

Present: Council President Domzal; Members: Downey, Koss, McCleary, Pfeifer and Taylor and Woodrow

Absent: None

Also Present: Village Manager, Spallasso  
Assistant to the Manager, Pasieka  
Finance Director, Wiszowaty  
Village Clerk, Marshall  
Building Official, Byrwa  
Director of Public Safety, Woodard  
Village Attorney, Ryan

President Domzal called the regular Council meeting to order at 7:37 p.m. in the Village of Beverly Hills municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road. This is a continuation of a Council study session that started at 5:30 p.m. The five year projected revenue and expenditure reports as well as an updated five-year capital improvement plan were topics of discussion. There was also conversation regarding administrative matters relating to the Village Manager position. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those in attendance.

Domzal recognized newly elected Oakland County Commissioner, Marcia Gershenson, who came forward to introduce herself and talk about services and programs that the County offers its citizens. She is available in her office at the County to talk to anyone about County concerns.

#### **ADDITIONS TO AGENDA/APPROVE AGENDA**

Motion by Taylor, second by Pfeifer, to approve the agenda as published.

Motion passed (7 – 0).

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Motion by Pfeifer, second by McCleary, to approve the consent agenda as follows:

- a. Review and consider minutes of a regular Council meeting held on February 1, 2005.
- b. Review and file bills recapped as of Monday, February 7, 2005.

Motion passed (7 - 0).

#### **BUSINESS AGENDA**

##### **PUBLIC HEARING ON A PROPOSED LOT SPLIT AT 32380 MAYFAIR**

Before Council for consideration is a request from William and Lisa Christie for a lot split at 32380 Mayfair. On December 13, 2004, the Village Zoning Board of Appeals voted 6-2 to approve, with conditions, variances from the minimum lot width and minimum lot area requirements on the Mayfair site. On February 9, 2005 the Village Planning Board held a public hearing and reviewed the land division application in accordance with applicable zoning ordinance standards. The Planning Board voted 8-0 to recommend approval of the lot split to

Village Council. The final step in this process is for Council to conduct a public hearing and take action on the lot split request.

Village Attorney Ryan reviewed the legal background with respect to this proposal. He noted that the only entity that can vary the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance is the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Christies requested a variance from the zoning ordinance to reduce the lot width requirement from 100 feet to 79.5 feet in an R-1 single family residential zoned area and to vary the minimum lot area requirement from 16,000 square feet to 12,643 square feet. The request for variances was heard by the Village Zoning Board of Appeals and resulted in a 4-4 tie on a motion to grant the variances. Because an affirmative vote of the majority of the Zoning Board members (five votes) is required to grant a variance, the motion failed, and the request for variance was not approved.

The Christies appealed the decision to the Oakland County Circuit Court where Judge Tyner remanded the matter back to the Zoning Board for finding of fact and conclusions. At its second meeting after the remand, the Zoning Board of Appeals passed a motion by a 6-2 vote that approved the two variance requests with conditions.

By the action of the Zoning Board, this property comes before Council as a legal non-conforming lot. The issue tonight will be whether there are any public health, safety and welfare issues that Council should consider to not approve the lot split. Otherwise, a motion to approve the split would be in order, referencing the conditions placed upon the lot by the Zoning Board and accepted by the Christies at the December 13, 2004 ZBA hearing.

Domzal opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m. on the Christie lot split request.

William Christie of 32380 Mayfair stated that he is present requesting Council approval of a lot split and will answer any questions.

Richard Marsh of 32344 Mayfair, property owner directly south of the Christies, expressed the view that the Circuit Court judge changed the rules of the Village Zoning Board of Appeals from needing five affirmative votes to approve a variance to requiring a majority vote to act. The Zoning Board voted 4-4 at two hearings, which resulted in failure of the variances to be approved. Ryan responded that people are entitled to a decision, and a 4-4 tie is not a decision.

Marsh stated that there are many area residents in opposition to the proposed lot split. By approving this, the Village is allowing the Christies to build on a 79.5' lot. He questioned whether the new owners are bound by the limitations placed on the lot by the Zoning Board. He is concerned that there will be a big house built next to him on a small lot with no restrictions.

Drew Schmidt of 19096 Bedford stated that he supports the Christie lot split request. He was not initially in favor of the variances or the lot split. After gathering information and learning that the Christies' lot is 212 feet wide, it seemed that they were entitled to the variance and lot split.

