

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
CITY OF NOVI
Tuesday, November 19, 2013

Proceedings taken in the matter of the ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Tuesday, November 19, 2013

BOARD MEMBERS

- Linda Krieger, Chairperson
- Mav Sanghvi
- Jeffrey Gedeon
- David Ghannam
- Rickie Ibe

ALSO PRESENT: Charles Boulard, Community Development Director
Beth Saarela, City Attorney
Coordinator: Angela Pawlowski, Recording Secretary

REPORTED BY: Jennifer L. Wall, Certified Shorthand Reporter

♀

1
2
3

INDEX

Case No.	Page
PZ-13-0052	6

Page 1

4	131119. txt PZ-13-0054	12
5	PZ-13-0056	27
6	PZ-13-0057	38
7	PZ-13-0058	55
8	PZ-13-0059	71
9	PZ-13-0062	77
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

♀

3

1 Novi , Mi chi gan.
2 Tuesday, November 19, 2013
3 7:00 p. m.
4 ** ** **
5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Wel come and
6 good eveni ng. Wel come to the Novi Zoning Board
7 of Appeals meeti ng for Tuesday, November 19,
8 7:00 p. m. , and we have a call to order, and Mav,

9 if you could say the pledge, please.
10 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
11 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And
12 Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.
13 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell is
14 absent, excused.
15 Member Gedeon?
16 MR. GEDEON: Here.
17 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick is
18 absent.
19 Member Ghannam?
20 MR. GHANNAM: Here.
21 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
22 MR. IBE: Present.
23 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
24 Krieger?
25 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Here.

♀

4

1 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
2 MR. SANGHVI: Here.
3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
4 quorum. And this is a public hearing format and
5 the rules of conduct are in the back. If
6 anybody has any questions, we can help as well.
7 Do we have an approval of the
8 agenda? Is there any changes?
9 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Yes, we do have a
10 change.
11 Case No. PZ13-0060 at 47900
12 Grand River, for Applebee's, they have asked
13 to be tabled to the December 10th meeting.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Then we have
15 an approval of the agenda with the change?

16 MR. GHANNAM: I'll move to approve
17 it as amended.

18 MR. IBE: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
20 motion and a second. All in favor say aye.

21 THE BOARD: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any opposed?
23 (No audible responses.)

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
25 we have an agenda.

♀

5

1 MR. SANGHVI: I just wanted to
2 point out there are two items (inaudible).

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I think
4 they're two different sites though. Are they
5 different two different sites?

6 MR. BOULARD: Two different
7 parcels.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

9 And minutes, a motion or any
10 discussion regarding the September 10
11 minutes?

12 MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
14 motion.

15 MR. IBE: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Motion and
17 second for September 10, 2013 minutes? Any
18 other discussion?

131119.txt

19

(No audible responses.)

20

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing

21

none -- we call the roll --

22

MS. SAARELA: Just a voice.

23

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor

24

say aye.

25

THE BOARD: Aye.

♀

6

1

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any opposed?

2

(No audible responses.)

3

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,

4

we have approval of September.

5

Now for October 8, 2013

6

minutes.

7

MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

8

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any second?

9

MR. GHANNAM: Second.

10

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a

11

second. All in favor say aye.

12

THE BOARD: Aye.

13

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any opposed?

14

(No audible responses.)

15

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,

16

we go to the public remarks.

17

Is there anybody in the public

18

that has a comment regarding anything, or

19

else if it's regarding a case, if you could

20

come up during that time.

21

(No audible responses.)

22

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none.

23

Then that closes public remarks.

24 We will go to Case No. 1, which
25 is PZ13-0052, for North Haven. If you come

7

1 up to the podium and state your name and
2 spell it for our court reporter.

3 MS. SAARELA: You should let all
4 the applicants know that they can have their
5 case postponed until the next meeting if they
6 want because of the lack of a full board.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If anybody
8 out there wants to -- we do not have a full
9 board. We have two members absent, if you wish
10 to postpone to another one, we would be willing
11 to table that, when you come up or as you wish.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead.

13 MS. EICHLER: My name is Denise
14 Eichler.

15 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Could you
16 spell your name.

17 MS. EICHLER: E-i-c-h-l-e-r.

18 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an
19 attorney?

20 MS. EICHLER: No.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you could
22 be sworn by our secretary.

23 MR. GEDEON: In Case No.

24 PZ13-0052, do you swear to tell the truth?

25 MS. EICHLER: Yes.

8

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right.

2 You may proceed thank you.

3 MR. EICHLER: This is a variance
4 request for a small addition my husband put on
5 our house. Unfortunately, he's not here because
6 he passed away in September. So I'm here -- I'm
7 not sure -- I'm just trying to fill in for him.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So you're
9 looking for a variance.

10 Then I will send it over to
11 Mr. Boulard, do you have any questions?

12 MR. BOULARD: No questions just to
13 maybe fill in a few of the blanks. This is --
14 an addition that was put on the rear of an
15 existing home. The rear setback of 35-foot
16 minimum is required to be maintained and the
17 house sits fairly far back on the lot and the
18 addition and the deck extends into the rear
19 setback, hence the need for the variance.

20 The site is somewhat unique in
21 that it backs up to a multi family project
22 and there is a fully dense amount of
23 vegetation, and then a set of carports, so
24 there is not like there is another neighbor.

25 It's unique only in that there

♀

9

1 is not another neighbor basically behind it.

2 Other than that, I will be
3 happy to answer any questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.
5 I'm sorry for your loss.

6 MR. EICHLER: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I will open
Page 7

8 it up to the board -- oh, correspondence,
9 please.

10 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0052,
11 there were 19 notices mailed, zero returns, zero
12 approvals, zero objections.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.
14 Mr. Sanghvi?

15 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came
16 and saw your property yesterday. You have a
17 very good looking dog there.

18 MR. EICHLER: Thank you.

19 MR. SANGHVI: Anyway, what is
20 right behind your house?

21 MR. EICHLER: What is behind it?

22 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

23 MR. EICHLER: Condominiums.

24 MR. SANGHVI: Okay. The reason
25 why I ask you, I don't think you will disturb

10

1 anybody by having this kind of change with
2 your -- what you have requested, and as far as
3 I'm concerned, I have no problem with the
4 variance you have requested.

5 MR. EICHLER: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, public.

7 Thank you, Mr. Boulard.

8 Anybody in the public have any
9 comments regarding this case?

10 (No audible responses.)

11 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none.

12 I'm forgetful today. I blame my statins.

13 Anyone else? A motion maybe?

14 MR. GEDEON: I'll take it. In
15 Case PZ13-0052, 210 North Haven, I move that we
16 approve the variances as requested.

17 In this case, there are unique
18 circumstances or physical conditions of the
19 property, such as narrowness, shallowness,
20 shape, water, topography or similar physical
21 conditions and the need for the variance is
22 not due to the applicant's personal or
23 economic difficulties, specifically in this
24 case, there is little impact on the
25 neighboring properties given the vegetation

♀

11

1 barrier to the rear of the property as well
2 parking facilities and the adjacent property.

3 The need is not self-created.
4 Strict compliance with the regulations
5 governing the area, the setback, frontage,
6 height, bulk, density or other dimensional
7 requirements will unreasonably prevent the
8 property owner from using the property for a
9 permitted purpose or will render conformity
10 with those regulations unnecessarily
11 burdensome.

12 The requested variance is the
13 minimum variance necessary to do substantial
14 justice to the applicant as well as to other
15 property owners in the district.

16 The variance will not cause an
17 advance impact on surrounding properties,

18 property values or the use and enjoyment of
19 the property in the neighborhood or zoning
20 district.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I have a
22 motion.

23 MR. SANGHVI: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: A motion and
25 a second.

♀

12

1 Any other discussion?

2 (No audible responses.)

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
4 Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

5 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

6 MR. GEDEON: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member
8 Ghannam?

9 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

10 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

11 MR. IBE: Yes.

12 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
13 Krieger?

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

15 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

16 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

17 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five
18 to zero.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

20 MR. EICHLER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings
22 us to our next case, PZ13-0054, for Grand River

23 for Heyn multi tenant. If you could come to the
24 podium.

25 And are you an attorney?

13

1 MR. HEYN: No.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you could
3 spell your name for our court reporter.

4 MR. HEYN: H-e-y-n.

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Momentarily
6 Member Gedeon will swear you in.

