

**CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL
31555 W. ELEVEN MILE ROAD
FARMINGTON HILL, MI 48336
JULY 14, 2026**

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Irvin called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and made standard introductory remarks to explain the role of the ZBA and the formal procedures of the meeting.

A site visit had been held Sunday, July 12, 2026. No business had been conducted.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Irvin, Jamil, O'Connell, Khan, Rich, Rowland (alt), Vergun

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Kettler-Schmult,
Code and Zoning Supervisor Curry, City Attorney Mendelsohn, Recording
Secretary McGuire

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Jamil, supported by Vergun, to add Public Comment following Case C and before Approval of Minutes.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION by Rich, supported by O'Connell, to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. ZBA CASE: 7-26-5786

LOCATION: 28370 Danvers Ct.

PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-12-452-011

ZONE: RA-1B

REQUEST: In order to park and store recreational trailers and equipment in the front yard the following variance is requested:

- 1. A variance from section 34-5.7.1-3 and 34-5.1 of the zoning ordinance to permit parking and storage of recreational equipment or trailers where it is prohibited.**

CODE SECTION: 34-5.7.1-3, 34-5.1

APPLICANT: Anthony LaRussa

OWNER: Anthony LaRussa

Background

Director of Planning and Community Development Kettler-Schmult provided the facts of this case. The applicant submitted a site layout and a document identifying the usable area of the property, which is located in the RA-1B one-family residential district and fronts on Danvers Court. The property includes a waterway, and a twelve-foot elevation change from the

northwest corner to the southeast corner. Other properties in the neighborhood also contain waterways and significant elevation changes.

Director Kettler-Schmult reviewed the ordinance definitions of front, side, and rear yards. She explained that the request involves two related but distinct variance components. Section 34-5.7.1 governs the limited period during which recreational equipment or trailers may be placed in otherwise prohibited areas for loading and unloading. Storage beyond the permitted 72-hour period requires a use variance.

Sections 34-5.7.2 and 34-5.7.3 address the physical location of such equipment and are nonuse variance provisions. Section 34-5.1 concerns general accessory structure standards and also requires a nonuse variance.

The requests are governed by different standards, and all standards applicable to the use variance must be satisfied.

Applicant Presentation

Anthony LaRussa, 28370 Danvers Court, stated that the configuration of his property makes it difficult to move and store equipment within the areas permitted by ordinance. The lots in the area have unique physical characteristics that require different approaches to access and use.

Joe LaRussa, 20953 Birchwood Street, Farmington, identified himself as a registered professional engineer in Michigan with 22 years of experience. He presented technical information on the applicant's behalf. He stated that the parcel is constrained by longstanding natural conditions, including creek and drainage influences, recorded drainage easements, irregular lot geometry, and limited usable area. He opined that the proposed storage location is the least intrusive alternative and provides the minimum relief necessary. Alternatives such as extending or relocating the driveway, grading, or other site modifications would create disproportionate impacts and unnecessary hardship.

Joe LaRussa further stated that the existing use has not caused observable traffic, safety, visibility, or neighborhood character impacts, and that the absence of complaints supports compatibility with the neighborhood. Subdivision plats and historical materials show that the drainage and environmental conditions predate the applicant's ownership and are not self-created. He pointed out that no site plan was available from City Hall and that strict compliance would require substantial alteration of the property's existing terrain and drainage conditions.

Public Comment

Chair Irvin opened the meeting to public comment.

Ayana Hill, 28209 Danvers Drive, identified herself as a neighboring property owner and a representative of the Wood Creek Civic Association, which she clarified is not a homeowners association. She requested denial of the variance, stating that the ordinance protects the residential character of the neighborhood, neighboring property owners, and consistent application of zoning standards. She was concerned that approval could weaken those protections and establish a precedent for similar requests.

Ms. Hill also raised concerns about alleged construction, extensive tree clearing, and disturbance of the wooded area without permits on file. Photographs showed a substantial loss of trees and ground cover. She was concerned about erosion, stormwater runoff, hillside stability, soil movement, and possible damage to her home. She also reported observing marijuana being grown on the property and experiencing a strong marijuana odor from her property.

