dave Hardin,
8 development manager for Hillside Investments. I'm here
9 tonight to discuss Novi Technology Center Building Six
10 and Seven. Hillside Investments is the current
11 property owner of the Novi Technology Center, which is
12 off of the north side of Grand River Road, a few blocks
13 east of Seeley Road. The development consists of five
14 buildings totaling roughly a hundred thousand square
15 feet.

16 This development is one of our arguably best
17 assets in our portfolio. It's had virtually zero
18 long-term vacancy over many years. We have tenants
19 like Sony, Mitsumi, Prestige Portraits. Very
20 reputable, nationwide and global tenants.

21 The reason that I'm here today is some of our
22 tenants have discussed the need, when it comes time to
23 renew their leases, that they need more spaces. So we

1 have gone down the path of seeking to construct two
2 new, roughly, 25,000 square foot, kind of single-story
3 office, lab-type spaces for them at the additional
4 property to the northwest of the current technology
5 center.

6 Just to go through the plan a little bit,
7 there are a few changes, I believe, from the plan that
8 you have seen. We worked through some additional
9 details during the Planning Commission stage. And as
10 we worked through some details with the property owner
11 to the north of the mobile home park, we brought the --
12 the berm height has increased a few feet along the
13 entire length of the berm.

14 We brought the edge of the berm all the way
15 up to the edge of the parking lot. We've also provided
16 a substantial amount more trees on that berm, more than
17 what is required. And we have a six-foot privacy fence
18 along the entire north property line.

19 We were seeking to have that fence atop the
20 berm, but in our discussions with the property owner to
21 the north, they asked that we move it to the property
22 line as opposed to the top of the berm, which we didn't
23 have an issue with.

1 The two variances that we are here seeking
2 are to allow two accessory structures on the side yard.
3 Those two structures would be a dumpster enclosure and
4 a transformer, electrical transformer. Those are in
5 between the two buildings just to the south of the
6 buildings. And then the other variance would be a
7 dimensional variance for a -- we're asking for a
8 55-foot parking setback and move the 100-foot parking
9 setback between industrial zone and residential
10 properties.

11 The hardships that we face with this lot are
12 the very narrow shape of the lot. It's approximately
13 300 feet by 1100 feet. And that kind of I'll call it
14 spot zoning of residential development in what is
15 otherwise a large tract of industrial zone plan.
16 They're from essentially Haggerty to Meadowbrook, Grand
17 River up to 96 is industrial zone with the exception of
18 some properties off of Grand River.

19 However, in the back there is a couple of
20 small parcels of residential zoning. Which the
21 combination of those two being that we have the long
22 side of our property up against the residential
23 development. It makes for that hundred foot parking

1 setback extremely difficult to achieve. We went
2 through -- this is probably the seventh or eighth
3 different land iteration.

4 We tried to balance all the things. We tried
5 numerous times to meet the requirement, but in doing so
6 we were not able to meet the parking spaces required.
7 And to even get closer, you'd have to destroy all of
8 the regulated woodland that currently exists to the
9 west side of the property. We tried to leave that as
10 much in place as possible to protect that regulated
11 woodland.

12 The way we laid out the site was kind of a
13 balance, like I said, of all those different things.
14 We tried to keep the woodlands to the west and we knew
15 that we needed to have our retention (ph) basin in the
16 northeast corner. So we kind of fit everything in
17 between there.

18 We did -- we tried to come up with a
19 development that we thought would be a win/win
20 situation for everyone in the area including the
21 residences to the north. We worked, as I said, with
22 the owners of the property to the north through the
23 Planning Commission stages to come to agreements on,

1 you know, some things like a no-turn right sign at the
2 Seeley Road exit for trucks. So that trucks could only
3 turn left so they do not, you know, travel in front of
4 the mobile home community.

5 And we're keeping the trucks on the south
6 side of the building. So you see, the buildings are
7 kind of a U-shape, which helps kind of to shelter and
8 enclose those truck areas.

9 One thing to note, too, this is not a
10 normal -- we don't have any truck wells or any dock
11 equipment here. The trucks that frequent this
12 development are more like small, box trucks, like a
13 moving truck size truck. So it's just for minor
14 deliveries here and there. There's no large scale
15 semi-trucking on site.

16 So, like I said, we've tried to come up with
17 something that would be agreeable with everybody. We
18 will have normal office business operation hours. So
19 the standard, you know, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. There
20 will not be any late night activity on the site.

21 We've designed our photometric study so that
22 even before you get to the berm there is no light that
23 is being -- before you get to the top of the berm,

1 there is no light that is being transmitted from the
2 buildings onto and above that berm height. There
3 should be no light pollution to the property to the
4 north.

5 Let's see. What else?

6 As I mentioned, this is more -- even though
7 it is zone industrial, it is heavy office use. Our
8 existing tenants are primarily -- I'll call it 80
9 percent office, with the 20 percent either storage,
10 warehouse or a lab-type component in the back.