7 MR. GEDEON: In PZ13-0054, do you
8 swear to tell the truth?

9 MR. HEYN: I do.

10 MR. GEDEON: Thank you.

11 MR. HEYN: Good evening, Board
12 Members. Like we said, I'm Jeff Heyn. I reside
13 at 1420 Pettibone Lake Road, Highland, Michigan.
14 And I'm one of the property owners.

15 There is three buildings on
16 this sight. The rear building is this one
17 here, this upper building, or then there is
18 two up on the front of Grand River.

19 We have just recently went to
20 the Planning Commission to renovate the
21 westerly front building, that's this building
22 right there. That's vacant. It's an older
23 1960s building. We plan to turn it into that
24 image above right there.

25 So anyway, we are really

14

1 excited about looking forward to rejuvenating
2 this older '60s building, which will soon
3 look like an attractive 2014 building.

4 We have done considerable
5 recent work on the other two previously
6 vacant light industrial buildings, and we now
7 have three great tenants, Total Sports Roller
8 Hockey in the rear building and two new
9 tenants in the eastern front building. That
10 would be that one.

11 Cross Fit Novi Gym and Brian
12 Adams Physical Therapy.

13 So we've recently been to the
14 Planning Commission and got approval -- or
15 what do you call, preliminary approval to do
16 the renovation on the older building, which
17 we plan on removing certain parts of the
18 building.

19 This front office will be
20 removed and this side pendage will be
21 removed.

22 But we have no tenants lined up
23 as of yet for the newest building, but as
24 part of our retrenching, we are here seeking
25 your approval to install a new multi-tenant

♀

15

1 ground sign.

2 This sign will service three --
3 these three buildings, which total 60,000
4 square feet with a potential of six or more
5 businesses located at one of these three

6 buildings. And we modeled our sign after
7 another business center sign located a couple
8 blocks west of this site. I have got a
9 picture here.

10 This is essentially what we are
11 trying to do. This particular sign is just a
12 couple blocks west of our site and it
13 services a 20,000 square foot multi tenant
14 building.

15 Our proposed sign is about the
16 same size, this is a little bit taller, maybe
17 six inches taller.

18 Of course, this we're -- that's
19 what we would like to do.

20 There are a couple of important
21 needs or purposes that this sign will achieve
22 for businesses in this project. Some of
23 these businesses have limited or no
24 visibility to Grand River traffic.

25 This sign will allow potential

♀

16

1 customers traveling along Grand River to find
2 these businesses and not pass on by, then
3 turn around and try again.

4 Currently this happens often
5 with the roller blade hockey building in the
6 rear building, you know, without having any
7 Grand River identification.

8 This sign will also designate
9 where the entrance to these businesses are
10 and where to enter the site aiding in traffic

11 movement in and out of this multiple business
12 complex.

13 So I can answer any questions.
14 I know we are going to deal with the sign,
15 and then the parking variance afterward.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there
17 anyone in the public that has any comments?

18 (No audible responses.)

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
20 I will turn it over to Mr. Boulard.

21 MR. BOULARD: Just one point of
22 confirmation, I believe the sign, just to
23 confirm, that the sign is 72 inches high so
24 there is not a variance required for that
25 height, right?

♀

17

1 MR. HEYN: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And
3 correspondence?

4 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0054,
5 there were 20 notices mailed, two were returned
6 mail, zero approvals, zero objections.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Now open it
8 up to the board. Questions? Member Sanghvi.

9 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I was
10 wondering what you were doing to make the place
11 look better.

12 MR. HEYN: Thank you.

13 MR. SANGHVI: I have no problem
14 with your new improvement plan, building your
15 parking lot arrangement. Thank you.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

MR. HEYN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: It said in the packet there is storage. Do you know what kind of storage you would have in there?

MR. HEYN: Storage?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I believe so --

MR. HEYN: In the old building there is some stuff in there, but --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Depending on

18

your tenant then?

MR. HEYN: I'm not sure what --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I was reading it in the part on the planning review.

MR. HEYN: We plan to totally renovate that building. I'm not sure --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Maybe then I just misread it.

I also have -- it looks very nice how you're going to -- it would be nice to see how it's going to be used, since I'm right around the corner from there.

MR. HEYN: It's been vacant a long time.

MR. GHANNAM: I have a couple of questions. None of the buildings have particular tenant signs at this point?

MR. HEYN: They have wall signs. Pretty -- yeah, designating where they are and where their entrances are. Like there is a

♀

21 brand new business there, Adams Physical
22 Therapy. Actually you can see the sign right
23 above the door.

24 MR. GHANNAM: So each of them
25 already have identifying signs?

19

1 MR. HEYN: Yes, the existing
2 tenants. There is three. And we would hope
3 that, you know, any future tenants would also
4 have that ability, because actually, that
5 designates more where they're at within the site
6 and where their entrance is.

7 MR. GHANNAM: I don't have any
8 other questions. Thank you, sir.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes?

10 MR. GEDEON: Can you go back to
11 the picture of your mockup sign.

12 MR. HEYN: Sure.

13 MR. GEDEON: Are those -- now, you
14 already corrected the height dimension as 72 not
15 79 inches. But are the other dimensions
16 accurate?

17 MR. HEYN: Correct.

18 MR. GEDEON: And to the city, how
19 is the overall square footage or are any of
20 those portions of this mockup sign omitted from
21 that calculation of 40.47 square feet?

22 MR. BOULARD: The base would be
23 omitted. I have to get a calculator to do the
24 rest.

25 MR. GEDEON: It's safe for us to

1 go with the 40.47 square feet if we approve the
2 variance?

3 MR. BOULARD: Yes.

4 MR. GEDEON: That's all. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. HEYN: Charles, we would
7 probably ensure that it's six foot total. We
8 would have the base, it's still there. So, you
9 know, we would reduce proportionately, whatever,
10 not to exceed the six feet we could probably
11 still have that eight or 10-inch base at the
12 bottom just to get it off the ground.

13 MR. BOULARD: But as -- if I may,
14 as long as the base stays at least at six and a
15 half inches, you would be within the 40 square
16 feet.

17 MR. HEYN: Right.

18 MR. BOULARD: If we don't exceed
19 the 72 high, we should be good.

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You're
21 amendable to that?

22 MR. HEYN: Yes, absolutely.

23 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: What, we
24 have to do the parking separate from the sign?

25 MR. BOULARD: The criteria are

1 different, so it might be worthwhile doing a
2 separate motion. They both have been included
3 for you.

4 MR. IBE: One quick question.

5 Sir, I heard you say that you
6 may have new tenants obviously once this
7 addition is done, is that correct?

8 MR. HEYN: Correct.

9 MR. IBE: Now, the sign that you
10 have, the mockup sign, obviously, shows six
11 businesses. Are these the existing businesses
12 right now that you have?

13 MR. HEYN: No. There is three of
14 them that are existing. We just used three
15 fictitious names right now.

16 MR. IBE: So you assume -- you're
17 taking into consideration that new business will
18 come and they can fit into this sign as well?

19 MR. HEYN: Yes. That's our hope.
20 If we end up having four tenants, then we are
21 going to have to, you know, make each panel
22 smaller or whatever we do, you know. I know we
23 are going to have to stay within that area.

24 MR. IBE: Very well. Thank you,
25 sir, you have answered my question.

♀

22

1 MR. HEYN: Thank you.

2 MR. IBE: You're welcome.

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Looking for
4 a motion then, or two. Member Gedeon.

5 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0054, I
6 move to approve the applicant's request for a
7 sign variance for a 40.47 square foot multi
8 tenant ground sign.

9 The request is based on
Page 18

10 circumstances or features that are
11 exceptional and unique to the property, and
12 do not result from conditions that exist
13 generally in the city or that are
14 self-created.

15 Specifically this is a multi
16 building parcel, where there are certain of
17 those tenants bases are obscured from the
18 roadway, such that wall signs would not be
19 sufficient for those businesses.

20 Failure to grant relief will
21 unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the
22 property and will result in substantially
23 more than a mere inconvenience or inability
24 to attain a higher economic or financial
25 return.

♀

23

1 The grant of relief will not
2 result in a use of structure that is
3 incompatible with or unreasonably interferes
4 with adjacent or surrounding properties and
5 will result in substantial justice being done
6 to both the applicant and adjacent or
7 surrounding properties and is not
8 inconsistent with the spirit of the
9 ordinance.

