

**CHIKAMING TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**Minutes of the June 20, 2023, Regular Meeting**  
**APPROVED**

The June 20, 2023, regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held at Chikaming Township Hall and called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chairman (hereinafter Chair) Larry Anderson. Roll call of members attending: Doug Dow, Liz Rettig, Larry Anderson, Tom Gold, Bob Beemer. 5 present - Quorum.

Noted that Attorney Hilmer and ZA Kelly Largent (hereinafter ZA) are also present along with many others attending in the audience.

Chair advises that the next order of business is to approve the March 21, 2023, minutes. Chair asks for corrections/additions. None noted. **Dow makes a motion to approve the minutes as submitted; Anderson seconds. VOICE VOTE: 5 AYES. MINUTES APPROVED.**

Chair reads the cases:

***Case #2026 Applicant Richard Padula, represented by Ed Lijewski, 15036 Lakeshore Road, Lakeside, Property Code #11-07-0019-0021-03-0 are proposing a 382.5 first floor garage addition and a 1303.5 second floor garage addition which exceeds the allowable square footage of an accessory dwelling unit. Variance is requested from Section 6.15(G)(4)(b)(iii) of Chikaming Township Zoning Ordinance #144, as amended, which states “The total floor area of the accessory residence shall not exceed eight hundred (800) square feet.”***

No letters.

Chair asks Kelly (ZA) to give details on this case. Kelly advises that this case comes back from being tabled at the March, 2023, meeting. We had no other cases in May, so it moved to the June agenda. There was discussion with the owner to see if they could make it comply with the Ordinance. Ed Lijewski is representing the owner, who is ill. When first presented, it was a 2-story accessory structure, first floor was garage expansion, second floor was for dwelling space to be an ADU. Since it is over 800 square feet, they needed the variance first, then if granted, it would go to the planning commission for the special land use.

Mr. Lijewski advises that the owner is not able to attend because he is in the hospital. Lijewski says he has nothing more to add, but it could be tabled again until the owner is well. Chair advises, since it is on the agenda, we will proceed.

Chair asks for Public Comment. None.

Board discussion. Gold begins reminding us that since the garage is so close to the house, it was suggested that the garage be connected with a breezeway, and we would not have the need for a variance. I don't know how we can give a 70% variance. Dow interjects – 61%. Gold again suggests that it be connected.

Dow questions the ADU situation – difference if it is attached or not? Kelly answers that even if attached to the house it would be an ADU and would need to go to the Planning Commission. Dow agrees, there are no mitigating circumstances to grant a variance. The question is, if we deny the variance, can they still connect to the house? There are 2 ways to go: Deny the variance and they connect to the house, or it is withdrawn, and they connect to the house. Kelly answers that either way, it could work, but they would have to redo their plans and then still go to the Planning Commission. Gold questions the difference

between a guest suite or an ADU – is a fully functioning kitchen the only difference in an ADU? Kelly answers that attached they cannot have a fully functioning kitchen as an ADU – they must remove the stove. If attached, it is considered a mother-in-law suite.

Rettig asks Lijewski if there is a kitchen. He responds – there is no kitchen.

Gold interjects that he knows where Dow is going with his line of thinking - trying to determine if they owner wants to withdraw. Gold asks Lijewski if he has the authority to withdraw the petition. Lijewski decides to withdraw the petition. Anderson completes and signs the ZBA form showing the petition was withdrawn.

**CASE #2026 IS WITHDRAWN AT THE APPLICANT’S AGENT’S REQUEST.**

Next case:

***Case #2028 Applicant, Richard Spain, 14265 Prairie Road, Harbert, Property Code #11-07-0015-0022-00-0. The applicant is requesting a variance to exceed the maximum square footage for an accessory dwelling unit. Section 6.15(4)(C)(iii) of Chikaming Township Ordinance #144, as amended, states “accessory dwelling units shall not exceed 800 square feet.***

Chair goes to ZA for input. Kelly begins by stating the parcel is 20 acres, with almost 14 acres in a conservancy which cannot be built upon. Kelly shows us a map of where the proposed accessory dwelling unit will be placed. Kelly indicates that she had a conversation with the applicant about attaching the dwelling unit. There are 4 large oak trees over 100 years old that would be affected if the unit were attached – the trees would die. Kelly points out her summary review showing the request of the proposed addition to be 1,074 square feet and shows the floor plans with elevations. When first submitted, the plans were larger, and these revised plans are smaller by a few hundred square feet.