Kathleen Berwick of 31381 Kennoway Court stated that she favors spacious lots and is opposed to the lot split request. She is concerned that the house built on the site will not be in keeping with the look of the neighborhood.

Pam Rijnovean of 32420 Evergreen questioned whether this is the start of “big foot” housing in Beverly Hills. She bought in the Village because she liked the bigger lots and openness of the community and is concerned that approval of this lot split will set a precedent.

Bob Walsh of 20655 Smallwood Court asked why this lot split is any different from other lot splits that traditionally are reviewed by the Planning Board. This proposal went to the Planning Board after a variance was granted by the ZBA.

Ryan responded that only the Zoning Board can vary lot requirements. Instead of sending a proposal to the Planning Board for conditional approval, a variance can be sought from the Zoning Board of Appeals prior to Planning Board and Council review. If the Zoning Board does not approve a variance, the proposal does not go further.

Ryan explained that the two lots resulting from the proposed lot split will meet area setback requirements for the R-1 zoning district and will comply with the average depth of front open space standard. The applicant’s lot is 212 feet wide, more than double the 100 foot wide lot requirement. The house was placed inefficiently on the lot, and the ZBA did not feel it was necessary to tear down the existing home, split the lot, and build two new homes on lots that meet the 100 foot lot width requirement. There will be two lots on 212 feet of frontage. One of the lots will be 79.5 feet in width. The Zoning Board placed a condition on the variance approval that the 132.5 foot lot cannot be split again, and it will be recorded as a condition of the lot split if it is approved by Council with those conditions. Ryan emphasized that this is a unique circumstance because of the area and the 212 foot width of the lot.

Building Official Byrwa commented that the Zoning Board looks at each case on its own individual merit. He commented on the variance process and lot split procedures.

Frank Worrell of 32123 Bellvine Trail expressed a concern that the Circuit Court action with regard to this case may adversely impact R-A zoning in the Village.

Gladys Walsh of 20655 Smallwood Court questioned why there was no presentation of the lot split proposal this evening by the applicant or Council. She does not feel like she has all of the information she needs on this agenda item.

Domzal responded that Mr. Christie has provided copies of all required documents and information to the Planning Board and Council with respect to the lot split request. He asked that the applicant or staff give a brief presentation of the proposal for the benefit of those present.

Building Official Byrwa displayed a site plan of the Christie parcel on the east side of Mayfair showing the existing home and the dimensions of the proposed two new lots. He outlined the land division proposal for this property.

The Planning Board passed a motion (8 – 0) that, in accordance with action taken by the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant variances for lot area and lot width, it recommends approval of the Christie land division application for property located at 32380 Mayfair at the recommendation of the Village Planning Consultant.

Sharon Tischler of 21415 Virmar Court referred to the drawing displayed and noted that the house immediately south of the Christie parcel does not meet the 15 foot side yard setback requirement. Byrwa confirmed that the Marsh residence has a non-conforming side setback.

Art Liberty of 20850 W. Thirteen Mile Road, Planning Board member, stated that the Planning Board agreed that the proposal submitted by the petitioner met minimum requirements. Some members questioned why the lot split was before the Planning Board when there was no basis on which to disapprove the lot split.

Rich Marsh commented that there was an addition constructed on the north side of his house in the early 1960s before he purchased the home. A variance was received from the Zoning Board allowing a 6 foot side yard. Marsh commented on the footprint for a new house that was submitted with the Christie proposal.

In answer to an inquiry from Pam Rijnovean, Bill Christie stated that he has owned the property for almost two years and that he bought the property as his home for many years to come. Rijnovean reiterated her concern that there will be a “big foot” home on the lot.

Byrwa commented that any house built on the Christie lot will meet ordinance setback requirements. The house will also be required to comply with the restrictions placed on the lot by the Zoning Board as part of its approval of the variances.

Gladys Walsh of 20655 Smallwood Court expressed concern that there will be future variances requested by owners of the house that will be built on that property.

No one else wished to be heard; therefore, the public hearing was closed at 8:15 p.m.

Motion by Taylor, second by Pfeifer, to approve the Christie land division application for property located at 32380 Mayfair subject to the Zoning Board of Appeals provisions set forth in its motion of December 13, 2004.

Ryan stated that restrictions will be recorded against both properties if this motion passes. There will be no further splits allowed on the 132.5 foot lot. Any future owners will be on notice that the new residence and any structures on that property cannot be enlarged. There will only be remodeling allowed.