Ms. Hill stated that the continued storage of large trailers, recreational vehicles, and commercial-style equipment was inconsistent with the residential character of the neighborhood. She noted that the Wood Creek subdivision was nearing completion of more than one million dollars in infrastructure improvements, including culvert replacement and road repaving, and that homeowners had made substantial investments in their properties. She asked the Board to apply the ordinance consistently and deny the appeal.

Applicant Response

Anthony LaRussa explained that substantial culvert work had affected vegetation on the site and contributed to exposed roots, leaning trees, and erosion near the culvert and drainage area. Before the current matter, there had been no complaints from the civic association or other neighbors except for one anonymous report submitted through the Citizen Problem Reporting website. He maintained that the prior absence of complaints supported their position that the requested relief was compatible with the neighborhood.

Correspondence

Member Rich reported that the file contained an affidavit of mailing, one undeliverable notice, and three letters supporting the variance, submitted by Maher Shaheen, Glenn Leibovitz, and Peter Webber.

Board questions and discussion

In response to questions, Anthony LaRussa said that the box trailer exceeding six feet in height had been parked in the rear yard. He believed the remaining equipment had been cited inaccurately because licensed and registered equipment trailers are not subject to the setback requirement referenced in the violation.

Member O'Connell stated that the number of trailers was constrained by the available parking area.

Member Rich explained that, although the ordinance does not prescribe a specific number or size of recreational vehicles that may be stored on residential properties, the Board may impose conditions when granting a variance. Such conditions could address the number, size, type, and placement of the equipment. He emphasized that a variance runs with the land and that the request as submitted was broad enough to permit unspecified recreational trailers and equipment anywhere within the front yard without a defined duration or location.

Member Rich stated that the Board would be better able to evaluate the use and nonuse variance standards if the applicant submitted a diagram identifying each RV/trailer, its dimensions, and its proposed storage location. He suggested that any future replacement

equipment could then be limited to the same size or smaller. Member Rich was inclined to defer the matter so the request could be defined more precisely.

Member O'Connell asked whether the storage area could be limited to the area shown behind the dotted line on the submitted drawing, and whether the variance could be restricted to the existing trailer over six feet in height.

Member Rich stated that a motion could include limits based on the current equipment and its placement, including the extent to which trailer tongues may project beyond the front of the house, but the record did not yet contain sufficient detail for the Board to offer such a condition.

Chair Irvin asked whether the required information could be provided verbally during the meeting or should be submitted as part of the application record. Director Kettler-Schmult explained that equipment exceeding six feet in height is not permitted in a side yard and, when stored beyond the seventy-two-hour loading and unloading period, must be located in the rear yard. The application before the Board did not include needed information regarding the nonuse variance, in order to place equipment over six feet in height in the side yard.

Member Rich said he was leaning toward deferring the matter to a date certain so the applicant could revise the request to include all necessary relief, and provide the required details supporting the request.

Anthony LaRussa stated that the creek occupies the property's front yard and that the driveway is the only usable front yard area. He affirmed that the trailer lengths and heights could be provided during the meeting.

Member O'Connell asked Anthony LaRussa how long the trailers had been parked in the driveway. Mr. LaRussa said that they had been there since he moved to the property in 2018. He said that he had moved the principal trailer at issue, which was approximately seven feet high, to the rear of the property to comply, but was requesting relief to provide flexibility to move and temporarily position equipment because of the property's constrained layout and limited rear yard.

Member O'Connell referenced the draft sample motion to defer the matter *"in order to allow the applicant to submit additional information regarding the number and type of recreational equipment and/or trailers to be parked or stored."*

Director Kettler-Schmult explained that staff had encouraged the applicant to provide that information when the application was received, but this did not prevent the matter from being placed on the agenda. However, the Board has typically received more detail regarding the number and type of recreational equipment proposed for storage.