Chair asks applicant’s input. Applicant gives a short summary stating the original plan was to increase the size of the house to accommodate a first-floor bedroom – stairs currently are steep for 2<sup>nd</sup> floor bedroom. This, however, would mean we would need to take out a large oak tree and the construction vehicles needed would probably kill 2 or 3 other trees which are on the South side of the house, per Bruce Graham, the tree expert. The plan here is to put it way in the back, cannot see it from the road. With 20 acres, we should be able to have the variance – it is only 1 story. Rettig asks, you are making this accessory structure so you will have a bedroom on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor – so the accessory structure is for you? Applicant answers, yes, either for ourselves or family.

Chair asks for public comment. None.

Board Discussion:

Chair asks if the screened porch is included in the coverage. Kelly answers yes. Anderson then continues that by removing the 140 square foot off screened porch, we can get closer to what is needed to comply with the 800 square feet. There is nothing in the land that would allow us to grant the variance. Gold disagrees by stating the fact that the owners have put 14 acres in a conservancy far out-weights our giving a few hundred square feet way off the road, and she is attempting to preserve some very old trees. Dow wonders if the argument is if the old established trees are considered something like a wetland – can’t build on it, can’t build near it – a topographical issue. Chair still does not feel this gives us reason to increase the size of the accessory structure. They have the ability to build an appropriate ADU in the location they want and meet the criteria. Dow continues by trying to find what’s in the land that we can consider – no stream, no ravine, no critical dune, no protected wetland – but there are trees – is this something we need to consider? Gold agrees – trees should be considered, and this is the special condition

for a little leeway. Rettig comments even though this is R-2, the only difference between this property and others is that it has 20 acres and size-wise would be considered agricultural. It is an area where AG is all around – down the street, across the street – farmland. Kelly advises that this parcel and 1 very small parcel at the end of the road is the only R-2 zoning – all other zoning on this road is AG.

Beemer comments and suggests that they remove the screened porch then you have 931 square feet. Although over the 800 square feet allowed, it is a good compromise. Dow does some math, house is 910 plus 164 for the porch. Chair asks applicant about removing the screened porch. Applicant feels that because she has 20 acres, a few hundred square feet should not matter. Chair answers that we must respect our zoning ordinance – an ADU must be 800 square feet. The previous case would have been a flat-out rejection.

Gold says there are 2 ways to go, I could propose a motion to grant, and it could be shot down. You would need to get to 800 square feet to be in compliance. Sounds like if you take the compromise, you may get the variance. Rettig adds, if she reduces the size of the ADU then she could keep the screened porch, this could also be an option. Applicant says then the windows won't look right and spacing would not work if size would be reduced. If necessary, I would choose to eliminate the porch. Rettig continues, it is not the decking, but the roof of the screened porch that is the issue. Dow and Kelly both comment that it is the roofing, the enclosed part, that has the problem. Kelly says even an awning would work as long as it does not extend out past the 10 feet – it could not go out 13 feet. This cuts off 164 square feet. The ask then is only 910 square feet for the ADU.

Chair: No letters.

**GOLD MAKES A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE VARIANCE ON CASE #2028 WITH THE ROOF REMOVED FROM THE SCREENED PORCH. DOW AMENDS: TO RESULT IN AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT OF 910 SQUARE FEET. ANDERSON SECONDS.**

Chair goes through the criteria:

1. Unique circumstances or conditions exist which apply to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district. Yes. All agree – the trees, the acreage, the surrounding AG properties.
2. As a result of the unique circumstances or conditions, strict compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance would unreasonably prevent the use of the property for a permitted purpose, or would be unnecessarily burdensome. Yes. All agree – strict compliance is burdensome.
3. The unique circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicants, including the knowing purchase of a property limited by existing non-conformities. Yes, all agree – there are no existing non-conformities.
4. The variance requested is the minimum variance which will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure. Yes – minimal variance after reduced by porch roof removal. All agree.
5. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Ordinance, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. Yes. All agree.