11 You know, we've positioned the buildings to
12 have the more pleasant, visually appealing side of the
13 buildings to the north and, like I said, tuck
14 everything -- all the logistics operations tuck it into
15 the south.

16 With that, I'll take any questions.

17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you
18 very much. Very enlightening.

19 Is there anyone in the audience who would
20 like to speak regarding this case? If you do, you
21 could come up to the podium, state your name and spell
22 it for the court recorder and proceed.

23 Seeing none, we'll close that.

1 And from the City?

2 MR. BUTLER: Yes, Madame Chair, I would just
3 like to say that they are working with a very narrow
4 lot. They had to go lengthwise instead of widthwise.
5 And this was noted. That's how they added the
6 additional screening to the top of the berm for the
7 residents that are to the north. And also by doing
8 that, they also did not have to take on the regulated
9 wetland trees that are to the west. As we all know, in
10 Novi we love our trees.

11 So they did a good job of that and paying
12 attention to the additional prodding from the building
13 department. That was something that the developer did
14 on their own.

15 And also, I noted, if you'll notice they have
16 two accessory structures in the back. And I would like
17 to find out what is in the additional structure? One
18 is the trash enclosure. Is the other one a transformer
19 or air conditioner unit?

20 MR. HARDIN: Yes. It's a trash enclosure and
21 a electrical transformer.

22 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. HARDIN: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

2 MR. BUTLER: That's all I have.

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
4 Correspondence?

5 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes. There were two separate
6 mailings related to this petition. There was a first
7 mailing in August; 38 letters were mailed, 10 returned,
8 zero approvals, zero objections.

9 And there was a second renounce in September
10 that included the individual addresses of the mobile
11 home community. And so in that mailing there were a
12 hundred letters mailed, two letters returned, zero
13 approvals and zero objections.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. And I'll
15 open it to up to the board for questions and/or a
16 motion.

17 Yes, Member Gronachan?

18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good evening. Very nice
19 presentation. Could you just point out, please, where
20 the transformer and the dumpster are going in your
21 picture, please.

22 I don't know if you want to move that back a
23 little bit because I don't know about the video, if

1 they're going to be able to pick it up on the camera.

2 MR. HARDIN: Sure.

3 (Complied.)

4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's fine. I think
5 you're good here.

6 MR. HARDIN: There's a small grass area here
7 where we would like to locate the dumpster enclosures
8 and the transformer would be located directly next to
9 it.

10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. And that's on the
11 opposite side of the mobile home park, correct?

12 MR. HARDIN: That's correct.

13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. And what are the
14 hours of operation for the transformer? Just when
15 there's a power outage or was that ...

16 MR. HARDIN: A transformer is necessary at
17 every element to downgrade the high voltage from the
18 power lines. It's just a small --

19 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. Transformer. All
20 right. All right. I got it. I had something else in
21 mind.

22 MR. HARDIN: Okay.

23 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So thank you for that. I

1 just was not clear on that.

2 And then in terms of the parking lot, now,
3 you're increasing -- you're adding the buildings
4 because they're increasing their business. Are you
5 increasing employees as well?

6 MR. HARDIN: Yes.

7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So where is the parking
8 for the additional employees going to be? Does
9 the total site --

10 MR. HARDIN: Well, the parking provided for
11 these two buildings is entirely sufficient for these
12 two buildings.

13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay.

14 MR. HARDIN: So any additional employees will
15 be able to park in these spaces and would not need
16 extra parking in the additional center.

17 MEMBER GRONACHAN: All right. So despite the
18 fact that, um ...

19 All right. Okay. That's all I needed to
20 verify. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Member Ferrell?

22 MEMBER FERRELL: I had a question about you
23 said you talked to the properties to the north to keep

1 the truck traffic. Where was that going to be? I
2 guess I missed that when you were saying that.

3 MR. HARDIN: We worked with the mobile home
4 park to the north. They had requested when trucks are
5 leaving and exiting the property here on Seeley Road
6 that they not be able to turn right which would crowd
7 them in front of their residences. So we will locate a
8 "No Turn Right" sign here.

9 MEMBER FERRELL: So you would want them to
10 take a left when they come out to head south?

11 MR. HARDIN: Correct. And we also here, once
12 the trucks come in to the site, there's a sign here "No
13 Turn Left." So all truck traffic has to continue
14 straight behind the building as opposed to around.

15 MEMBER FERRELL: So when they come out
16 they'll be going south?

17 MR. HARDIN: Correct.

18 MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Other questions?

20 MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah, I believe on the south
21 side where the dumpster enclosure and transformer is
22 going to be, is there fire department access? Can the
23 City get a fire truck in there if it had to?

1 MR. HARDIN: In where?

2 MEMBER BYRWA: It's along the bottom side of
3 the ...

4 MR. HARDIN: Along the property line here?

5 MEMBER BYRWA: Right. In there.

6 MR. HARDIN: I would tend to believe so. I
7 think behind the dumpster enclosure there's a parking
8 space that's at least 30 to 35 feet before you get to
9 the property line.