10 MR. IBE: Second.

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

13 (No audible responses.)

14 Seeing none, if Ms. Pawlowski
Page 19

15 can call the roll.

16 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

17 MR. GEDEON: Yes.

18 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

19 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

20 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

21 MR. IBE: Yes.

22 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

23 Krieger?

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

25 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

24

1 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

2 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five

3 to zero.

4 MR. HEYN: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Dimension

6 variance we do that too? Part two. Go ahead.

7 MR. HEYN: We're seeking a
8 variance for 270 square feet of -- a few parking
9 spaces within the setback. You can -- it
10 illustrates it on the landscape plan there.

11 And I think the City of Novi
12 planners have favorably -- I don't know if I
13 can say endorsed, but they looked favorably
14 at our treatment of -- you know, the design
15 of the building, the design of the
16 landscaping. Right here we're going to have
17 eight feet of landscaping in front of the new
18 building. And it's according to your
19 landscape designer.

20 And then we also have
21 three-foot high berm up in front kind of
22 buffering the parking in front along there.
23 And we are providing a marginal access for
24 future connection to the westerly property,
25 adjoining property. So I think they viewed

25

1 it as a positive in trying to redesign this
2 area of this site.

3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it?
4 Open it up to the public again for any comments?
5 (No audible responses.)

6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
7 Mr. Boulard?

8 MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The board?
10 We're looking for a motion again.

11 MR. IBE: In Case No. PZ13-0054,
12 for 6035 Grand River Avenue, I move that we
13 grant the petitioner's request regarding the
14 issue of parking for the following reasons.

15 There are unique circumstances
16 and physical conditions of the property, such
17 as the narrowness and shape and topography or
18 similar physical conditions and the need for
19 the variance it is not due to the applicant's
20 personal or economic difficulty.

21 For the fact that the applicant
22 is making quite a bit of improvement to the
23 property and the landscaping and all of that,
24 it obviously is meaningful that the parking

25

also be modified to fit with what the

26

1

applicant wish to accomplish.

2

The need is not self-created.

3

Strict compliance with regulations governing

4

the area setback, frontage, height, bulk,

5

density or other dimensional requirements

6

will unreasonably prevent the property owner

7

from using the property for a permitted

8

purpose.

9

The requested variance is a

10

minimum variance that is necessary to do

11

substantial justice to the applicant as well

12

as to all the property owners in the

13

district.

14

The requested variance will not

15

cause an adverse impact on surrounding

16

property and will not effect the property

17

values of the other properties in the area,

18

or the use and enjoyment of the property of

19

the neighborhood in the zoning district.

20

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

21

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a

22

motion and a second. Any other discussion?

23

(No audible responses.)

24

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,

25

if Ms. Pawlowski could call the roll.

27

1

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

2

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

3 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?
4 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.
5 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
6 MR. IBE: Yes.
7 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
8 Krieger?
9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
10 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
11 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
12 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five
13 to zero.
14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good luck.
15 MR. HEYN: Thank you very much.
16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Call our
17 next case for Varsity Lincoln. Case No.
18 PZ13-0056, 49251 Grand River.
19 MR. CASTANOS: Good evening. How
20 are you. My name is Rick Castanos,
21 C-a-s-t-a-n-o-s, service director of Varsity
22 Lincoln.
23 MR. GEDEON: In Case No.
24 PZ13-0056, do you swear to tell the truth?
25 MR. CASTANOS: I do.

♀

28

1 MR. GEDEON: Thank you.
2 MR. CASTANOS: I don't know if
3 these photos are going to show up on here. Can
4 I pass these out to you guys so you can see it.
5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. If you
6 have an extra one for the overhead.
7 MR. CASTANOS: What we have is

8 we're asking for a variance. What we have got
9 is we have got parking light poles that are
10 throughout the parking lot of the dealership.
11 And we put these black out plastic bollards
12 there just because we had customers that were
13 running into light poles, there was concrete
14 base and damaged cars, so we did this
15 esthetically throughout the dealership, plastic
16 bollards, they're about two and a half,
17 three feet.

18 They're located throughout the
19 entire dealership within the parking lot as
20 well as I guess on the -- facing Grand River
21 as well as Wixom Road.

22 The question here is -- the
23 label, you see the name, the Lincoln brand,
24 the logo and then varsity on top. Those are
25 stickers, they're about four inches each,

♀

29

1 they come off. They kind of come off during
2 the wintertime, so we put them back on. So
3 they're not fixed on permanent. So we didn't
4 realize when you come to the store,
5 esthetically when you're in the parking lot,
6 they're on the front and back and the parking
7 lot. So you don't see them from the road
8 whatsoever. There is probably 25 total
9 poles.

10 We did it esthetically on the
11 outside too, so it matched all of them
12 through inside the parameters of the store.

13 So what we are looking for,
14 what we'd like to go through on the exterior,
15 facing Grand River.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.
17 That's it?

18 MR. CASTANOS: That's it.

19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anybody in
20 the public have any comments regarding this
21 case?

22 (No audible responses.)

23 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
24 Mr. Boulard, do you have questions, comments?

25 MR. BOULARD: Just a point of

30

1 clari fication. If you look at the overhead shot
2 that's included in the packet, you will see that
3 there is a -- there is a line that runs from
4 left to right. That's actually the line that
5 separates the City of Novi from our neighbor to
6 the north and west. And so if you go out and
7 count the number of signs, you will find that
8 the total number is less than what's in the
9 variance because only nine or ten of them are
10 actually within the City of Novi believe it or
11 not.

12 MR. CASTANOS: Right, in Wi xom.

13 MR. BOULARD: Are out in Wi xom.

14 So I just want to point that out, if you notice
15 there is a discrepancy what you saw out there
16 and what's on here, that's why it is.

17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you

18 very much.

19 MR. BOULARD: Other than that, I
20 will be happy to answer any questions. Thank
21 you.

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You don't
23 have to don't pay taxes in both cities, do you?

24 MR. CASTANOS: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there any

31

1 correspondence, please.

2 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0056,
3 there were 12 notices mailed, zero return mails,
4 zero approvals and zero objections.

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right.
6 Open it up to the board. Yes, Member Sanghvi.

7 MR. SANGHVI: I drove around
8 outside to find out. I think these little
9 things really help to have an internal flowing
10 and proper (inaudible).

11 MR. CASTANOS: I appreciate that.

12 MR. SANGHVI: I don't have any
13 problem with your sign.

14 MR. CASTANOS: Thank you.

15 MR. GHANNAM: Have a question for
16 the city. If they didn't have the words on
17 there, would they be -- they would be considered
18 signs, I presume?

19 MR. BOULARD: The words or the
20 logo.

21 MR. GHANNAM: Right, the words or
22 the logo.

23 MR. BOULARD: If there was no
24 printing, essentially they would be considered
25 signs.

32

1 MR. GHANNAM: That's my problem, I
2 guess, with it. You're asking for ten signs,
3 realistically, and although you have more, some
4 are not in our city. If your theory is that
5 these are to prevent people from hitting the
6 poles, I understand that, but you don't need the
7 signs there to do that.

8 I don't blame you for wanting
9 them, don't get me wrong. But I think this
10 particular corner, been by there a million
11 times, I think all the signs that you have
12 are appropriate. It's well-lit and
13 well-signed, so I would be opposed to it.

14 MR. CASTANOS: Let me ask
15 something real quick. The reason for -- we
16 carried it on the outside, basically we were
17 following the Lincoln brand. We took the
18 Lincoln brand name, which all the cars in the
19 Lincoln line towards Grand River, so you're
20 seeing all the grills on Grand River, so we just
21 took the Lincoln emblem, the Lincoln name and
22 carried it and then obviously we added
23 (unintelligible) that's how we came up with it
24 esthetically when we look at the whole --

25 MR. GHANNAM: I don't blame you

33

1 for wanting it, but in terms of trying to get an

2 exception under our rules, it seems to be
3 excessive. That's all. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So it would
5 go along the with cars?