**ROLL VOTE: Dow, Rettig, Anderson, Gold Beemer. All in favor. 5 – 0 VARIANCE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS: SCREENED PORCH MUST HAVE ROOF REMOVED.**

Next case:

***Case #2028 Applicant, Anna Fraley, 509 Glenview Avenue, Sawyer, Property Code #11-07-0830-0090-00-0. A variance is requested from Section 4.02 of Chikaming Township Ordinance #144, as amended, which requires a 30-foot front yard setback and requesting an additional 2-foot overhang encroachment. This property has 3 front yards.***

Chair requests information from ZA. Kelly shows a map where the 3 front yards are located. Glenview Avenue runs along 2 sides of the property and a very small portion of the North line. Beemer questions why if only about 20% of the road runs along the North lot line, why are we calling that a front yard. Kelly answers that by definition a front yard is anything that separates a lot from a public or private road – even if it is a foot. Gold asks if the applicant also owns Lot C (referring to the map). Kelly advises yes. Rettig questions why the names are different on this subject parcel and Lot C. Attorney Mark Miller questions the applicant/his client, and she says that the name is different, but it is the same person. Kelly continues with the conditions requested:

1. Encroachment into the front yard setback by 18'
2. Kelly reminds us that 2 feet of overhang on a non-conforming lot does not count, but if it is over 2 feet, then the whole thing counts – they are asking for a 4-foot overhang – this does not affect their lot coverage.

Beemer asks if the overhang is the roofline, or a roofline and a balcony. Kelly answers that the overhang is only the roofline as the balcony is a pervious surface and does not count towards lot coverage – just the roof overhang.

Chair summarizes, so it is the 2 variances requested – 14 feet and the 4-foot overhang. Kelly shows the map and states the 14 feet request is along the East side, sort of Southeast, where the road comes around. Kelly is asked, what is the square footage of the parcel? And answers, 13,398 square feet. Chair asks about a survey. Kelly advises we have the topographical survey (Mitchell & Morse) that was done for EGLE and which EGLE has approved the location of the house. We have one with the house and one without the house. Kelly says she put a call into Brian at the Health Department for the septic to confirm the location of the septic. Usually when environmental health determines the location of the septic field, they don't change the location and I am fairly confident that the location will stay in the area based on the soil. If it were to be moved by the Health Department, it would require a new permit. Chair asks the location of the critical dune area – Kelly shows the critical dune line on the map – the dark line – the septic system is outside of the critical dune area. Then there is another line that shows the 33% slope. EGLE has given them a permit for a portion to be constructed in the critical dune area.

Chair begins reading letters. (Note: Letters in their entirety are part of the case file – below is summary only.)

**Shorewood Hills Homeowners Association (June 19, 2023).** States they were not consulted by the homeowner regarding the variance. Board met 6/17/23 and voted to oppose the variance – vote unanimous. The Property is located within the Association, the variance directly impinges on land owned by the Association – Glenview Avenue. Property is in new Residential District created to protect property in critical dune. Opposes variance for 1) Health and Safety risk. Reducing the 30-foot setback on Glenview Avenue will interfere with emergency access to the existing site at the end of Glenview Avenue; 2) Environmental risk. Association Park is unique and delicate biodiversity. The variance is likely to damage trees of the park. 3) Hardship created by Homeowner. Hardship is due to the owner's plan not unique circumstances. Oversized home – too large for dimensions of site; site is buildable for smaller home. 4) Association Policy. Supports Chikaming Ordinance as written and opposes similar variance requests. Home as presented will negatively affect the road and park and community. Oppose both

variances, setback and overhang. Recommend the owner develop a plan that does not require these variances.