10 MEMBER BYRWA: So you're saying there would
11 be fire department access to get a Novi fire truck in
12 there, if it had to?

13 MR. HARDIN: Behind the dumpster on this
14 side?

15 MEMBER BYRWA: No. I'm talking about in
16 access to the building. If the buildings was on fire,
17 would you be able to access the fire from that south
18 side?

19 MR. HARDIN: Yes. Yes, sir.

20 MEMBER BYRWA: Okay.

21 MEMBER NAFSO: Just one quick question. So
22 if entering that parking lot, is the entrance intended
23 to be off of Seeley Road as well? Is there also --

1 there's also a way to enter off of Haggerty and Grand
2 River, correct?

3 MR. HARDIN: Correct.

4 MEMBER NAFSO: But Seeley would take you
5 directly in to the property?

6 MR. HARDIN: Correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I wanted to ask, when
8 you said the "lighting in the berm," so the parking lot
9 lights are level to the berm?

10 MR. HARDIN: We do not have any light bulbs.
11 It's all building lights, ball packs attached to the
12 building. So there would not be any light poles in the
13 parking lot.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And then the
15 landscaping would be trees and evergreens?

16 MR. HARDIN: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. I would be in
18 support of this motion regarding the discussion and
19 needs taken care of. Thank you.

20 Yes?

21 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. A good
22 presentation. And do you know how many approximately
23 are in the parking lot, the number of parking cars?

1 MR. HARDIN: I believe it's around 220
2 parking spaces.

3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Wonderful. I have no
4 issue. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good. Do you want to
6 make a motion?

7 MEMBER FERRELL: Yeah. If you'd like.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead.

9 MEMBER FERRELL: I move that we grant the
10 variance in case number PZ18-0029 sought by the
11 petitioner for a reduction of the north parking lot
12 from 100 feet to 55 feet setback because petitioner has
13 shown practical difficulty requiring the addition of
14 two accessory structures to accommodate the long-term
15 tenants allowing them more storage.

16 Without the variance, the petitioner will be
17 unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the
18 use of the property because they risk the loss of the
19 long-term tenants that they've had on site. The
20 property is unique because the lot is narrow in shape.
21 The petitioner did not create the condition. This was
22 done as the lot was -- when it was platted.

23 The relief granted will not unreasonably

1 interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties
2 because they worked with the owners of the property to
3 the north with keeping truck traffic to the south as
4 they come out of the facility and not disturb the
5 mobile home neighborhood to the north of it, and they
6 also increased the height and size of the berms,
7 creating an additional screening.

8 The relief is consistent with the spirit and
9 intent of the ordinance.

10 MEMBER BYWRA: I'll second that.

11 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. We have a motion
12 and a second. Any other discussion?

13 Seeing none, if Katherine could call the
14 role.

15 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?

16 MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

17 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

18 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

19 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

20 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

21 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger?

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

23 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

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

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Bywra?

MEMBER BYWRA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations.

MR. SAROKI: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings us to our next case, PZ18-00037, for Saroki Architecture for 26090 Ingersol Drive, east of Novi and north of Grand River. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi ordinance section 28-5(d) for installation of an additional 20 square foot exterior building wall sign. One sign allowed by code. The property is zoned Town Center.

And if the petitioner could come to the board.

And this is for Wal-Mart, correct?

MR. SAROKI: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So, if you could, state your name and spell it for our court recorder and be

1 sworn in if you're not an attorney.

2 MR. SAROKI: Sure.

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

4 MR. SAROKI: I'm not an attorney. My name is
5 Victor Saroki. My address is 430 North Old Woodward.
6 We are architects in Birmingham.

7 MEMBER NAFSO: Good evening, Mr. Saroki. Do
8 you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

9 MR. SAROKI: Yes, I do.

10 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

11 MR. SAROKI: I don't know if we will have the
12 OPPORTUNITY to have the front elevation of the Wal-Mart
13 pulled up. Unless I can try to put this on.

14 (Document displayed.)

15 MR. SAROKI: Good evening. So we are
16 architects and we're actually representing a client
17 which is a very good client of ours, the Michigan First
18 Credit Union. They are a credit union throughout the
19 state. They are headquartered in Lathrup Village. In
20 fact, we did their original building in Lathrup Village
21 and we just had a ribbon cutting today for our big
22 expansion at their headquarters this morning.

23 They have a series of branches in Wal-Mart

1 stores throughout the state and in Kroger stores. And
2 this one, of course, is for the Wal-Mart store on
3 Ingersol Drive. The Michigan First Credit Union is a
4 separate business within the Wal-Mart store. And, as
5 you can imagine, a credit union is similar to a bank
6 like you see banks in these larger stores.

7 So the credit union has a couple of loan
8 officers and they also have two ATM machines and a coin
9 machine with the store. As you know, Wal-Mart is a
10 very large big-box tenant. The store is 140,000 square
11 feet. So, obviously, a very large store.