Koss understands the concern about “big foot” housing. She supports the lot split on the basis that setback requirements will be maintained and there are restrictions being placed on the new house.

Pfeifer commented that the request before Council is solely to consider approval of a lot split. She referred to the contingencies placed on the Zoning Board's motion granting variances on this property. The Christies will be allowed to construct a 3,700 square foot home on the property. The zoning ordinance requires a minimum 2,000 square foot home in an R-1 district.

Pfeifer reviewed that she made a request at a joint meeting of the Council and Planning Board that the Planning Board look at developing ordinance language that requires and defines open space in the Village. She strongly urges the Planning Board to get something on the books to protect the Village from overbuilding on its lots.

Woodrow calculated that the largest size house that can be built on the new lot will be 44.5 feet wide. The new house could be a minimum of 15' from the lot line, which would make it 21 feet from the Marsh home due to a non-conforming side yard setback of 6 feet on the house to the south. Woodrow thinks that setbacks were established to keep houses a minimum distance apart. He would cite the health, safety and welfare of the community as a basis on which to deny this lot split request. Woodrow questioned whether the Village ordinance should require a certain number of feet between houses.

At Woodrow's inquiry, it was noted that the request cannot be referred back to the Planning Board and receive action from Council in time to meet the 45 day State deadline for taking action on a lot split application.

Ryan stated that the new house will have to conform to the minimum setback requirements of the ordinance. Byrwa commented that the building code requires that structures be kept a minimum of 5 feet from the lot line so there is over 10 feet between structures for fire safety.

Roll Call Vote:

Taylor	- yes
Woodrow	- no
Domzal	- yes
Downey	- yes
Koss	- yes
McCleary	- yes
Pfeifer	- yes

Motion passed (6 – 1).

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL APPROVAL REQUEST FROM CONSUMERS ENERGY FOR SITE IMPROVEMENT AND AN ADDITION TO THE CONTROL BUILDING AT 30319 LAHSER ROAD**

Before Council for consideration is a request for site plan and special use approval from Consumers Energy for expansion of its gas regulator station located on Lahser Road. An 8'x 24' addition is being requested to the control building along with various site improvements to the property.

Domzal opened the public hearing at 8:40 p.m. for Special Land Use Approval and Site Plan for Consumers Energy property located at 30319 Lahser Road.

Susie Wells, Community Services Manager for Consumers Energy, asked for Council review and consideration of the site plan and special land use for expansion of their building at the Lahser municipal gate. Council is in receipt of drawings for the project and information on the landscape design.

Kristen Atkins from Pollack Design Associates displayed a site plan showing the existing building with the expansion. She commented on the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board. The plan provides a natural berm and plant groupings (trees and shrubs) in the front yard and a mixture of canopy and evergreen trees along the side yard. The plantings exceed buffer strip requirements and provide an enhanced view along Lahser Road. The plan includes a six foot tall green vinyl-coated fence. The location of the fence has been set back about 60 feet from the road behind the planting/berm screen. The proposed design reduces the visibility of the fence and will provide a natural landscape in the front yard.

Bunker Kelly of 21526 Corsaut Lane asked questions of the building and landscaping, which were addressed by Atkins.

Gladys Walsh of 20655 Smallwood Court questioned the purpose of the additional space. Matt Beach, project engineer with Consumers Energy, stated that the proposal is to modify the piping inside the building because it has reached its life expectancy. The piping will be enlarged and brought up to date to service the community.

At the inquiry of Norman Rubin of 31320 Rivers Edge Drive, it was indicated that the pipe expansion will provide additional capacity and that the fence is being proposed to meet homeland security requirements.

The public hearing was closed at 8:52 p.m.

**REVIEW AND CONSIDER SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR CONSUMER ENERGY BUILDING EXPANSION AT 30319 LAHSER ROAD**

Motion by Woodrow, second by Pfeifer, to approve the site plan from Consumers Energy for site improvement and an addition to the control building at 30319 Lahser Road contingent on the Planning Board condition that all control valves and pipes be painted green to match the color of the fence.

Roll Call Vote:  
Motion passed (7 – 0).

**REVIEW AND CONSIDER SPECIAL LAND USE APPROVAL FOR CONSUMERS ENERGY BUILDING EXPANSION AT 30319 LAHSER ROAD**

Woodrow explained that this lot is zoned residential. Use of the property for a public utility building requires Council approval.