**Elizabeth Swanson (e-mail June 16, 2023).** Own property at 508 Lakeshore, adjacent to Fraley property. Fraley did not provide us with notice of this proposal. Believe the proposed construction would have a negative impact on Shorewood. The proposed building and large 2-story home would cover the vast majority of the sub-plot directly across from our deck. We oppose the requested variance, and the construction would deprive us of the many benefits that led us to purchase our property. Large windows and doors will bring unwelcome light pollution, obstruct the view we enjoy and lead to unnecessary congestion. Our deck views of the ravine will be replaced by thirty feet of windows into our neighbor's home. Application states that absent a variance, Fraley would be denied the right to build a home. This is not correct; it would merely deny Ms. Fraley the ability to build the large 2 story home. This is why zoning laws exist. We would not object to Ms. Fraley building or adding to her current residence within the constraints of zoning laws.

**Laurel Hansen (e-mail June 16, 2023).** Own Lot 1, Block 23. We own property across the street/parking area from Swanson – whose property is not intrusive. Shorewood Hills is unique – encircled by almost all unbuildable land because of the creek, steep critical dunes and parkland owned by the Association. At night the area is quiet and dark; only 2 neighbors. Glenview Avenue is shared by only 3 families. Our patio is the only available outdoor space surrounded by steep critical dunes on 3 sides and the front yard setback. Variance request will impact us negatively and we do not support the setback as it directly borders our home. The change in setback puts the proposed building and deck only 15 – 20 feet from our home and patio. We would be looking directly into the proposed 8' windows/glass door. The wrap deck around the house will look directly on to our patio and into our house – only 20 feet away. We would no longer have dark space at night. The proposed plan does not fit – trying to squeeze too much house into a too small and irregular lot – does not blend. How would construction be staged? The parking area is shared with Fraley – we have 3/she has 1. The variance would negatively impact us and the area. Received the plans from Shorewood Hills Association.

Chair asks applicant to speak. Attorney Mark Miller and architect, John Allegretti, are here to represent the applicant. Miller wishes to respond to the letters. Hansens say the home will negatively impact; there is a misunderstanding and John will show us the model of the house. (Allegretti sets up a model of the home for the Board.) Mark continues: The Fraley property is over 30 feet from the west lot line. If you measure from where the Fraley house will be situated from Hansen's, it is 100 feet or more – between the homes. They said they will be looking into the windows – Allegretti now speaks stating that the land where the house will be is a bowl, about 20 feet lower than the concrete. The windows on the side where the Hansen house is located are the bedroom windows and are very small – they can't even be seen from above. We wanted to create passive solar light on the living room side – not the bedrooms. Miller continues: The house is being built in a bowl – the foundation is about 20 feet below the ridge. Allegretti interjects: Where Glenview wraps around on the West side, there's a drop off. The windows do not face the Hansen house. Miller continues: The house is a 1-½ story home, not 2 story. The deck is provided for maintenance to wash windows so as not to have to walk through the dunes. The overhang is for cooling and shade. Allegretti chimes in stating that he is working on reducing the number of windows, but we know light pollution is a problem. The idea of the overhang is to bounce the light back to the home and not be projected into the trees – creating soft light and maintaining darkness at night. Miller: The sight of the house will only take down 3 small trees – 6" and 9" in diameter – all large trees will remain. The overhang will block the light and preserve the nighttime solitude. Construction will be staged in the normal way to help prevent damage to Shorewood Hills property and will work around the neighbor's property. Regarding the 1 parking space on roadway, there will be additional parking created on the new property – so there will be more parking. Great efforts were taken by the architect. A very similar home