12 And the facade is about 500 feet long. It is
13 in the TC zoning district, Town Center district. And
14 under the sign ordinance it would be considered as a
15 single business for Wal-Mart as a big-box user. So,
16 you know, under the sign ordinance, we're allowed one
17 main wall sign and the Wal-Mart sign is about 300
18 square feet.

19 Wal-Mart does have, in that they have
20 received approval on, some smaller signs that designate
21 the departments within the Wal-Mart store. For
22 example, there's a small sign on the facade that says
23 "Market". And that is in this area right here. They

1 also have a small sign that says "Home and Pharmacy".

2 And it is in this area here. You can see it the

3 enlargement down below.

4 And they have an "Outdoor Living" sign, which

5 is an outdoor garden center, which is at this far end

6 here. If you add up all of their signs, it is about

7 450 square feet, not very much when you include,

8 really, the size of this facade.

9 Our proposal for the Michigan First Credit

10 Union is, quite frankly, a fairly, modest sign. It is

11 only 20 square feet. It is nine feet, three inches in

12 width and two foot two inches tall and on the facade,

13 on the overall facade, it's in this area. You can see

14 it right there. And on the enlargement, it's right

15 here over.

16 It will be an illuminated sign as we're

17 proposing it. It is a white channel letter sign with a

18 black frame. The acrylic on the base is white. Our

19 request is for a dimensional variance for this

20 independent business to provide exposure for the credit

21 union.

22 And by the way, I would point out, that this

23 is -- or has been approved by the Wal-Mart subject to

1 your approval.

2 So when we look at the sign ordinance and we
3 review the standards for sign variances, there are
4 several standards for us to meet. And I believe we can
5 demonstrate that we can meet those standards. So
6 standard number one talks about extraordinary
7 circumstances or conditions. And I think there's,
8 actually, are two conditions that apply. One would be
9 item D, the scale of the building or the lot frontage.

10 So again, this is a single business that
11 would be reviewed under the ordinance. So you've got
12 this large box. But again, we have a facade that is
13 500 feet long. And, in fact, the area of the facade is
14 almost 15,000 square feet. Our proposal is only about
15 one and a half percent of this entire facade. So it is
16 minimal.

17 And I would also point out that our building
18 is setback 735 feet from the center line of Ingersol
19 Road. So, again, the building is set way back and
20 we've got a very, very large facade.

21 Also item E talks about variances that are
22 not self-created and a practical difficulty would cause
23 the need for a variance. We do have a practical

1 difficult in meeting the exact language of the
2 ordinance for a single business and, therefore, we need
3 the variance on this very large facade.

4 Standard number two talks about the limited
5 use of the property. It talks about failure to grant
6 relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of
7 the property. In our opinion failure to grant relief
8 will prevent this separate business of the credit union
9 to have what we would consider an expected opportunity
10 to have exterior signage.

11 Standard number three talks about adverse
12 impact on the surrounding area. And I would say that
13 the granting of this variance will not interfere with
14 adjacent properties. Substantial justice, in our
15 opinion, will be served in granting this variance to
16 this business, to the community and to the patrons and
17 customers of both Wal-Mart and the credit union.

18 In our opinion it would be an unnecessary
19 hardship for this business if they cannot have this
20 modest sign.

21 If this, as an example, if this were a
22 multiple business center, let's say like a retail
23 center or strip center, you can imagine on a 500 feet

1 long facade you could easily have 20 separate
2 businesses of each business having a facade 25 feet
3 wide. And if this were the case, you would have 20
4 signs and each sign would be larger than the one we're
5 proposing.

6 So I don't think this is excessive. I think
7 it's a modest request. It is a request that is
8 important to the credit union to have the exterior
9 signage and one that Wal-Mart supports.

10 We think it meets the spirit and intent of
11 the ordinance and we hope that you will approve this
12 dimensional variance.

13 I'm happy to answer any questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

15 Is there anyone in the audience that has any
16 questions regarding this case?

17 Seeing none, I open it up to the City.

18 MR. BUTLER: Just one point I want to make
19 was that, before the credit union went in there there
20 were other businesses in that spot without any signage
21 on the front, which had been denied earlier. And it
22 was very difficult to know that that business was in
23 there. Which is what would pose a hardship. It was a

1 Del Taco, if you remember. There was a Del Taco in
2 there and then the space was used for an overstock sale
3 type of deal since then.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Thank you
5 very much.

6 Yes?

7 MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. I have a question for
8 the City. With our sign ordinance, the 20 feet over,
9 is that a certain subsquare footage or percent of
10 elevation or how is our sign ordinance? Obviously, it
11 doesn't seem like it took into account a 500 plus
12 length of building.

13 MR. BUTLER: No, sir. No, it did not. The
14 business was only one sign and that's the variance
15 they're asking for. We did look at the dimensions and
16 that has no impact on that because it's just ...

17 I believe you said 20 square foot sign?

18 MR. SAROKI: 20 square foot.

19 MR. BYRWA: Okay. But that was 20 square
20 foot over. I was wondering how the existing is
21 determined, though.

22 MR. BUTLER: That is determined by frontage.
23 By the length of the frontage.

1 MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. All right. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there any
5 correspondence?