Motion by Woodrow, second by Downey, to recommend special land use approval for expansion of a Consumers Energy gas regulator station located at 30319 Lahser Road.

Roll Call Vote:  
Motion passed (7 – 0).

**PUBLIC HEARING TO REVIEW AND CONFIRM 2004 SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE SOUTHFIELD ROAD BUSINESS ASSESSMENT DISTRICT**

The Village maintains the public right-of-way along the Southfield Road business district and assesses the cost of landscape maintenance and water for the sprinkling system to the property owners on the west side of Southfield Road. Domzal opened the public hearing on the Southfield Road business assessment district at 8:58 p.m.

Pfeifer read the names of the businesses and the charges that will include the following services: sprinkler electric bill, fertilizer/spring clean up, lawn maintenance, maintain weed beds/mulch, trim shrubs/cut new edges, repair sprinkler system, fall clean up, and 2004 season water cost.

Beverly Hills Racquet Club	\$ 2,764.37
Bed, Bath & Beyond	1,080.52
Beverly Hills Grill	445.25
Petix	791.12
Emile's	1,499.70
Taco Bell	935.11
31333 Building	1,086.82
Beverly Venture	2,779.40
Vic's Fruit Market	2,025.80

Pam Rijnovean of 32420 Evergreen Road expressed the view that the company maintaining the lawn, shrubs, and planting beds along the Southfield Road business district is not doing a good job, and the Village should consider changing companies.

Woodrow pointed out that the total cost of the assessment is \$13,408.09. Of that, \$5,855.00 is for maintenance and upkeep. The other \$7,553.09 is for water sprinkling costs. There is not a lot of money being spent on maintenance.

Bunker Kelly suggested that the Village should survey the business owners to see if they are satisfied with the maintenance or if they are willing to spend more for landscaping improvements. He commented on the importance of the appearance of Southfield Road.

The public hearing was closed at 9:06 p.m.

**REVIEW AND CONSIDER 2004 SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE SOUTHFIELD ROAD BUSINESS ASSESSMENT DISTRICT**

Motion by Pfeifer, second by McCleary, that the 2004 maintenance costs for the Southfield Road Business District were \$5,855.00, and; the 2004 water costs for the

sprinkling system for the Southfield Road Business District were \$7,553.09; therefore, be it resolved that the Village of Beverly Hills Council confirms the Village Business District Assessment Roll for Southfield Road maintenance for the 2004 season in the amount of \$13,408.09 as follows:

Beverly Hills Racquet Club	\$ 2,764.37
Bed, Bath & Beyond	1,080.52
Beverly Hills Grill	445.25
Petix	791.12
Emile's	1,499.70
Taco Bell	935.11
31333 Building	1,086.82
Beverly Venture	2,779.40
Vic's Fruit Market	2,025.80

Downey recommended that the Village allocate a fee to cover its costs for administering the contract for these services. He recommended that administration arrive at the appropriate administrative costs so that the business owners can be notified and charged on next year's special assessment.

Woodrow commented that there is no reason why business owners cannot go above and beyond what is provided by the Village in terms of improvements to their property. He would not mind a recommendation from the Planning Board on further improvements and increased landscaping along the business district.

Domzal expressed the view that the Beverly Hills commercial district is underperforming, and the Village is not receiving the tax revenue from the area that it should. Beverly Hills has a Downtown Development Authority. Tax increment financing is a tool that municipalities are using to promote redevelopment and façade improvements. It is a shared burden that involves capturing taxes that are generated by the increased value and making it available for improvements. There are techniques that can be reviewed by the Planning Board for improving the commercial district.

Ryan recalled that the Village attempted a DDA in the middle 1980's, and it was challenged by the Birmingham School District because they did not want to lose mills. The tax increment financing avenue takes from other taxing agencies. It was determined by the Court that Beverly Hills did not fit the criteria relative to being a distressed or underperforming area. That is not to say that the law has not changed since then.

Ryan pointed out that all of the sites along Southfield Road have received site plan approval and meet the minimum standards of the ordinance. Until and unless the business owners come in for improvements or redevelopment of their site, the Village does not have the authority to require improvements.

Roll Call Vote:  
Motion passed (7 – 0).

**CONSIDER THE VILLAGE MANAGER POSITION**

Downey prefaced his motion by saying that Council met in a study session prior to the regular meeting and discussed the Village Manager position.

Motion by Downey, second by Woodrow, that the Village Council refer to the Personnel Committee the charge of developing goals and objectives for the Village Manager position and present a recommendation for filling that position with a permanent replacement to Council on March 15, 2005.