for this applicant was approved in 2018 with a 10-foot side yard setback on Glenview. We are accommodating that further with a 14-foot set back. Ms. Fraley did not build in 2018 and since then, the Ordinance has changed. Addressing the photos Hansen attached, it just confirms how wooded the area is. Moving to the Swanson objection, they talk about the large home. It is only a 1-1/2 story home with a slanted roof, which will fit in to the contour of the dune. The back of the roofline is going to be about the same height as the dune – very low-pitched roof. The home is 2,336 feet plus the garage (438). The first-floor footprint is 984 square feet, given where they can site the home. Chair corrects him stating the footprint is 1,430 square feet – only covering 16% of the lot. The Zoning Ordinance would allow more lot coverage – but we are working to reduce the impact on the neighborhood. No large trees will be cut. The Swanson say that they will be looking into the home – their property is caddy corner and not looking into the house – it is off to the side, plus it will be built into the dune. Allegetti comments that the Swanson home is considerably higher than the home to be built. Miller continues: the home will be nearly 100 feet away from the Swanson house. Michigan Law has a long standing rule from the case of Faucher v Grosse Ile Twp Bldg. Inspector, 321 Mich 193 if an Ordinance change deprives someone the use of their property, if there is a reasonable accommodation that could be made, then it should be made. Since this was approved in 2018, it should be approved. As to the Association’s comments, the architect will be working with the construction crew so as not to damage trees and property in the park area. As to the health and safety and emergency vehicles, a fire truck can go into Mrs. Fraley’s driveway. There is a hardship: road on 3 sides, an unusually shaped lot – not of her making. 1 person will only be using the road, Mrs. Fraley and her family only, no traffic issues. Miller turns over the floor to Allegetti who gives the board a feel of the dimensions and the placement of the house stating the house is 8 feet down from Glenview Avenue, pointing to where the garage will be on the opposite side of the house. Gold asks about the roofing material – Allegetti answer TPO (membrane roofing) not shingles and not reflective.

Rettig asks Kelly and Kim Livengood as a point of order: Were notices sent out to the adjoining homeowners. Answer is yes and publication was made.

#### Public Comment:

**Cindy Ellis** – zoning chair of Shorewood Hills wishes to submit information as to a study on this area. The park is an area where Deer Creek runs from Sawyer through Shorewood Hills into the lake. Part of it is in the critical dune and critical dune topography. The study from many years ago because of a drainage ditch states that the land is an old-world forest – very fragile area. We are compelled to protect this and thankful that the Ordinance change took into consideration this type of area.

#### Board Discussion:

Beemer starts by stating that Glenview Avenue was platted as 25 feet wide but the pavement is much narrower, the full 25 foot wide roadway is owned by Shorewood Hills. In that platted roadway are huge tulip trees and beech trees. The idea of protecting the trees should extend to these trees. Also, Mrs. Fraley has a cottage on Lot C and all parking for her house on that Parcel C is in the roadway – which adds to density problems – which lends to meeting setback requirements. Dow asks, doesn’t the proposed plan add parking? Kelly agrees that the garage will allow for 2 cars. Beemer corrects her stating that the only parking spaces for the existing cottage are on the roadway. Gold adds that this is a modest proposal based on the restrictions and is lower than the other houses, but I would like to make a stipulation that the roof be as unobtrusive as possible. If any properties have issues with the land – this one certainly does. I think the architect has done a good job of keeping it as tight as possible and does not impinge on the park. The excavator has to be careful with the trees. This is not a big house. The case law may have some impact, we don’t want to take any rights away. Chair wonders where the 10 feet setback came from. Kelly has no information if this was ever approved but the old picture/map and Keystone does show the 10 feet set back – perhaps they were considering that side as a side yard. Gold continues that having a sloped roof is

unobtrusive. Chair questions if the roof is 18 feet to the mid roof line. Kelly says that NCR-1 allows 20 feet, and the plans are at 20 feet. Dow interjects that lot coverage could be as much as 20% and they are under lot coverage. The topography and the 3 roads are the hardships. Beemer feels that this is a self-created problem that homeowner wants a 2,700 square foot house on a 13,000 square foot lot. NCR 1 – 2 - 3 says – small property, small house. In that sense, it is self-created. Can this be smaller? Dow says this is substantially below the lot size maximum. If this were a big house, we would be talking about lot coverage – we are not. This is substantially different. We are talking about a variance for setback given the steep slopes on 2 ½ sides of the property and 3 sides of the property having a roadway. We are talking about 2 separate issues. Gold: what is the public harm? She is up against a unique situation – topography of lot. Dow: The question on the table is: By granting a variance that reduces by about ½ the 30-foot standard setback off a roadway, are we endanger the public safety in any way? Beemer, why do we have a 30-foot setback? For public safety. Chair: Question for the architect: Are you building in a critical dune? Allegretti: Yes, actually, what they have done is come back 2,000 – 1,500 feet from the shore of Lake Michigan and there are dunes that are greater than 33-1/3% and those cannot be built on without a special exception. We are not asking for that special exception, just a permit to build in the critical dune – which EGLE has given us. Chair is wondering if the design could be changed with the house being moved yet keeping the same square footage, so we can eliminate the setback. Rettig asks about flooding. Answered by many stating no, there are ravines all around. Kelly shows the line where the critical dune is on the map and shows the 33% grade line and pushing into that area creates the special exception – just a few feet away and the house does not appear to be able to be pushed any closer to the dune. Dow, listening to Kelly about the critical dune, the current location of the trees, the location of the roadway, it is hard to move the house envelope. If I have ever seen a cause for a variance that is required by the topography of the land – this is it. And being on a small private road with a very unique set of circumstances, this definitely needs a variance. Rettig: Let’s not forget that EGLE has given their approval to build. Beemer: can setbacks be diminished? The neighbors’ letters say, meet setbacks. Chair feels that it could be moved a bit, perhaps 5 feet? Rettig: To Beemer’s point – who uses the roadway – only the applicant and her family. Dow, if we move the house, we won’t get the parking. Beemer, I’m concerned about the trees in the roadway and the roots. Gold: People are already driving over the roots by going down the road. Chair: I can see the tenure of where we are going with the footprint.