6 MEMBER NAFSO: There were 42 letters mailed,
7 three letters returned, zero approvals, zero
8 objections.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. And I'll
10 open it up to the board.

11 Yes, Member Gronachan?

12 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good evening.

13 MR. SAROKI: Good evening.

14 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I have no problem with
15 this request. I think that your presentation was
16 outstanding, by the way.

17 MR. SAROKI: Thank you.

18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good job. And I feel that
19 because this is a separate business going in for under
20 separate square footage, basically, they could rent a
21 face from Wal-Mart and that's, basically, what they're
22 doing. They're just not changing the facade of the
23 building to represent the separate entrance for the

1 bank.

2 Having said that, that Town Center is growing
3 by leaps and bounds and people are in it all the time,
4 and I'm glad to see that. So if this sign is going to
5 help bring people to your credit union, then I'm all
6 for it. And I think that the size of the sign is
7 minimal based on the size of the building and I think
8 that this is a minimal request and it meets the spirit
9 of the ordinance. And I will be supporting your
10 request.

11 MR. SAROKI: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you.
13 Any other questions?

14 Yes, Member Sanghvi.

15 MEMBER SANGHVI: Have we done away with the
16 mockups in the city now?

17 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Mockups?

18 MEMBER SANGHVI: I didn't see any mockup of
19 this sign. I went looking for it yesterday. And,
20 normally, you put a mockup there so I know where this
21 sign is going and what it is going to look like.

22 MR. SAROKI: I'm sorry. I didn't know that
23 was request or a requirement. I can point on the

1 drawing.

2 MEMBER SANGHVI: Can you show me in the
3 graphic where this sign is going to be and what it is
4 going to look like?

5 MR. SAROKI: Yes, I can. So the top drawing,
6 if you see on the screen, is the overall facade. And
7 that sign is right where my pen is going. That is our
8 sign. And the drawing below it is an enlargement. And
9 you can see the Michigan First Credit Union logo is
10 right in there.

11 MEMBER SANGHVI: I see. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Good
13 clarification. Thank you.

14 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Can I make a notion?

15 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead. Thank you,
16 Member Peddiboyina. If you'd like to make a motion.

17 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. I move that
18 we grant the variance in case number PZ18-0037 sought
19 by Saroki Architecture of Michigan Credit Union because
20 the petitioner has shown the practical difficulty
21 requiring the installation of the additional 20 square
22 feet exterior wall sign.

23 Without the variance, petitioner will be

1 unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to use
2 of the property because the Michigan First Credit Union
3 branch is inside the Wal-Mart store. And the
4 petitioner -- the practicality -- the petitioner's
5 customers may not be able to find the branch. The
6 petitioner did not create the condition because the
7 Wal-Mart store is existing structure.

8 The relief granted will not unreasonably
9 interfere with adjacent and surrounding property
10 because the alteration is for the existing structure.
11 The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent
12 of the ordinance because the alteration is for existing
13 structure and the installation will not interfere to be
14 public safety. Thank you.

15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a
17 second. Any other discussion?

18 Seeing none, if Katherine could call the
19 role.

20 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa?

21 MEMBER BYRWA: Yes.

22 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

23 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

1 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?
2 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.
3 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger?
4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
5 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?
6 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.
7 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?
8 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
9 MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Sanghvi?
10 MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
11 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations.
13 MR. SAROKI: Thank you very much.
14 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck.
15 MR. SAROKI: Thank you.
16 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Um-hmm.
17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Our next case is
18 PZ18-0039, MGA Architects for 1317 East Lake Drive,
19 north of 14, south of -- wait.
20 North of 13, south of 14. The applicant
21 is seeking a variance from the zoning ordinance,
22 Section 3.1.5 for a four foot proposed side yard
23 setback, 10 feet minimum required and aggregate side

1 yard of 16 feet, 25 feet combined required. This will
2 allow a second story addition to the existing
3 non-conforming structure.

4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Madame Chair, can I ask,
5 is your mic on?

6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you.

8 MR. GORDON: Good evening.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good evening.

10 MR. GORDON: I'm Mike Gordon. My address is
11 4351 Delemere Court, Royal Oak, Michigan 48073. I'm
12 the architect representing the applicant.

13 MEMBER NAFSO: Mr. Gordon, please raise your
14 right hand.

15 Do you swear to tell the truth in this
16 matter?

17 MR. GORDON: I do.

18 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

19 MR. GORDON: Yeah. With me this evening are
20 the homeowners.

21 The project is a request for a variance to
22 construct a second floor on a non-conforming structure.
23 The home is only 1,084 square feet. With the addition

1 it will 1,960. We think this is a modest request and
2 will allow the home to be modernized and brought up to
3 a level of the surrounding neighborhood.

4 As noted, the lot is only 40 feet wide. And
5 the one, I think, advantage to the way we've designed
6 this, is the neighbor's driveway -- you know, we're
7 close to that property line, but the neighbor's
8 driveway is on that side. So the home sits relatively
9 far from both the neighbors.