6 MR. CASTANOS: Yes, they're
7 basically the Lincoln logos in the front of the
8 cars, kind of match that. We have the Lincoln
9 emblem following the Lincoln brand. Also we
10 have got the signs that are on Wixom, in Wixom
11 that actually face Wixom, Grand River and Wixom
12 Road. Those are also -- I hate to take away
13 those and still have those, you got eight signs
14 here, not there, then you got six that are
15 there, in Wixom, so --

16 MR. IBE: Sir, as part of what we
17 have to do here in approving or denying, we
18 obviously have to stay within the ordinance.

19 Now, can you tell me, sir, what
20 is the exceptional, unique reason why you
21 need these signs?

22 MR. CASTANOS: Well, esthetically,
23 when you drive into the store, and you see all
24 the signs that are out there, the look and the
25 cleanliness of them, really -- the awareness of

34

1 them, whether -- how it shows, it really stands
2 out a lot more. We like the look of it a lot
3 better. It's a lot cleaner than just having the
4 plain black boards that are there.

5 So putting them on the exterior
6 just kind of follows it throughout the entire

7 store, you know, inside the parking lot and
8 outside, facing outside.

9 MR. IBE: As a follow-up to that,
10 the purpose of why you need this is because you
11 feel because customers were running into --

12 MR. CASTANOS: It started inside
13 the parking lot, when we did them in the parking
14 lot. That's what happened. So what we did,
15 when we drove by, you saw the plastic bollards
16 inside, but then you had the plain poles that
17 were on the border line facing Grand River, so
18 it didn't look right.

19 So what we did was, we carried
20 the plastic bollards out there, esthetically
21 we take care of our dealership pretty well.
22 We are pretty proud of it, so it just didn't
23 look right when you saw the plastic bollards
24 in the parking lot, then you saw these poles
25 that were on Grand River, you know, that were

♀

35

1 just poles going down, so we decided to put
2 those out there, too, to make sure
3 esthetically it looked good.

4 Then when we carried later on,
5 because they have been up there for years,
6 later on we carried the lettering around the
7 poles, which -- carrying the Lincoln brand
8 and whatnot.

9 MR. IBE: So will you agree, sir,
10 that without the Lincoln logo on this
11 (unintelligible), you can still accomplish the

12 same thing that you wish to do without it, is
13 that correct?

14 MR. CASTANOS: Sure.

15 MR. IBE: So obviously it does not
16 limit or prevent you from reaching the intended
17 goal, is that correct?

18 MR. CASTANOS: Correct.

19 MR. IBE: So the only other thing
20 we are worried about, we don't want to see
21 happen is, we don't want to be driving down
22 Grand River, or anyone in there, see like, you
23 know, esthetically when you look at the
24 dealership, we spent a lot of money on the
25 facade of it, I'd hate to see seven, eight, nine

36

1 poles that are on Grand River that have the
2 logos on it, and then all a sudden, the other
3 five that are blank that are in Novi.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Has Wi xom
5 approved those?

6 MR. CASTANOS: Yes.

7 MR. IBE: Sir, I think you have
8 made it pretty easy to oppose this. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We will know
10 we're in Novi, then, too. I don't know.

11 Any other comments?

12 Member Gedeon, questions?

13 A motion then?

14 MR. GHANNAM: I can. In Case No.

15 PZ13-0056 for 49251 Grand River for Varsity

16 Lincoln, I move to deny the zoning request as

17 requested.

18 I do not believe the request is
19 based upon circumstances or features that are
20 exceptional or unique to the property. The
21 failure to grant relief will not unreasonably
22 prevent or limit the use of the property.

23 The grant of relief will not
24 result -- strike that.

25 The grant of relief will result

37

1 in a use of structure that is -- I take that
2 back. I will strike that also.

3 I don't believe substantial
4 justice would be done to above the applicant
5 in the adjacent or surrounding property, if
6 the request was granted. It would be
7 inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance
8 if granted.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes?

10 MS. SAARELA: Can you add some of
11 the specific facts about why you don't think any
12 exceptional circumstances exist.

13 MR. GHANNAM: Yes, the reason why
14 is because if you look at the property, it is
15 well-lit, well-signed, and they have the
16 required signs according to the ordinance.

17 These particular signs, I don't
18 believe, would add anything to it. I think
19 you can accomplish the object that you're
20 seeking to do, which is to prevent vehicles
21 from running into these poles without the

22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

signs on there.
So I just don't think it's
necessary.
MR. GEDEON: I will second that.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
motion and a second. Any other discussion?
(No audible responses.)
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If
Ms. Pawlowski could call the roll.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?
MR. GEDEON: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?
MR. GHANNAM: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
MR. IBE: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: No.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes four
to one.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.
That brings us to Jared
Jewelers, Case No. PZ13-0057, 27795 Novi
Road.
MR. STIEBER: Good evening.
Patrick Stieber, 33650 Gift Hills Drive, Clinton
Township, Michigan.

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You're an
2 attorney?

3 MR. STIEBER: No.

4 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member
5 Gedeon, if you could swear him in.

6 MR. GEDEON: Could you spell your
7 last name, please, for the court reporter.

8 MR. STIEBER: S-t-i-e-b, as in
9 boy, e-r.

10 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0057, do
11 you swear to tell the truth?

12 MR. STIEBER: I do.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead.

14 MR. STIEBER: We are here tonight
15 actually revisiting a site that we came in front
16 of the board approximately 13 years ago, for
17 this Jared location.

18 But basically we are back here
19 tonight. We originally were back in 2000,
20 came in front of the board and asked for
21 relief to the sign ordinance for an
22 additional sign on the south elevation and
23 also an additional diamond logo on the west
24 elevation. Those signs were approved at that
25 time and permanently installed.

♀

40

1 We are back tonight to revisit
2 the sign on the west elevation and ask the
3 board if we can add additional copy to the
4 diamond logo that was installed originally

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

back in the year 2000.
Basically what Jared is trying to do is get their branding out to everything in the development to the west. They feel there is a lack of identification to the west of all the traffic flows within the development, and they wanted to get the copy on that elevation along with the diamond log that was previously approved.

So due to the fact that it is the stand alone building and has the frontages on Novi Road, the entrance road into the development and, you know, all traffic flows to the west, we are here tonight to ask, you know, for relief to add the additional signage.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is that it?

MR. STIEBER: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anybody in the public have any questions or comments?

(No audible responses.)

41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, Mr. Boulard, questions, comments?

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add. The gentleman already pointed out that the existing second sign is there per variance. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. Open it up to the board. Oh, correspondence. Thank you.

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0057,

10 there were 34 notices mailed, two return mails,
11 zero approvals, zero objections.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Open it up
13 to the board. Yes, Member Sanghvi?

14 MR. SANGHVI: Do you have an
15 entrance on the west side?

16 MR. STIEBER: No.

17 MR. SANGHVI: You had -- that sign
18 was already -- you had the one, and then you
19 want to move it to the south side?

20 MR. STIEBER: Correct.

21 MR. SANGHVI: The development on
22 the back, that was always there. It's not new?
23 This is a facility with an island with
24 (inaudible) side, you like it all on four sides
25 the sign?

♀

42

1 MR. STIEBER: Well, I'm sure they
2 would like that, but, you know, they feel that
3 the west side is the side that they're looking
4 for the identification. The Starbucks is to the
5 north.

6 MR. SANGHVI: I remember the
7 Zoning Board, last time, also we discussed this
8 and (inaudible) on the south side instead of the
9 west side.

10 MR. STIEBER: Correct.

11 MR. SANGHVI: Tell me what has
12 changed tremendously since now you want a third
13 sign on that side?

14 MR. STIEBER: Well, I mean,

15 nothing has changed to the surrounding area,
16 other than, you know, the buildup of traffic
17 flows.

18 The building is still the same
19 building. The developments, you know, to the
20 west have grown since 2000. So, you know,
21 they just feel like there is a lack of
22 identification and a hardship due to the fact
23 all of that, those flows and parking right
24 there on the west.

25 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you.

43

1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I was
2 reading the correspondence from prior also. If
3 somebody -- they opted for the south sign, so
4 that people can drive out on the west side, if
5 somebody is shopping, be it for Christmas
6 shopping, they can see the identification, but
7 any other time, somebody is already knowing
8 where their store is, they're going to -- so
9 driving out, their intent is probably -- when
10 you want to catch them is when they're going in,
11 not when they're going out.

12 MR. STIEBER: There is another
13 entrance into that development though from --
14 you know, not just from right there on -- which
15 would be the southeast corner of the building.