Chair: Now let’s talk about roofline. We put in a 2-foot requirement for NCR lots. I don’t know why we would increase the roofline. We are 14 feet from the road, we would now be at 10 feet on the roofline. Kelly: We made the conscious effort with our definitions in the Ordinance to not include overhangs when we are considering setbacks. Chair: I understand it is not included. Kelly: They have made the request of the 2 feet overhang to go to 4 feet and they have also demonstrated according to our Ordinance when you extend more than 2 feet on a non-conforming, that entire overhang counts toward your lot coverage, and that increasing that to 4 feet does not drive them over. Gold: The benefit of the overhang is for the neighbors – it shields more light. Dow: I think Gold’s argument are good points to consider – the design has logic – not so much uplighting. Gold: I want there to be a stipulation about the roof – that it be non-reflective and dark color – which would cut down on reflection and what the neighbors would see. Beemer: Let’s require all downward, shielded lighting. Gold: Yes – dark sky lighting.

**DOW MAKES A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE VARIANCE ON CASE #2029 TO REDUCE 1 OF THE 30-FOOT FRONT YARD SETBACKS DOWN TO 14’ AND WE APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL 2 FEET IN THE ROOF OVERHANG FOR A TOTAL OF 4 FEET WITH THE 2 CONDITIONS BEING: DARK SKY LIGHTING MUST BE USED FOR ALL EXTERIOR LIGHTING AND THE ROOF NEEDS TO BE NON-REFLECTIVE DARK MATERIAL TO MINIMIZE NEIGHBOR IMPACT. GOLD SECONDS.**

Chair goes through the criteria:

1. Unique circumstances or conditions exist which apply to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district. Yes. All agree – the land, the pitch, the dunes, 3 front yards, old trees.
2. As a result of the unique circumstances or conditions, strict compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance would unreasonably prevent the use of the property for a permitted purpose, or would be unnecessarily burdensome. Yes. All agree – strict compliance cannot be accomplished.
3. The unique circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicants, including the knowing purchase of a property limited by existing non-conformities. Yes –all agree.
4. The variance requested is the minimum variance which will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure. Yes – 4 agree minimal variance; 1 No (Beemer).
5. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Ordinance, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. Yes. All agree.

**ROLL VOTE: Dow -Yes, Rettig - Yes, Anderson - Yes, Gold – Yes, Beemer No. 4–1 VARIANCE #2029 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS: DARK SKY LIGHTING MUST BE USED FOR ALL EXTERIOR LIGHTING AND THE ROOF NEEDS TO BE NON-REFLECTIVE DARK MATERIAL TO MINIMIZE NEIGHBOR IMPACT.**

(Cindy from Shorewood asks if she may put the report in the file; Chair allows.)

**DOW MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT; ANDERSON SECONDS. Voice vote: All ayes.** Chair announces we are adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elisabeth A. Rettig  
Recording Secretary

Date Approved July 18, 2023