10 The current home has only two bedrooms and
11 one bath, minimal living space. The addition will
12 allow for a more functional three bedroom, two bath
13 home with additional family space. The home will be
14 much more family friendly.

15 The home will have minimal impact on
16 adjoining residents and will have no deleterious
17 effects. The renovation should enhance the
18 neighborhood, which has seen significant investment
19 over the years and will continue with the established
20 patterns of investment, improvement and rebuilding.

21 The design meets the spirit and intent of the
22 ordinance and we hope you will look favorably upon us
23 and we'll answer any questions. So it's for the

1 dimensional variances for the side yards.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

3 MR. GORDON: And we know that portrays the
4 addition and we've captivated it in a very modest
5 style, and we think it will blend in with that. Even
6 the roof line has been brought down on the sides so
7 that it's only a story and a half on the corners of
8 home.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

10 MR. GORDON: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there anyone in the
12 audience that would like to speak regarding this case?

13 Seeing none, open it up to the City.

14 MR. BUTLER: Just one comment. The new
15 addition matches the footprint of the lower level.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, very good. Thank
17 you.

18 And correspondence?

19 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes. There were 51 letters
20 mailed, four letters returned, one approval. That
21 approval is from Gordon Wilson, address 1345 East Lake
22 Drive. And it states that: "Mark and ..."

23 FEMALE SPEAKER: Isley (ph).

1 MEMBER NAFSO: "Isley reviewed their plans
2 and answered the few questions I've had. Thanks for
3 taking the time to allow me to review the plans. This
4 will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. Lots
5 surrounding the lake are challenging. I am in support
6 of improving this variance."

7 Nothing further.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

9 I'll open it up to the board.

10 Member Sanghvi?

11 MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and
12 visited the property in question. I have no doubt that
13 yours is the first step of the lot. There's nothing
14 you can do without variances and you are not changing
15 the footprint at all. So I have no problem.

16 MR. GORDON: Thank you.

17 MEMBER SANGHVI: I'll support your
18 application.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I have -- the
20 foundation supports the second story?

21 MR. GORDON: Yeah. We've had an engineer
22 already out to look at that.

23 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. I also

1 would be in support because, just as you stated in your
2 beginning.

3 MR. GORDON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any other questions or
5 a motion?

6 MEMBER NAFSO: Sure. I'll take this one.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Member
8 Nafso?

9 MEMBER NAFSO: I move that we grant the
10 variance in case number PZ18-0039 sought by the
11 petitioner in this matter. The applicant -- it's for
12 the variance from the City of Novi zoning code of order
13 man section 3.1.5 for a four foot proposed side yard
14 setback where a 10 foot minimum is required. And an
15 aggregate side yard setback of 16 feet where 25 feet
16 combined aggregate is required.

17 The purpose of this is to allow for a second
18 story addition to the existing non-conforming
19 structure. Because petitioner has shown practical
20 difficulty requiring this variance. Without the
21 variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented
22 or limited with respect to use of the property because
23 of how narrow the lot is and how the lots are situated

1 there along East Lake Drive.

2 The property is unique, again, for the same
3 reason because of the way that the property is situated
4 on a very narrow lot in a very congested area.

5 The petitioner did not create this condition.
6 It existed -- in fact, there's a prior nonconforming
7 use that exists there as it stands now. And the relief
8 granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent
9 or surrounding properties. Again, simply because of
10 how the properties are situated in that area, this
11 request is more the norm than it is the exception.

12 And the relief is consistent with the spirit
13 and intent of the ordinance because of how things are
14 situated there along East Lake Drive as is precisely
15 this type of situation. And this board is called upon
16 to review and use its common sense and judgment
17 interpreting the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The motion is second.
20 Any none, if Katherine'd call the roll.

21 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?

22 MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

23 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

1 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

2 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

3 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

4 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger?

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

6 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

8 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

9 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

10 MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Bywra?

11 MEMBER BYWRA: Yes.

12 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations.

14 MR. GODSON: Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We wish you all the

16 best.

17 FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much. Thank

18 you.

19 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck.

20 FEMALE SPEAKER: That's fantastic.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. And that

22 brings us to our last case PZ18-0041, Tina and Mark

23 Miller, 1957 West Lake Drive, south of Pontiac and

1 north of South Lake. The applicant is requesting a
2 variance from the City of Novi ordinance code 3.1.5 for
3 an eight foot and 6.3 foot variance for a proposed two
4 feet and 3.7 feet side setback required, 10 feet
5 allowed.

6 A 9.4 foot variance for a proposed 5.6
7 aggregate side yard setback, 25 meet minimum required;
8 and proposed 40.1 percent lot coverage, 25 percent
9 maximum allowed. Covered balcony is included in these
10 requested variance boundaries.