16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The south
17 drive they could see the sign on the south side
18 as they're driving by.

19 Yes, Member Gedeon?

20 MR. GEDEON: I guess, I can see a
21 reason for supporting the sign. Just so I'm
22 clear, we are talking about adding a sign to the
23 west side, right?

24 MR. STIEBER: Correct. Currently
25 it was approved for the diamond logo that

44

1 currently exists there. I don't know if you
2 guys went by the site, saw we had installed the
3 banner lettering underneath the diamond logo
4 that's there.

5 So we are looking to add the
6 Jared jewelry copy to the -- underneath that
7 diamond logo that was previously approved.

8 MR. GEDEON: So if I was going to
9 make a motion in this regard, you know, I would
10 use as the supporting reasons the fact that this
11 is a -- you know, a multi entrance shopping
12 center, there is West Oaks Drive, there is -- I
13 can't remember the name of the street, but off
14 of Twelve Mile that goes behind Kohls, some of
15 those other -- towards the rear of those other
16 buildings which connects to West Oaks Drive. So
17 there is multiple ways that vehicles could get
18 into the parking lot, and they would provide
19 them behind this business. So they wouldn't
20 necessarily see the signs against Novi Road or
21 against the driveway, right near the south
22 elevation of the building.

23 So I don't have a problem with
24 this.

25

45

♀

1 MR. BOULARD: Just a point of
2 clarification, the diamond logo that's currently
3 on the west wall of the building was installed
4 without a permit, so that's part of their
5 variance, along with the lettering, that's in
6 the letter -- it's the last page of your packet.

7 MR. STIEBER: Jared would like
8 that investigated. There is a permit for that
9 sign and approval at the variance for 2000.

10 MR. BOULARD: The variance from
11 2000 was for second wall sign on the south
12 elevation.

13 MR. STIEBER: There was a variance
14 for the west elevation also just for that logo
15 though.

16 MR. BOULARD: I'm not aware -- at
17 the same time?

18 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I don't
19 remember seeing it in this packet, in the
20 previous minutes.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there
22 windows facing the west?

23 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I also
25 remember seeing the freestanding -- correct me,

46

♀

1 if I'm not mistaken, that a freestanding
2 building could be identified as a sign in a mall
3 center like that? That's what Member Bauer

4 said?

5 MR. STIEBER: There was a variance
6 from November 8, 2000. Case No. 00-058.

7 MR. GHANNAM: Charles, did you get
8 that case number he just told you about?

9 MR. BOULARD: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You have a
11 question, Mr. Ibe?

12 MR. IBE: Yes, I have some
13 questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We can go
15 onto the next questions then.

16 MR. IBE: If I understand you
17 correctly, there is no entrance on the west side
18 of the building, is that correct?

19 MR. STIEBER: Correct, just
20 parking.

21 MR. IBE: And if someone were to
22 park there, they will have to come to what, the
23 south side?

24 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

25 MR. IBE: To get in the building?

♀

47

1 MR. STIEBER: Correct.

2 MR. IBE: And you have a visible
3 sign on the south side?

4 MR. STIEBER: Yes, sir.

5 MR. IBE: So in order to get to
6 the west parking, I have to go through the south
7 to get to the west, is that correct? The
8 entrance.

9 MR. STIEBER: Yes. Well, there is
10 parking on the west. You have to go to the
11 south entrance to get in, yes.

12 MR. IBE: So in order for me to
13 get to where you want the sign, I have to pass a
14 big sign that says Jared to get to the back, is
15 that correct?

16 MR. STIEBER: No.

17 MR. IBE: Wait a minute. Where is
18 the entrance that is into your building?

19 MR. STIEBER: There is an entrance
20 on the east elevation, and south elevation. So
21 west elevation is the parking lot side. So,
22 yes, there is traffic and parking over there,
23 and then you would have to walk past that
24 elevation and go to the front of the store.

25 MR. IBE: Let's pretend I didn't

48

1 know where your building is. I want to come to
2 Jared, I need to buy diamonds for my beautiful
3 wife. And I pull in from the south entrance.
4 And I tend to park in the rear, which is the
5 west of the building. Are you following me?

6 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

7 MR. IBE: I'm making sense?

8 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

9 MR. IBE: So in order to get to
10 the west parking, I have to go to either the --
11 if you have two entrances on the east and the
12 south, is that correct?

13 MR. STIEBER: Yes. You're saying
Page 40

14 that once you came in, off of Novi Road, you
15 would see the sign there on south.

16 MR. IBE: Because I know that's
17 where I'm going. But I'm just going to park on
18 the west side because that's where I can find
19 parking in the back.

20 MR. STIEBER: Sure. I hear what
21 you are saying.

22 MR. IBE: The sign you're looking
23 for is in the back?

24 MR. STIEBER: It's not the back,
25 it's the side.

♀

49

1 MR. IBE: It's the rear of your
2 building that has no entrance, is that correct?

3 MR. STIEBER: Well, it's the side
4 of the building that has no entrance, yes.

5 MR. IBE: So --

6 MR. STIEBER: There is no parking
7 in the rear. You know, it's the side of the
8 building. The north side is what we would call
9 the absolute rear of the building.

10 MR. IBE: Tell me what is so
11 exceptional and unique about having the sign in
12 the back where you have no entrance?

13 MR. STIEBER: Well, what it is, is
14 to get the identification to the traffic flows
15 from the west. The other entrances into the
16 development from the west from Twelve Mile Road,
17 you can get in. If you're back in that parking
18 lot, you look up at Jared, you can't see Jared.

19 You can see the building there.
20 But there is nothing that identifies it as
21 Jared, when you're looking at it from the
22 west, you know, that area of development back
23 there.

24 So that's what the hardship is.
25 And that's why they feel that the sign is

50

1 needed.

2 MR. IBE: Do you have any other
3 businesses that share the building with you?

4 MR. STIEBER: There is Starbucks
5 to the north, yes.

6 MR. IBE: How many signs do they
7 have?

8 MR. STIEBER: You know, I think
9 they have just the one on Grand River, yes.

10 MR. IBE: Thank you.

11 MR. BOULARD: Based on my reading
12 of this, there was the original variance, 0058,
13 the one that you mentioned, which allowed two
14 signs, including a logo each of 60 square feet
15 on the --

16 MS. SAARELA: West and the east.

17 MR. BOULARD: West and the east.
18 Then in '09 the request was to relocate one of
19 those. There is still only two Jared signs with
20 two logos on it.

21 There should not be a logo on
22 the back of the building at this point, which
23 I believe is there.

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So you took
25 the sign and the emblem and separated them?

51

1 MR. STIEBER: No. That's what
2 doesn't make sense because we have an actual
3 permit just for that logo alone. So something
4 doesn't make sense.

5 MR. BOULARD: You may have had a
6 permit before the second variance. So I would
7 be happy to look into that for you.

8 MR. STIEBER: Sure. Obviously
9 everyone wants to get it right.

10 MR. BOULARD: If the board is
11 inclined to grant a variance, I would suggest
12 that it would include the logo and the --

13 MR. STIEBER: Sure.

14 MR. BOULARD: Thank you.

15 MR. GHANNAM: My two seconds is in
16 that I'm not in support of this. You have to
17 understand, as you can imagine, even from
18 tonight, the bulk of our cases are sign cases.
19 Why, because the ordinances are written the way
20 city council intended.

21 The question becomes do you
22 come within one of the exceptions. We have a
23 lot of buildings that are visible from more
24 than one side and they want more than one
25 sign, and under certain circumstances that's

52

1 appropriate.

131119.txt

2 Here, I mean, you can be seen
3 from all four sides. That doesn't mean you
4 need four signs.

5 So I think the two that you
6 have are sufficient. If you want to
7 relocate, I would, you know, consider that, I
8 guess, that would probably have to be a
9 different petition.

10 But I would not be in favor of
11 the one on the west elevation just because
12 your building is visible from the west,
13 because with that theory, you should have one
14 on the north, every building that can be seen
15 from all four sides should have four building
16 signs. I don't think that's appropriate.
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member
19 Gedeon?