Anthony LaRussa questioned the relevance of the number and size of the trailers, stating that the ordinance did not limit the number of trailers that could be stored, and addressed size primarily through location requirements.

Member O'Connell explained that the question was intended to give Mr. LaRussa an opportunity to clarify the equipment involved, noting that one trailer exceeded six feet in height.

Joe LaRussa stated that the applicant would stipulate to the current number of trailers being stored within the boxed driveway area shown on the submitted diagram. They could also submit drawings defining the storage area. Anthony LaRussa noted that three of the four trailers were shown in the photographs. Joe LaRussa stated that one additional trailer could fit in the designated area currently stored on site.

Member Rich requested clarification regarding the number and types of trailers stored on the property.

Anthony LaRussa identified the equipment as a sixteen-foot dump utility trailer, a twelve-foot utility trailer, a trailer carrying jet skis, and a twelve-foot box trailer approximately seven feet high. He clarified that the Board observed the utility trailer, the jet ski trailer, and the box trailer during the site visit, while the sixteen-foot trailer was at his parents' property. He also stated that another personal vehicle was being serviced and was not present during the site visit.

Member Rich stated that he did not object to the three trailers and their placement as observed during the site visit. His concern was that adding the sixteen-foot trailer could cause the storage area to extend significantly farther toward the street. He acknowledged that the property is located well within the subdivision and near the cul-de-sac.

Chair Irvin emphasized that the Board should consider the technical evidence concerning the property's unusual configuration, drainage conditions, and soil erosion, and determine whether those conditions prevented compliant storage elsewhere on the property and satisfied the applicable variance standards.

Joe LaRussa said that they would stipulate to limiting the request to the current number of trailers stored within the boxed driveway area shown on the submitted diagram. He stated that drawings defining the storage area could be prepared and submitted after tonight's approval.

MOTION by O'Connell, support by Rowland, in the matter of ZBA Case 7-26-5786, that the Petitioner's request for a use variance from Section 34-5.7.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit storage of recreational equipment and/or trailers in the front yard where it is limited to less than 72 hours cumulatively in any 5 day period for the purposes of loading and unloading be **APPROVED** based on the Petitioner's submission, Petitioner's presentation before the Zoning Board of Appeals, public comments and the following findings:

1. Petitioner has presented proof of "unnecessary hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of the zoning ordinances." *The features of the property (elevation changes and existing vegetation) do not allow access to the side and rear yard of the property for storage of recreational equipment and/or trailers, creating an unnecessary hardship.*
2. Petitioner's plight is due to unique circumstances peculiar to this property and not general neighborhood conditions. *The property changes elevation significantly at the rear of the*

- property. Existing vegetation limits access to the side and rear of the lot. These features are unique to this property.*
3. That the petitioner's requested use would not alter the essential character of the area. *The petitioner's request to store trailers and recreational equipment in the front yard area without limitation would not change the residential character of the area.*
 4. The problem is not self-created. *The features of the property are not created by the property owner.*

With the following conditions:

1. *The Petitioner must limit the number and type of recreational equipment and/or trailers parked/stored to those that can be stored in the area of the driveway on the side of the house and not to go beyond front line of the house and the side yard and area marked in red outline with light blue filler on document labeled Usable Area – 28370 Danvers Ct., which is included in the Staff Packet for the July 14, 2026 ZBA meeting (Exhibit A of Staff Packet for July 14, 2026 ZBA Meeting).*
2. *This approval is conditioned on approval of the non-use variances from Sections 34-5.7.2-3 and 34-5.1 of the Zoning Ordinance that are also part of this ZBA Case 7-26-5786.*

Director Kettler-Schmult clarified that the motion addressed only the use variance and that a separate motion would be required for the nonuse variances. Member Rich requested that the submitted image be displayed and asked for clarification regarding the usable area shown on the applicant's materials. Director Kettler-Schmult confirmed that the image had been submitted by the applicant and that the identified area was the area referenced in the motion.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Rowland, Jamil, Khan, O'Connell, Vergun, Rich, Irvin

Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

MOTION by O'Connell, support by Rich, in the matter of ZBA Case 7-26-5786, that the Petitioners request for a variance from Section 34-5.7.2-3 and 34-5.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit parking and storage of recreational equipment and/or trailers in the front yard where it is prohibited be **APPROVED** based on the Petitioner's submission, Petitioner's presentation before the Zoning Board of Appeals, public comments and the following findings:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the Petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome. *The features of the property (elevation changes and existing vegetation) do not allow access to the side and rear yard of the property for storage of recreational equipment and/or trailers without unreasonable expense.*
2. That granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the Petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district or that a lesser relaxation than that relief applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners (i.e., are there reasonable alternatives?). *The proposed location is a reasonable location with the limitations of the site and will not substantially impact adjacent property owners. The location proposed has been carefully reviewed to reduce the variance requested to the smallest amount needed for this allowed use.*

3. That the Petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property. *The property changes elevation significantly at the rear of the property. Existing vegetation limits access to the side and rear of the lot. These features are unique to this property.*
4. The problem is not self-created. *The features of the property are not created by the property owner.*

With the following conditions:

1. The Petitioner must agree to limit the number and type of recreational equipment and/or trailers parked/stored to those that can be stored in the area of the driveway on the side of the house and not to go beyond the front line of the house and in the side yard and area marked in red outline with light blue filler on document labeled Usable Area – 28370 Danvers Ct. , which is included in the Staff Packet for the July 14, 2026 ZBA meeting (Exhibit A of Staff Packet for July 14, 2026 ZBA Meeting).
2. The size and height of the vehicles and equipment be consistent with the size and height of the vehicles that are currently on the property (three), including one additional trailer that was described to the ZBA Board this evening (total of four).
3. This approval is conditioned on approval of the use variance from Section 34-5.7.1 of the Zoning Ordinance that is also part of this ZBA Case 7-26-5786.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. ZBA CASE: 7-26-5787

LOCATION: 26200 Farmington Rd

PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-15-351-030

ZONE: RA-1

REQUEST: In order to construct a 396 sq. ft. shed with a covered patio in the rear yard. The accessory structure is a 117 sq. ft. potting shed with an attached 279 sq. ft. covered patio with rolling screens, the following variance is requested:

1. A 52 sq. ft. variance from section 34-5.1.2.D of the zoning ordinance to permit a detached accessory structure of 396 sq. ft., which combined with existing accessory garage structure of 906 sq. ft. would result in a total accessory structure floor area of 1,302 sq. ft., where the maximum allowed is 1,250 sq. ft.

CODE SECTION: 34-5.1.2.D

APPLICANT: Richard and Linda Spranger

OWNER: Richard and Linda Spranger

Staff Presentation

Director of Planning and Community Development Kettler-Schmult explained that the applicants proposed constructing a shed with a covered patio in the rear yard of their large property at 26200 Farmington Road. The variance request concerned only the size of the structure.

Applicant Presentation

Linda and Richard Spranger, along with their Architect Mike Gordon (Royal Oak), were present on behalf of this application for a variance. Ms. Spranger stated that she and her husband had owned the property since 1997 and completed a major renovation in 2005 that enlarged the garage and included substantial interior work. She explained that the proposed accessory structure would enhance their use of the backyard and would match the house in materials and

architectural design. No trees would be removed, and the design would incorporate the existing hill. She stated that they had discussed the proposal with adjacent neighbors.

Ms. Spranger explained that the structure would include a covered patio and a potting and storage area for outdoor furniture and other items during the winter. She stated that the project would not negatively affect the neighborhood and would enhance the property.

Mr. Gordon noted that the design had been reduced in an effort to minimize the requested variance. Integrating the structure into the hill and existing landscaping would minimize its impact. The storage area would accommodate patio furniture during the winter and serve as a functional potting area during the spring, summer, and fall.