11 Go ahead.

12 MR. MILLER: Hi.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Hi.

14 MR. MILLER: This is my wife Tina. I'm Mark
15 Miller. We reside at 1957 West Lake Drive Novi,
16 Michigan 48377.

17 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you. Let the record
18 reflect that you're both raising your right hands.

19 Do you each swear to tell the truth in this
20 matter?

21 MR. MILLER: Yes.

22 MRS. MILLER: Yes, I do.

23 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

1 MR. MILLER: So the prior applicant kind of
2 stole my thunder. I think we live probably right
3 across the lake from each other. But, as you're well
4 aware now, there are hardships with living on Walled
5 Lake and one of those hardships is very narrow lot.
6 Ours in particular is a little over 30 feet and we have
7 a house that is currently 24 feet wide. So at some
8 point a variance was obtained from the City of Novi for
9 the existing structure.

10 We were in here in 2012, I believe it was, to
11 get a variance on a construction of a garage, which was
12 our first phase of this remodeling project. We are
13 now in here, basically, requesting or reaffirming the
14 variance that we had previously obtained for this
15 addition between the garage and the house and a little
16 addition off the back of the house towards the lake.
17 Some people call it the front, to me it's the back
18 because it's not the street side.

19 So we are staying within the existing house
20 footprint. We're not getting any closer to the lot
21 line. So we're not changing the relationship between
22 the property and the building structure. We're just
23 trying to reaffirm the distance that we have between

1 the house and the garage, if we maintain that property
2 relationship, that we will be allowed to complete the
3 construction.

4 So there's -- as was read, the distance that
5 needs to be maintained by the variance and we are
6 certainly not within that. And that is because of the
7 property size. Also, I talked -- the variance requests
8 a larger use of the property by volume. So we're going
9 to go from 25 percent to nearly 40 percent or a little
10 over 40 percent.

11 All of this is consistent with the homes
12 currently that have been remodeled along West Lake
13 Drive. If you had a chance to drive that area, you'll
14 see there are some very nice and large homes that have
15 been recently remodeled in the last few years. And we
16 believe that allowing us this variance and the ability
17 to add on to our home is in compliance with and suits
18 the neighborhood more than the condition of our house
19 right now, which was last remodeled or built, we don't
20 know which it was, in 1986.

21 So we believe we have some unique
22 circumstances with the lot size. We don't believe
23 there's an increase in fire potential or public safety

1 due to adding, basically, along our length and not
2 widening our property at all -- or widening the house
3 on the property.

4 We believe this will increase our property
5 value and make the neighborhood itself more appealing.
6 Because, as was stated before, more and more houses now
7 along the lake's edge are being remodeled as more
8 affluent people are coming into the neighborhood and
9 wanting to live on the lake. And they're converting
10 the smaller cottages into larger residential buildings
11 or homes because they have multiple kids or larger
12 families.

13 I think you have on record a signed statement
14 from our residents, our closest residents to the
15 northeast on 1953 West Lake Drive, a Mr. Robertson. We
16 sat with him and his wife on our patio and went through
17 our building structure and walked the property and took
18 the tape measure out. And upon that evening, he signed
19 the statement that he didn't feel that this impinged
20 upon his ability to view the lake or the access or use
21 of his property.

22 And again, I want to state that we believe
23 the variance is within the character of the

1 neighborhood.

2 So with that --

3 MRS. MILLER: The neighbor.

4 MR. MILLER: Oh, and we do have -- a neighbor
5 to our south, just on the on side of 1953, there's a
6 vacant lot, the city of Novi owns it, and then the
7 immediate home is Elizabeth's home. And so she's just
8 here for moral support and any comments she would like
9 to make.

10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

11 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

13 Is there anyone in the audience that would
14 like to make a comment?

15 Okay. If you could state your name and then
16 spell it for our court recorder (sic).

17 MS. BURKETT: My name is Elizabeth Biretta,
18 B-u-r-k-e-t-t. I live at 2005 West Lake Drive. As
19 Mr. Miller said, I am --

20 MEMBER NAFSO: Can you please raise your
21 right hand?

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We'll have you sworn
23 in.

1 MEMBER NAFSO: Do you swear to tell the truth
2 in this matter?

3 MS. BURKETT: I do.

4 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

5 MS. BURKETT: As Mark said, I'm their nearest
6 neighbor to the south. In between my house and lot and
7 their house and lot, there are two empty lots that the
8 City owns. And I have lived in my house since 1979 and
9 those lots have been empty the majority of that time.

10 Since I've lived in my house a long time, I
11 have seen a lot of changes in the neighborhood.
12 Originally, they were summer homes and very small and
13 the houses were so staggered. But as houses have been
14 renovated and a number of new houses have been built on
15 our street on the lake side, all of those houses are
16 long and narrow and fill more of the lot than the
17 original sort of cabins did in the beginning.

18 I think that the plans that you have to
19 remodel their house, I do think it will improve not
20 only my view, but also the property value because it
21 does enhance the neighborhood every time a house is
22 improved and more modernized. So I approve and I would
23 like to say so.

1 Do you have any questions for a neighbor?

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Thank you
3 very much.