20 MR. GEDEON: I'm all set.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Can I have a
22 motion?

23 MR. IBE: I will take it. In Case
24 No. PZ13-0057, 27795 Novi Road, Jared Jewelers,
25 I move that the applicant's request be denied

♀

53

1 for the following reasons, that the request is
2 not based on any circumstances or features that
3 are exceptional and unique. And that the
4 failure to grant relief will not prevent or
5 limit the use of this property, as intended and
6 will not substantially impact the ability of the

7 petition to attain a higher economic or
8 financial return.

9 The petitioner obviously has
10 been before the board before and requested a
11 sign and I believe based on the minutes from
12 that particular event in 2002, the petitioner
13 was offered one actually on the west side,
14 but elected to put it on the south side. And
15 now the petitioner wishes to have an
16 additional sign on the side that was once
17 rejected.

18 And frankly, I think the
19 petitioner's own words does justice to the
20 denial of this motion when the petitioner
21 claims that there has not been any
22 significant changes in terms of circumstances
23 or situations other than the fact that you do
24 have more people coming through the mall.

25 And that is a great reason,

1 obviously, to deny this particular motion.

2 Secondly, there is no entrance
3 on the west side of the petitioner's -- or
4 the applicant's building. You know that you
5 get access into the building, you have to go
6 to either the east or the south elevation,
7 that's half signs, visible signs. A
8 free-alone standing building does have four
9 sides, but two signs have been allowed, one
10 by right and one to a variance.

11 And now petitioners seek to

12 have a third sign in an area that obviously
13 is not -- with no entrance and serves no
14 purpose other than to accomplish what the
15 petitioner seeks to do right now, which
16 obviously is inconsistent with the spirit of
17 the ordinance.

18 Therefore, I move that the
19 petitioner's request be denied.

20 MR. GHANNAM: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
22 motion and second. Any other discussion?

23 (No audible responses.)

24 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If
25 Ms. Pawlowski can call the roll.

♀

1 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

2 MR. GEDEON: No.

3 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

4 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

5 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

6 MR. IBE: Yes.

7 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

8 Krieger?

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

10 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

11 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

12 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes four

13 to one.

14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

15 MR. STIEBER: Thank you for your

16 time.

17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings
18 us to Verizon Wireless. Case No. PZ13-0058, for
19 26401 Novi Road.

20 That's for you, too?

21 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.

23 Please restate your name.

24 MR. STIEBER: Patrick Stieber.

25 You need to be sworn in again?

♀

56

1 MS. SAARELA: No.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We are all
3 good. Go ahead.

4 MR. STIEBER: All right. Well,
5 away from Jared, and onto Verizon.

6 But, yes, we're here tonight
7 asking for relief from the sign ordinance to
8 add a second sign to the building at 26401
9 Novi Road. I'm sure you guys have all been
10 to the site and seen the situation out there.
11 But we are asking for a sign which would be
12 on the west elevation, the rear of the
13 building, the main entrance to the building.
14 You know, due to the fact that this sign sits
15 up so close to Novi Road. The main entrance
16 is on the rear of the building.

17 We need to have the
18 identification on Novi Road, with the traffic
19 flows on Novi Road. But we also need to have
20 that identification on the rear elevation
21 where the main entrance is and the parking

22 lot is. This building actually does face
23 another road behind it, Expo Drive, and you
24 come in off of Crescent, Novi Road there.

25 So this site is unique. It

57

1 does have unique circumstance. There are
2 other, you know, businesses, developments
3 that have some of the same features as this
4 in the area.

5 Ts development and businesses
6 also have, you know, what looks to be like be
7 similar requests of what we have here.

8 We don't feel like it is
9 excessive, it does fit within the
10 architecture of the building.

11 So basically, that's the gist
12 of what we are asking for and why. And we do
13 feel like we do have a hardship here and some
14 unique circumstances due to the development
15 of the property.

16 The developer, landlord owner
17 is here as well, if you have any questions
18 about any of that, along with Verizon
19 Wireless representatives as well.

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is that it?

21 MR. STIEBER: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anybody else
23 in the public want to have a comment? Question?
24 (No audible responses.)

25 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,

58

1 Mr. Boulard?

2 MR. BOULARD: Just one point. I
3 do recall that when Qdoba came for this exact
4 building and talked about their -- requested the
5 second sign, which there was quite a bit of
6 discussion about.

7 One of the concerns was that
8 every tenant, in fact, I think I asked the
9 question, you know, how was this tenant
10 different from others.

11 I believe it was represented
12 that Qdoba was different because they were on
13 the far south end, and so on. I guess, I'd
14 just like to understand why now is Verizon
15 also requesting the second sign?

16 MR. STIEBER: Well, they have the
17 entrance on the rear. They are the far tenant
18 to the north. They're actually limited with
19 their visibility because they are the north
20 tenant and the main entrance into this
21 development is from the south.

22 But, yes, there is definitely a
23 lack of identification for knowing that that
24 is the Verizon store without a sign over the
25 entrance on that rear elevation.

♀

1 It's definitely something that,
2 you know, they feel that they really need to
3 get the customers into the entrance from the
4 parking area. I really think there are some
5 unusual circumstances with how that sits, you

6 know, the traffic flows on Novi Road,
7 obviously, they need to have a sign up there
8 so that everybody knows where -- that Verizon
9 is there. If they had just the sign on the
10 rear, they would be very limited to their
11 identification, just feel like this
12 situation, with the traffic flows on Novi
13 Road, and the entrances and parking into this
14 development, you know, to the south, the fact
15 that they do have the other roads going in
16 there, that this sign is warranted.

17 MR. BOULARD: So would your
18 position be that all four or all three or four
19 of the businesses there are going to be in this
20 building deserve two signs, if one does?

21 MR. STIEBER: I would say yes.

22 MR. BOULARD: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You like to
24 participate? If you could spell your name,
25 please, be sworn in.

60

1 MR. SCHULTZ: Ryan Schul tz,
2 S-c-h-u-l-t-z, Versa Development. We are the
3 landlord of the building.

4 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0058, do
5 you swear to tell the truth?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: I do. My name is
7 Ryan Schul tz, Versa Devel opment.

8 I was the one who actually made
9 the second approach to the board on behal f of
10 Qdoba, when the fi rst one went si deways.

11 Qdoba asked for something a little different
12 than what Verizon is asking for.

13 They did ask for that sign to
14 be placed on the side of the building, which
15 is on Novi Crescent Place Drive, which is a
16 little bit different.

17 I think in the TC district
18 within the City of Novi, we pushed those
19 buildings as close as we can to the
20 right-of-way, which limits us from the
21 traditional bi-directional sign that we are
22 used to.

23 In this circumstance, again,
24 all our customers are entering the building
25 from the back. In that instance, we need to

♀

61

1 provide them effective direction to what
2 tenant they're going to.

3 This is kind of a unique
4 circumstance, we understand that, we do feel
5 that there is precedent in the community. We
6 have brought some additional materials,
7 similar to the ones I presented when we were
8 up here for Qdoba.

9 So we will feel strongly that
10 signage on Novi Road is appropriate, granted
11 by right, signage on the back side of the
12 building to help further, show those
13 customers, where they need to go. This is
14 something that can be easily granted, and
15 like our sign consultant mentioned, the sign

16 is unique in certain characteristics. It is
17 fronted on three sides by public roads. That
18 effects our setbacks. There are some -- a
19 number of limitations, I guess, you would
20 say. We had to apply to the board for
21 variances just to get overall site plan to
22 work.

23 We feel that kind of ties into
24 the overall hardships situation.

25 I can answer anymore questions,

♀

62

1 too, if there are some from the board.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER:

3 Correspondence? Thank you,
4 Member Gedeon.

5 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0058,
6 there were 18 notices mailed, two returned
7 mails, zero approvals, zero objections.

8 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Open it up
9 to the board. Yes, Member Sanghvi.

10 MR. SANGHVI: I drove into your
11 parking lot yesterday, and you got to have some
12 sign to show which is your business from the
13 back, you know. I have no problem with giving
14 you an identification sign. The question is
15 only whether you need a 64 square foot or
16 something smaller. But you do need
17 identification on the door.

18 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Did they
19 have identification on their door, when we go
20 around, park in the back, you go to the door,

21 there should be like some kind of identification
22 that you know which door you're at? Do they do
23 that?

24 MR. BOULARD: There is limited
25 identification so you can tell which door to go

63

1 into. It's an opportunity that's available, but
2 it's not near 60 square feet.