The proposed structure would occupy approximately one-half of one percent of the rear yard, and all structures on the property would occupy approximately nine percent of the site. The 52 square foot variance request was minor in relation to the size of the property.

Board Questions

Member Rich asked whether the applicants could reduce the structure by the 52 square feet and still store the intended items. Mr. Gordon responded that the requested area was needed to provide walkable space, tables for seedlings and plants, and sufficient winter storage for patio furniture without using garage space needed for vehicles.

Mr. Spranger added that the flowerpots observed during the Board's site visit would also be stored in the structure; the space would be fully used.

Chair Irvin summarized that the applicants had worked with City staff to reduce the proposal and were within 52 square feet of the ordinance limit.

Public Comment

Karimierz Czarnecki, 26093 Pillsbury, said that he lived directly behind the applicants, had known them as neighbors for many years, and supported the variance request. The applicants maintained their property well, and he had no concerns regarding the proposed structure.

William Nichols, 26291 Pillsbury Street, said that he was also a rear neighbor, and he supported the proposal. The applicants maintained their property in excellent condition, and the structure would be an asset to the property.

Correspondence

Member Rich reported that the file contained an affidavit of mailing. There were no undeliverable notices and no written correspondence from the public.

Board Action

MOTION by Jamil, supported by O'Connell, in the matter of ZBA Case 7-26-5787, that the Petitioner's request to install a 117 sq.ft. potting shed with an attached 279 sq.ft. covered patio with rolling screens, for a total of 396 sq.ft, with the following variances:

1. A 52 sq.ft. variance from Section 34-3.5.1.2.D of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a detached accessory structure of 396 sq.ft. which combined with the accessory structure of 906 sq.ft

would result in a total accessory structure floor area of 1,302 sq.ft. where the maximum allowed is 1,250 sq.ft.

Be **GRANTED** because the Petitioner **does** demonstrate that practical difficulties exist in this case in that facts were set forth which do show that based on the Petitioner's submission, Petitioner's presentation before the Zoning Board of Appeals, public comments and the following findings:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome. *The property owner has a need for more storage, and the limitations of the total floor area cannot accommodate all the items utilized on the property.*
2. That granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district or that a lesser relaxation than that relief applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners (i.e., are there reasonable alternatives?). *The neighboring property owners would be better served by having the loose items properly stored in the new detached shed. The neighbors are adequately screened by existing vegetation and have not objected to the request.*
3. That the Petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property. *The unique sizing of the yard and features of the home create unique circumstances.*
4. The problem is not self-created. *The configuration of the property and features of the home were existing or created by previous owners.*

With the following condition: The detached shed must be constructed in accordance with the submitted plans.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

C. ZBA CASE: 7-26-5788

LOCATION: 32200 Middlebelt Road

PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-01-101-080

ZONE: RA-1

REQUEST: In order to construct a 168 sq ft accessory building to be used as a guardhouse positioned at the main entrance.:

1. **A variance from Section 34-5.1.B and Section 34-2.2 (yards-front yard) of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a 168sq. ft detached accessory building to be erected in the front yard where the accessory structure is not permitted.**

CODE SECTION: 34-5.1.B, 34-2.2

APPLICANT: Aaron Rosenhaus

OWNER: Hillel Day School of Metro Detroit

Staff presentation

Director of Planning and Community Development Kettler-Schmult stated that the property is located in a residential zoning district and has long been occupied by Hillel Day School of Metro Detroit. The School was proposing additional security measures, including controlled access to

the property and designated areas for student drop-off, pickup, and visitors. The improvements would include an enclosure and a guard shelter for school security personnel.

The School was proceeding with engineering and construction work that did not require a variance in an effort to complete the security improvements before school resumed in September. The guard shelter was the only portion of the project requiring variance approval because it would be located in the front yard. Providing an enclosed shelter was preferable to requiring security personnel to work outdoors.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Rosenhaus was present on behalf of this variance request. He described the proposed guardhouse as a small, purpose-built structure essential to a modern secured entrance rather than an aesthetic improvement. The proposed location was the only location compatible with the School's existing circulation and safety procedures. The improvement would strengthen student safety and visitor screening without negatively affecting neighboring properties.