4 MEMBER NAFSO: Just to be clear, your house
5 is on the other side of that parcel that's owned by the
6 City?

7 MS. BURKETT: Yes. There's one that has a
8 drain and then another small lot that the City bought
9 many years ago I think for tax purposes or got it
10 through a tax issue.

11 MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

12 And, Mr. Miller, just to be clear, does your
13 home directly abut that lot or is your home between you
14 and that lot?

15 MR. MILLER: No. We are adjacent to the lot.
16 Actually, there's an easement that has a storm drain
17 and then the City-owned property that used to be some
18 residential home at one point I believe. So we are
19 next to the easement that is next to the vacant
20 property.

21 MEMBER NAFSO: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. MILLER: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anyone else in the

1 audience.

2 Seeing none, I'll close it from the public.

3 And from the City.

4 MR. BUTLER: The only comment is a very
5 narrow lake lot which makes it hard for the house to
6 conform to normal zoning standards.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.

8 And correspondence?

9 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes. There were 43 letters
10 mailed, zero letters returned. One approval and zero
11 objections.

12 And the approval letter, I believe, is the
13 one that Mr. Miller mentioned here. It's dated August
14 19th, 2018. It's from the neighbor at 1953 West Lake
15 Drive.

16 "As a homeowner of adjacent residents of
17 1953 West Lake Drive, Novi, Michigan, I have reviewed
18 the neighbor's revised lot survey showing a proposed
19 home addition for residents at 1957 West Lake Drive and
20 determined that the home addition will not obstruct or
21 otherwise block the view of Walled Lake. By signing
22 this document I acknowledge the decision of the City of
23 Novi Zoning Board.

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

2 Now I'll open it up to the board.

3 Yes, Member Sanghvi?

4 MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.

5 I came and visited your place and as soon as

6 I came there, I realized I have been there before.

7 Thank you for reminding me that you were here five

8 years ago or six years ago.

9 MRS. MILLER: The garage.

10 MR. MILLER: I hope you found it better this

11 time than the last time.

12 MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. Actually, I was

13 surprised that you wanted to do anything. You still

14 have a good-looking garage in front of your house. And

15 I said, "Why do they want to break this all down and do

16 it all over again?"

17 MRS. MILLER: Attached.

18 MEMBER SANGHVI: But I see your point. And I

19 understand it. You can't do anything without these

20 variances and I have no problem. I totally support

21 you, sir. Now, go ahead and have the best of luck with

22 your new home. Thank you.

23 MR. MILLER: Appreciate it.

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, Member

2 Peddiboyina?

3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

4 Tina and Mark, a nice, good presentation. I
5 visited your property, as my colleagues here. And also
6 there are a lot of properties that are renovated and
7 very beautiful houses. I have no issue and I'm okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

9 I also have over the years been driving up
10 and down West Lake. And after I found it, I said,
11 "Wow, this is a cool road."

12 And watching how they improved over the
13 years, it's nice to see and I also am in favor of your
14 request.

15 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Bywra, can you
17 help us with a motion?

18 MEMBER BYRWA: I wasn't prepared on this one
19 here.

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You can wing it and we
21 can help you.

22 MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. We can maybe give it a
23 try here.

1 I move that we grant the variance for case
2 number PZ18-0041 by Tina and Mark Miller. It's for
3 1957 West Lake Drive. Let me see, they're proposing
4 two feet and 3.7 feet side yard requested. Minimum of
5 10 feet is allowed. In a 9.4 foot variance for a
6 proposed 5.6 aggregate side yard setback minimum, 25
7 foot required.

8 I believe that the petitioner would be
9 unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to using
10 the property without the variance. The variance is not
11 unique. It's pretty minimal in size, I guess, in
12 comparison to the rest of the neighborhood. It's
13 similar.

14 The petitioner did not create the variance.
15 The property was previously platted and the house was
16 pretty much existing on the lot when you bought it.
17 And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere
18 with adjacent surrounding properties. I don't believe
19 it would.

20 And the relief is consistent with the spirit
21 and intent of the ordinance. So for those reasons, I
22 move that we approve the variance.

23 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Will you accept a friendly

1 amendment?

2 MEMBER BYWRA: Yes.

3 MEMBER GRONACHAN: To add the 40 percent lot
4 coverage.

5 MEMBER BYRWA: Oh, the change from the 25
6 percent to 40.1.1 percent?

7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Correct.

8 MEMBER BYRWA: Yes.

9 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Then I would second that.

10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a
11 second. Any other additions?

12 Okay. Seeing none, Katherine, call the role.

13 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?

14 MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

15 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

16 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

17 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

18 MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

19 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger?

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

21 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

23 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

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

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Bywra?

MEMBER BYWRA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MEMBER BYRWA: Good luck.

MR. MILLER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Any other
matters?

No other matters. Then a motion to adjourn?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Make a motion to adjourn the
meeting.

MEMBER BYRWA: Support.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Very good.
We're adjourned.

(At 7:53 p.m., matter concluded.)

- -