3 There is also an opportunity to
4 put signage on the glass, on the inside of
5 the glass, you know, by the letters or
6 something like that, but nothing of this
7 size.

8 MR. GHANNAM: What's the maximum
9 signage in terms of square foot for the one sign
10 of right?

11 MR. BOULARD: For the one that's
12 currently on the east side?

13 MR. GHANNAM: Right. On the Novi
14 Road side. Do you know what size the sign is on
15 Novi Road?

16 MR. STIEBER: Same size.

17 MR. SCHULTZ: Sixty-four square
18 feet, if I'm interpreting the ordinance
19 correctly, it is listed on the documents that
20 are in the packet. It is one linear foot to
21 1.25 square feet of signage. That puts it at
22 about 85 square feet, which would be approved
23 for one singular wall sign.

24 So the sign that's on the back
25 of the building is less than that. It is at

♀

1 63.9 square feet.

2 MR. BOULARD: We round to 64.

3 MR. GHANNAM: Tell me again,
4 what's the size of the sign on Novi Road as it
5 exists today?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: Sixty-four square
7 feet.

8 MR. GHANNAM: I mean, again, I
9 remember the Qdoba case very well. I thought it
10 was an unusual circumstance. This was the old
11 Big Boy that was torn down and rebuilt, I
12 understand all of that. You do have three
13 fronts. I remember the other variances for, I
14 think it was the dumpster and parking, I forget
15 all the other ones. I remember all of those
16 things.

17 I have no problem with the
18 second sign. I think it makes sense in this
19 particular situation. My only concern is the
20 size of the sign. You need that full 64
21 feet, can you use something less?

22 MR. SCHULTZ: I think the
23 petitioner obviously would prefer that, me being
24 the party to the petitioner. I do want to point
25 out, too, that Verizon is taking the largest

1 amount of square feet.

2 There will not be four tenants
3 in this building. There will only be three.

4 Originally they started out at 3,200 square
5 feet. I think now they're up to 5,500 square
6 feet. So they are the largest tenant in this
7 building.

8 MR. GHANNAM: I understand that.
9 I appreciate that. My question is, I guess
10 what's the minimum amount of square footage that
11 would be needed for this particular space? What
12 could you live with?

13 I don't know what the board is
14 inclined, but 64 foot, you have it on the
15 east side, I'm just trying to figure out what
16 you can live with here.

17 MR. GEDEON: I'm just pointing out
18 in the mockup, you know, a large chunk of that
19 64 square feet is this checkmark. There is a
20 lot of -- the lettering is not going to look
21 like a 64 square foot sign. The lettering is
22 going to be only half of at that, roughly half
23 of that space. I'm not sure if it's going to
24 really look that huge.

25 MR. STIEBER: That was next point

♀

66

1 I was going to bring out is the fact that there
2 is so much white, blank space, you know, between
3 the box out of the logo with the letters. I
4 mean, look at all the space above the letters
5 that's getting, you know, boxed out as signage,
6 but it's not, it's just wall.

7 MR. GHANNAM: I understand. Okay.
8 That does make sense also, you're right. I

9 forgot about the checkmark is included as part
10 of the calculation.

11 So in general, I do not have a
12 problem. I do understand the need for it in
13 this case.

14 MR. GEDEON: I would also support
15 this. You know, I was in favor of the Qdoba
16 case. And I think these -- I think in an ideal
17 word, you know, city council will come and
18 update the sign ordinance specifically for these
19 new Town Center buildings areas.

20 You know, I think they're going
21 for a certain look here, where the buildings
22 are pushed up close to the road, you know,
23 gives it slightly more of an urban look, with
24 the parking to the rear.

25 And I think, you know,

♀

67

1 somewhere along the line, you know, that the
2 sign ordinance was forgotten about in all of
3 this planning process.

4 So I don't have a problem. I
5 think it's, you know, an appropriate role of
6 the ZBA, you know, to step in when things got
7 forgotten, things get forgotten in this
8 process. So I have got no problem with this.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Would this
10 go with -- if we approve for a 64 square foot,
11 would that go with just Verizon, or can we say
12 to this tenant, and then they would have to come
13 back if it was a different one?

14 MS. SAARELA: It would be limited
15 to square footage. I'm not sure what the role
16 would be to -- I mean, have to come back for a
17 different tenant, from the reasons that I'm
18 hearing, it's for rear identification. It's not
19 specific to a tenant issue.

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Once Expo
21 Drive, Adele builds, then that Expo Drive would
22 be used and then it will be essential for
23 visualization of what buildings or what tenants
24 are in the buildings, okay.

25 MR. IBE: I will make a motion.

♀

68

1 In Case No. PZ13-0058, 26401 Novi Road, Verizon.
2 I move that we grant the petitioner's request as
3 requested, for the following reasons.

4 One, that the request is based
5 upon circumstance or features that are
6 exceptional and unique to the property and do
7 not result from conditions that exist in the
8 city, or that are self-created.

9 Specifically, this property
10 obviously is located in a very unique area.
11 And the design of the building itself, it's
12 so close to Novi Road, that the entrance is
13 in the rear of the building. And though
14 there is a sign that tells you which building
15 it is, but there is no sign that tells you
16 which door to go into. So it makes more
17 logical sense that a sign should be allowed
18 for the patrons to know which place to go

19 into. And since that is in the rear
20 entrance, and where the parking is also
21 located, it is more conducive that the
22 petitioner be granted a sign in the rear of
23 the building.

24 Second, the failure to grant
25 will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of

♀

1 the property and result in substantially more
2 than a mere inconvenience, inability to
3 attain a higher economic financial return.

4 Now, the petitioner obviously
5 caters to, you know, the public. The
6 petitioner seeks to get more businesses and
7 new businesses. And (unintelligible) to pull
8 into the parking lot and not be able to
9 locate where to go, chances are that this
10 will not serve the purpose of why the
11 petitioner is there in the first place.

12 Third, the grant of relief will
13 not result in the use of structure that is
14 incompatible or unreasonable or interferes
15 with adjacent or surrounding properties and
16 will result in substantial justice being done
17 both to the applicant as well as the
18 surrounding properties, and is not
19 inconsistent with the spirit of the
20 ordinance.

21 May I cite that other
22 businesses located in this particular
23 establishment here, or where the property is

24 located, is Qdoba. Qdoba has similar need,
25 and this board, based on similar reasons

1 offered by the petitioners, was able to grant
2 Qdoba's request for the variance.

3 Therefore, based on all of
4 this, I move that we grant the petitioner's
5 request as requested.

6 MR. GHANNAM: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So we have a
8 motion and a second. Any other discussion?

9 (No audible responses.)

10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none,
11 Ms. Pawlowski, call the roll.

12 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

13 MR. GEDEON: Yes.

14 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

15 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

16 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

17 MR. IBE: Yes.

18 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

19 Krieger?

20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

21 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

22 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

23 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five
24 to zero.

25 MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you very much.

1 MR. STIEBER: Thanks.

2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings
Page 59

3 us to Country Cousin, PZ13-0059, on 26855
4 Haggerty Road.

5 MR. FULLER: Good evening. I'm
6 Trevor Fuller, 10836 Cartier Drive, Brighton.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Could you
8 spell your last name for us.

9 MR. FULLER: F-u-l-l-e-r.

10 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0059, do
11 you swear to tell the truth?

12 MR. FULLER: I do.

13 MR. GEDEON: Thank you.

14 MR. FULLER: As I understand, we
15 are going to handle these two separately, right?
16 There is two parcels for Country Cousin.

17 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

18 MR. FULLER: We are requesting a
19 monument sign be placed 10 feet from the current
20 right-of-way within a future planned
21 right-of-way. This is for 26855 Haggerty Road.
22 Currently there are no signs for the
23 development. So this sign here would serve a
24 dual purpose, double sided monument sign, as
25 you're heading north on Haggerty Road, it would

♀

72

1 identify the entrance. As you're heading north
2 on Haggerty, there is an overpass. The first
3 entrance there comes up quickly, so give a
4 visitor, guest a chance to identify the sign,
5 make a decision and turn into that entrance
6 safely. So that's it.

7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it.
Page 60

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

MR. FULLER: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there anybody in public? Nope. They have -- our public left.

Mr. Boulard, any questions?

MR. BOULARD: If I could speak to both of these cases, similarities. I realize it can get a little bit confusing.