Mitch Harvey, Stonefield Engineering, addressed the standards for a nonuse variance. He noted that the school building had occupied its current location for many years and was positioned far back on the eastern portion of the property. Compliance with the ordinance would require the guardhouse to be placed behind the western wall of the school building, which would not provide effective traffic control or security for vehicles entering from Middlebelt Road. The guardhouse would be small, located behind the edge of the soccer field, and generally aligned with residential properties to the north. An existing berm and mature trees along Middlebelt Road would screen the structure, and most of the trees would remain. He stated that the building placement and recently increased security concerns created unique circumstances, and the need for the variance was not self-created.

Board Questions

Chair Irvin asked whether the guardhouse would be supplied with electricity and heat. Mr. Harvey confirmed that it would have both.

Public Comment

Chair Irvin opened the meeting to public comment.

Raymond Kach, 32250 Tall Timber Drive, stated that he lived in the subdivision behind Hillel Day School and fully supported the request because of the need for additional security.

Correspondence

Member Rich reported that the file contained an affidavit of mailing, one undeliverable notice, and no written correspondence from the public.

Board Action

MOTION by O'Connell, supported by Vergun, in the matter of ZBA Case 7-26-5788, that the Petitioner's request to install a 168 sq.ft. accessory building to be used as a guardhouse positioned at the main entrance of a school with a variance from Section 34-5.1.B and Section 34-2.2 (yards-front yard) of the Zoning Ordinance, to permit the 168 sq.ft. detached accessory building to be erected in the front yard where the accessory structure is not permitted, be **GRANTED** because the Petitioner **does** demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case in that facts were set forth which

do show that based on the Petitioner's submission, Petitioner's presentation before the Zoning Board of Appeals, public comments and the following findings:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the Petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome. *The proposed additional building is a logical extension of the existing use (primary school) and is necessary to support the intended operations to have safe and orderly drop-off and pick-up of students and screening of guests. The location of the main building with a drop-off/pick up circulation in front is a standard layout for efficient flow of parents and students to enter or exit the site.*
2. That granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the Petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district or that a lesser relaxation than that relief applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners (i.e., are there reasonable alternatives?). *A lesser variance would not give substantial relief to the owner in that a smaller variance would impact safety and security of the site. Either the guardhouse would have to be relocated closer to the main building or the guard would be required to work without shelter. Further, the new guardhouse building will be screened from other residents by the berm and vegetation.*
3. That the petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property. *The property requires additional security measures because it is a primary religious school, and similar religious schools and institutions have faced increased threats to the safety of staff and attendees in recent years.*
4. The problem is not self-created. *The configuration of the property and features of the site were existing.*

With the following condition: *The guardhouse building must be constructed in accordance with the submitted plans.*

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pamela Santo, 29606 Moran Street, described longstanding concerns regarding the Tawheed Center property adjacent to her home. She requested that a masonry wall be installed. She expressed concerns regarding dumpster maintenance, pests, and parking near her property line with views toward her home. Ms. Santo asked that officials visit her property.

Chair Irvin explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals did not have jurisdiction to require a masonry wall and offered to direct her to the appropriate City staff after the meeting.

Kelly Santo, 29606 Moran Street, supported her mother's concerns and stated that parking at the Tawheed Center is inadequate, with traffic management sometimes required. She reported repeated efforts by Tawheed officials to purchase her mother's property. She also reported concerns with waste disposal relative to the dumpster area.

Code and Zoning Supervisor Curry stated that the City was addressing the dumpster issue with the Tawheed Center.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 9, 2026

MOTION by Vergun, supported by O’Connell, to approve the June 9, 2026 meeting minutes as submitted.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Jamil, supported by Rowland, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 pm.

Brian Rich, Secretary

/cem