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Luzod Reporting Service, Inc.

Novi Zoning Board Members. It takes a vote of at least four members to approve a variance request and a vote of the majority of members present to deny a variance. A full board consists of six members. This evening we have five. Those petitioners at this time who wish to have their case tabled until the next meeting when a full board is present may do so now if anyone wishes to do that.

Seeing none, we will move to our first case -- I'm sorry, are there any changes to the agenda?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. Case Number PZ18-0029, Hillside Investments, has been postponed until September.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. We had our minutes in our packet from July of 2018. Were there any changes, deletions?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes. I just noticed one typo on Page 12, Line 15. Where it reads addiction, it should read addition.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. On Page 12, Line 16, addition. MR. SANGHVI: 15.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 15, sorry.
Anything else?
MR. SANGHVI: No.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor of -- we don't have to do that. Sorry, no motion. MR. SANGHVI: I make a motion to adopt the corrected minutes.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor? THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: None opposed.
Okay. At this time if there's anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment to the ZBA in matters other than what is on the agenda this evening, they can step forward at this time.

No one? We will move forward.
We will move forward with Case PZ18-0033, Halis Roziali. Is the petitioner here? All right. Please come on down. Come on down to the podium. 25869 Strath Haven Drive east of Beck and south of Eleven Mile. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Ordinance to reduce the front yard setback, to reduce the rear yard
setback, and to reduce the combined side yard aggregate. The property is zoned Residential Acreage.

And if the Petitioner is ready, would you please be sworn in by our secretary.

Raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you. MR. ROZIALI: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed. Go ahead.

MR. ROZIALI: Okay. I'm sorry, I'm kind of nervous. This is my first time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So you can take a deep and start by telling us your name and spell it and give us your address. And none of us up here bite.

MR. ROZIALI: Okay. My name is Halis Roziali.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can you spell that for us, please?

MR. ROZIALI: H-a-l-i-s is first name.
Last name is R-o-z-i-a-l-i. And I work in Novi and I live in Novi with my two children and wife. We moved up here about three years ago from Kalamazoo, and
since we moved, my children's performance at school greatly improved thanks to award winning Novi School District. Thank you. Even though it has -- Novi has a higher property tax rate, but it's worth it. Thank you.
So recently I -- since this April I started a small construction business. So this is going to be my first build. So I bought a piece of land, actually it's the last piece of vacant land on the Strath Haven Drive. It's about 100 feet by 120 feet deep, so it's a fairly smaller lot. I have through Freedom of Information Act, I obtained my next door recent builds, and I found out they all have very close variance approval from the board. So I would like to request the Board giving me a similar approval in order to proceed with this construction. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Well, thank you, but you have to give us a little more. So each case that we review is on its own merit. So could you please tell the board exactly what variances you are requesting this evening?

MR. ROZIALI: Yes. I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That's okay.

anything else that you would like to offer for your testimony to the board this evening? MR. ROZIALI: I think that's all. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Seeing none, is there any correspondence? MR. OLSEN: 37 letters mailed, 3 letters returned. 0 approvals, 0 rejections. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Does the City have anything to offer? MR. BUTLER: Yes. I would like to offer that due to the unique size of the lot and he would like to actually billed a two-story new home on the lot, and it's pretty comparable to what is in comparison with the neighborhood. And I would like to follow with that that he doesn't have a whole lot of room to go in too many directions. It's not that deep or that wide, so he's working within the limitations of what he has, and we have no issues with that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Board
members, do you have any questions?
Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your lot a couple of days ago, and I noticed you cut a couple of trees, and that will give you a lot of fire wood in 93 degree temperature. So it's interesting. You still have two large trees there. What are you planning to do with those?

MR. ROZIALI: I'm keeping them.
MR. SANGHVI: You are keeping them?
MR. ROZIALI: Yes. They're very nice --
MR. SANGHVI: That's all I wanted to know. Okay. If you are keeping them, I have no problem with your request, and I will support your request.

MR. ROZIALI: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you Member Sanghvi.