What's going on here is there is an existing right-of-way and there is a proposed future right-of-way, which is why. The ordinance states these signs are supposed to be setback from the future right-of-way. Not sure if that is ever going to happen.

Certainly the proposed location sign is quite a distance from the edge of the roadway.

My suggestion would be if the

board were inclined to consider a variance, that a stipulation be put on that, if the additional right-of-way is ever realized, that the petitioner or the owner at that time would relocate the signs -- back out of the right-of-way at their cost.

Just for your consideration. Other than that, I will be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thanks. Any correspondence?

MR. GEDEON: In Case No.
Page 61

♀

13 PZ13-0059, there were 13 notices mailed, one
14 return mail, zero approvals and zero objections.

15 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. I
16 will it open up to the board. Yes, Member
17 Sanghvi.

18 MR. SANGHVI: It is amazing that
19 you never had a sign for this property ever
20 before.

21 MR. FULLER: Yes, it is. As you
22 drive by, there is no type of identification.

23 MR. SANGHVI: I don't know how
24 many times I have been across the street there,
25 the flower place, but Jones, I think it is. I

74

1 never saw any sign in front of the mobile home
2 park. I think it's time they have one.

3 Thank you. I have no problem
4 with this request.

5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.
6 I see that we have got a sign -- a letter from
7 the Road Commission, too. Yep, every time I go
8 up Haggerty Road, I know that place, but where
9 is your sub sign, okay. I'm in favor also.

10 MR. GHANNAM: I just have a
11 question for the city. I'm still a little
12 confused.

13 They're proposing to put it
14 10 feet from the future right-of-way at the
15 present time?

16 MR. BOULARD: Ten feet from the
17 edge of the existing right-of-way, within the

18 potential future right-of-way.

19 MR. GHANNAM: I assume that's if
20 Haggerty Road is expanded, right, it's widened?

21 MR. BOULARD: Yes.

22 MR. GHANNAM: Then it will be
23 effected?

24 MR. BOULARD: Yes.

25 MR. GHANNAM: I gotcha. I have no

75

1 problem with it, too.

2 And I think Mr. Boulard's
3 comment about if the right-of-way is
4 expanded, if your sign is within the
5 right-of-way, then it should be moved at the
6 owner's expense, but with that stipulation, I
7 have no problem.

8 MR. FULLER: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member
10 Gedeon, any questions?

11 MR. GEDEON: No.

12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: A motion?

13 MR. GHANNAM: I'll make a motion.

14 In Case PZ13-0059, for 26855
15 Haggerty Road, Country Cousin, I move that we
16 approve the petition as requested, with the
17 provision that if for some reason the
18 right-of-way of Haggerty in this area is
19 expanded such that the sign where it's going
20 to be placed comes within that right-of-way,
21 it must be moved, it has to be moved at the
22 owner's expense.

23 I think the request is based on
24 circumstances or features or exceptions that
25 are unique to this particular property, and

76

1 do not result in conditions that exist
2 generally in the city.

3 The failure to grant relief
4 will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of
5 the property, and will result in
6 substantially more than a mere inconvenience
7 or inability to attain a high economic or
8 financial return.

9 The grant of relief will not
10 result in the use of a structure that is
11 incompatible with or unreasonably interferes
12 with adjacent or surrounding properties and
13 will result in substantial justice being done
14 to the applicant.

15 I think the necessity of having
16 the provision that the owner remove the sign,
17 if the right-of-way is expanded, is necessary
18 also because it may or may not be expanded in
19 the future and we can't predict that, so I
20 will move to approve based on those reasons.

21 MR. IBE: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON KRUEGER: A motion and
23 a second. Any further discussion?

24 (No audible responses.)

25 CHAIRPERSON KRUEGER: Seeing none,

77

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Ms. Pawlowski, call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five

to zero.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER:

Congratulations. You're doing

the next one?

MR. FULLER: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's Case

No. PZ13-0062, for 26955 Haggerty Road, Country
Cousin.

MR. FULLER: Thank you. This is
for 26955 Haggerty, this would be the entrance
to the north requesting a second sign parcel to
identify the entrance to the north. The same

situation, be placed a minimum 10 feet from the
existing right-of-way, however, within the
planned future right-of-way.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it?

MR. FULLER: Yes.

♀

6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: No public
7 remarks. Mr. Boulard?
8 MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.
9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER:
10 Correspondence?
11 MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0062, 13
12 notices mailed, one returned mail, zero
13 approvals, zero objections.
14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.
15 Open it up to the board.
16 MR. SANGHVI: I think nothing
17 further to add. It's no different than the
18 previous.
19 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Same
20 stipulation?
21 MR. GHANNAM: If nobody has any
22 comments or questions, can I make simply the
23 same motion based on the same reasons that we
24 just said in the other case or do we need to
25 restate it?

♀

79

1 MS. SAARELA: Just restate it
2 because the motions get separated for.
3 MR. GHANNAM: Okay. May I make a
4 motion?
5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
6 MR. GHANNAM: Thank you. In Case
7 PZ13-0062, for 26955 Haggerty Road, for Country
8 Cousin, I move that we approve the petition as
9 requested, with the stipulation that if for some
10 reason this sign had to be removed because of a

11 future expansion of the road, where this comes
12 within the right-of-way, that it must be removed
13 at the owner's expense and relocated.

14 I think the request is based on
15 circumstances or features that are
16 exceptional and unique to the property, and
17 do not result from conditions that exist
18 generally in city, or that are self-created.

19 A failure to grant relief will
20 unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the
21 property and will result in substantially
22 more than a mere inconvenience or inability
23 to attain a economic or financial return.

24 The grant of relief will not
25 result in the use of a structure that is

♀

80

1 incompatible with or unreasonably interferes
2 with adjacent properties, and will result in
3 substantial justice being done to the
4 applicant.

5 It is not inconsistent with the
6 spirit of the ordinance. And additionally
7 the agreement or stipulation that the owner
8 pay for any removal based on the conditions
9 that previously stated is also necessary
10 because of any potential planned future
11 expansion of the right-of-way.

12 MR. IBE: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a
14 motion and a second. Any further discussion?

15 (No audible responses.)

16 CHAIRPERSON KRI EGER: Seeing none,
17 Ms. Pawlowski, call the roll.
18 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?
19 MR. GEDEON: Yes.
20 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?
21 MR. GHANNAM: Yes.
22 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
23 MR. IBE: Yes.
24 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
25 Krieger?

81

1 CHAIRPERSON KRI EGER: Yes.
2 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
3 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
4 MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five
5 to zero.
6 CHAIRPERSON KRI EGER: Very good.
7 Congratulations.
8 MR. FULLER: Thank you.
9 Appreciate it.
10 CHAIRPERSON KRI EGER: Other
11 matters?
12 MR. BOULARD: Happy Thanksgiving.
13 MR. IBE: Just a just quick
14 comment, obviously, I think it's probably right,
15 we just had an election in the city and we just
16 re-elected our mayor as well as some members of
17 city council, I think it is appropriate that
18 this board at least congratulate them.
19 MR. GHANNAM: Second that.
20 CHAIRPERSON KRI EGER:

131119. txt
Congratul ati ons.

21

22

MR. SANGHVI: Make a moti on to

23

adj ourn.

24

MR. GHANNAM: Second.

25

CHAI RPERSON KRI EGER: All in favor

82

1

say aye.

2

THE BOARD: Aye.

3

CHAI RPERSON KRI EGER: We are

4

adj ourned.

5

(The meeti ng was adj ourned at 8:33 p. m.)

6

** ** *

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

♀

♀

1 STATE OF MICHIGAN)

2) ss.

3 COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

4 I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the
5 County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the
6 witness whose attached deposition was taken before me in the
7 above entitled matter was by me duly sworn at the aforementioned
8 time and place; that the testimony given by said witness was
9 stenographically recorded in the presence of said witness and
10 afterward transcribed by computer under my personal supervision,
11 and that the said deposition is a full, true and correct
12 transcript of the testimony given by the witness.

13 I further certify that I am not connected by blood or
14 marriage with any of the parties or their attorneys, and that I
15 am not an employee of either of them, nor financially interested
16 in the action.

17 IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the
18 City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.

19

20

21 _____
Date

Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183
Oakland County, Michigan
My Commission Expires 11/12/15

23

24

25

♀