Taylor commented that the motion is not in line with the published agenda item which is, “Review and consider authorizing Village Attorney, Council President and Interim Village Manager to prepare the Village Manager’s contract”.

Domzal stated that the purpose of the business agenda is to alert the public to what is being discussed. The motion is germane to the Village Manager topic. Attorney Ryan concurred. It was clarified that the Personnel Committee of Council consists of Council President Domzal, President Pro-Tem Woodrow, and Downy.

Koss expressed the view that Renzo Spallasso is the right man for the position. She remarked that she is not familiar with the procedure for replacing a Village Manager. Apparently there needs to be a decision among Council as to whether Mr. Spallasso is the right person for the job, and she would like to see Council decide on this soon. Koss does not think that the Village needs to go out and look for a candidate for Village Manager when it has a person that is qualified for the position.

Pfeifer commented that she will not support the motion on the basis that she does not think that Council should refer the matter to the Personnel Committee.

Woodrow stated that he believes that the job of the Personnel Committee is to look at employment positions within the Village and make a recommendation to Council. It is his view that there needs to be consideration of alternatives to fill the Village Manager position.

Taylor remarked that Council has been working with this issue for weeks. There is a large amount of public support to elevate Mr. Spallasso to the manager position, and Taylor thinks that he would be able to fill that position.

McCleary proposed that the Village Manager position be forwarded to the Personnel Committee for review and a recommendation to Council.

Downey stated that Council is looking for leadership. He wants to make sure that Mr. Spallasso goes into the next year with a clear set of goals that represents what administration can do and what the Council expects.

Domzal stated that there is no question that goals and objectives should be set by a body in conjunction with the manager. The Personnel Committee does this on an annual basis. The issue is whether to offer Renzo Spallasso the position of Village Manager. Council has

discussed this and taken public input. Domzal is ready to offer Renzo Spallasso the position contingent upon resolution of terms and conditions of the contract and satisfactory review of goals. To the extent that the motion does not go that far, he cannot support it.

A number of residents came forward and spoke in support of offering Renzo Spallasso the position of Village Manager. Individuals cited Mr. Spallasso's integrity and his depth of knowledge about Beverly Hills. Other qualifications that were mentioned were his work ethic, attendance, team work, ability to relate to residents, good character, leadership abilities, problem solver, decision maker, fiscally responsible and accountable. Residents suggested that offering the manager position to Spallasso will provide the opportunity for him to train an individual for the public services director position and share his knowledge of the Village with that person. It was mentioned that Spallasso is the person to face the dire financial straights that the Village faces. The individuals who spoke suggested that Council give serious consideration to offering Spallasso the job and prepare a contract that works. It was stated that Council will not find anyone better for the job than Renzo if it is looking for someone who has the best interest of the town at heart in every decision he makes.

Sharon Tischler	21415 Virmar Court
Frank Worrell	32123 Bellvine Trail
Kathleen Berwick	31381 Kennoway Court
Gladys Walsh	20655 Smallwood Court
Bunker Kelly	21526 Corsaut Lane
Art Liberty	20850 W. Thirteen Mile Road
Bob Walsh	20655 Smallwood Court

Roll Call Vote on Motion:

Koss	- no
McCleary	- yes
Pfeifer	- no
Taylor	- no
Woodrow	- yes
Domzal	- no
Downey	- yes

Motion fails (4 – 3).

Pfeifer proposed that there needs to be an offer on the table before dealing with the agenda item as written, "Review and consider authorizing Village Attorney, Council President and Interim Village Manger to prepare the Village Manager's contract".

Motion by Pfeifer, second by Koss, that the Beverly Hills Council offer Renzo Spallasso the position of Village Manager with a contract to be drafted by Mr. Spallasso, President Domzal and Village Attorney Ryan and that Council request the Personnel Committee to establish goals and objectives with the manager and to develop an administrative staffing plan.

There was further Council discussion on the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

McCleary - yes  
Pfeifer - yes  
Taylor - yes  
Woodrow - no  
Domzal - yes  
Downey - yes  
Koss - yes

Motion passed (6 – 1).

**REVIEW AND CONSIDER TRAFFIC CONTROL ORDER #525-PP-04**

At the request of the Public Safety Department, “No Parking” signs have been installed on the east side of Vic’s Market facing Southfield Road to create a fire lane. Council is being requested to approve a permanent Traffic Control Order to retain the signs in this location.

Motion by McCleary, second by Taylor, to permanently adopt Traffic Control Order No. 525-PP-04 prohibiting parking at the following location:

31201 & 31213 Southfield Road (Vice’s Market)  
East side of building facing Southfield Road (fire lane)

Motion passed (7 – 0).

**FIRST READING OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE ENTITLED OFFENSES AGAINST PUBLIC PEACE, SAFETY AND MORALS**

It has been brought to Council’s attention by Village Attorney Tom Ryan that recent appellate court action has generated the need for changes to the current Village ordinance dealing with alcohol possession by minors. Specific issues for updating include possession by consumption (in the body as opposed to in the hands), the obligation by a minor to submit to a preliminary breath test and the associated fines/costs/community service alternatives that can follow a conviction.

Village Attorney Ryan stated that proposed Ordinance No. 320 will update the Village ordinance to mirror State Law so that the Beverly Hills Public Safety Department can write its own ordinance tickets and receive the fines. Ryan summarized Ordinance No. 320, An ordinance to amend Chapter 42 of the Municipal Code for the Village by amending, in part, Chapter 42, Section 10.10, Purchase, Consumption or Possession of Alcoholic Liquor by Minors.

Questions from Council were answered by Ryan. A second reading and consideration for adoption will be on the agenda of an upcoming Council meeting. The proposed ordinance is on file at the Village office for public review.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Doyle Downey announced his candidacy for a seat on the Birmingham Board of Education. He stated that he intends to provide some diversity to the School Board and that he would like the School Board to be more responsive to the governments. Downey would like to be a representative of the communities and the taxpayers.

Downey commented that one of the most important things that Council members can do as community leaders is recruit the next generation of community leaders. He is pleased to see a number of people from the Strategic Planning Committee becoming involved in the community.

Pam Rijnovean of 32420 Evergreen commented that the Public Safety Department Operational Review is not available on the Village web site. She mentioned that the Public Safety web site is in need of updating. Rijnovean was informed that the Public Safety report is available for public review at the Village office. Questions on the budget were addressed by Council. Rijnovean asked about the availability of statistics from Baldwin Public Library on use of the library by Beverly Hills residents.

Koss responded that results from the Library Survey will be an agenda item for the March 1 Council meeting. She and Pfeifer will attempt to schedule a meeting with Baldwin Library representatives before that meeting to receive answers to questions that have been raised. A representative of the Baldwin Library Board will be asked to attend the March 1 Council meeting to address questions from residents.

## **REPORTS – MANAGER**

The first day that residents can reserve the pavilion at Beverly Park is Wednesday, March 2, 2005. Due to the anticipated pavilion renovation construction project, pavilion rentals may not be able to occur after August 1. Village staff will know more about the construction schedule after the next Parks and Recreation Board meeting when the Board forwards its recommendation on a contractor and project cost to Council for consideration.

The Village offices will be closed on Monday, February 21, 2005 for President's Day.

The water main project is continuing on schedule. Spallasso again thanked the people who live along the route for their patience. Questions from Council were addressed by Spallasso.

## **COUNCIL**

McCleary stated that the Parks and Recreation Board will meet on Thursday, February 17 at 7:30 p.m. at the Village municipal building. There will be an update on the pavilion renovation plans.

Downey commented on the valuable information available on the SEMCOG (Southeastern Michigan Council of Governments) web site ([www.semco.org](http://www.semco.org)). He urged families to have a disaster plan, noting that there is information on this topic on the Oakland County web site.

Pfeifer stated that the Cable Board will meet tomorrow morning, Wednesday, February 16 at 7:45 a.m. Pfeifer shared information specific to Beverly Hills that was requested and received from the Birmingham Youth Assistance Committee.

Woodrow commented that his vote on issues is based on his concern about the Village and what the residents want and need. He votes his conscience and heart on issues. Woodrow thinks that the requisite homework should be done on issues before a Council vote.

Domzal stated that it has been suggested that Council schedule a public meeting on a Saturday to review where it stands on the Strategic Plan and how to go about implementing the recommendations in the plan. He suggested that this meeting take place tentatively on Saturday, March 19 at 9:00 a.m.

Motion by Pfeifer, second by Koss, to adjourn the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

Motion passed.

**Dave Domzal**  
**Council President**

**Ellen E. Marshall**  
**Village Clerk**

**Susan Bernard**  
**Recording Secretary**