Anyone else?
The Chair would entertain a motion.
MR. BYRWA: Madam Chair, I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay, Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: I move that we grant the three variances in Case Number PZ18-0033 sought by Mr. Halis Roziali. Without the variances, the petitioner would
be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property. And I admire the fact that you're trying to save the trees out there. This variance would be consistent with the setbacks of the neighboring properties. It wouldn't be exceeding or any less than the neighboring properties' front and rear yard setback. And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties, and relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

I guess $I$ can read what the variances are. The front yard variance would be at 40 feet, equivalent to the neighbors, which 45 feet was required. The rear yard variance is proposed at 40 feet, which 50 feet is required, which is -- the 40 feet is identical to the neighbors in the rear yard. And the side yard aggravate is 50 feet, and the petitioner is proposing 42.84 feet.

Like I said, I move that we grant the variance.

MR. SANGHVI: Support.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can I add a
friendly amendment if you don't mind?

MR. BYRWA: Yes, absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: In reference to
reference the unique shape and size of the lot, which is what needs the -- which is what is requiring a variance or which is what is causing the variance. Do you accept that?

MR. BYRWA: I accept.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you second?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second as amended.

Kate, would you please call the roll?
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 13
been requests have
Good luck. Congratulations and welcome to Novi.

MR. ROZIALI: Thank you very much for your support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good luck. Thank you.

So our next question case is PZ18-0036. DTN Management Company/Tricap Holdings. I take it you're here. All right. Come on up to the podium. West of Novi and south of Grand River Avenue. The applicant is requesting variances that are too numerous to read and they are part of the record, and I will let the petitioner identify himself and get sworn in and proceed to explain exactly what they're here for.

MR. OLSEN: Raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. LUDWIG: I do.

MR. OLSEN: And just please state your name for the record.

MR. LUDWIG: Albert Ludwig.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And your address,

Mr. Ludwig, please?
MR. LUDWIG: 30600 Northwestern, Farmington Hills, 48334.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If you don't mind, just pull that microphone so they can hear you at home as well. Our audio department will be happy. And you may proceed.

MR. LUDWIG: Okay. We're here tonight to as you mentioned discuss several variances. I'm with Tricap Holdings, and this project is a joint venture along with DTN Management, who is also here with us tonight.

This is a very unusually shaped, long, narrow parcel with a big curve in it as you can see. And that street that you see on the top is Flint Street. Right now it's partially paved, it's partially unpaved, and it is planned to be part of the City's loop road so there is a circle going around Grand River in Novi. This will be the final leg of Main Street and the other streets that will circle the intersection. The plan I believe is so it alleviates traffic in that whole region.

We've been working with staff for about a
year and a half on this project now because their plan is to redo this road more or less the same time as we're building the project, and it will become a new paved street. In order to do that, they need additional property, and we have offered to grant the city approximately an acre, a little over an acre of land out of an 8 acre parcel. So we're giving up about 13,14 percent of the property to the right-of-way, to extend the size of the right-of-way in order for the City to be able to build this road. Being that it was already a very narrow parcel, shallow from top to bottom, and sacrificing this portion of the property has created a lot of these variances.

Now, the property is surrounded. In the rear it's got a railroad track, and on the rest of the rear it's got a cemetery. The other way it's got a detention pond, and the other way it's got a river. So it's a stand-alone property with no neighbors, it's not affecting anybody. And we're trying to create this extension of downtown with this apartment project, a little bit of a different kind of project with an urban feel to it, walkability over to main
street. And that was one of the other variances, too. Instead of having a 12-foot sidewalk was to have 8-foot sidewalk, which again -- in the right-of-way, which again aligns with the City's right-of-way drawing, because there is going to be sidewalk on both sides of the street, not just one side.

Other than that, I'm happy to answer any questions about any specific variances that you may see. Like I said before, we've worked with staff for a long time to eliminate as many as possible. This building has -- the plan has changed dramatically over the past year and a half in order to do that. That's a two-story parking deck that you see behind the building between the buildings and the railroad. That fills up that entire rear area which pushes some of the other parking to the side as well as to our loading zones.

But again, we have staff recommendation for approval, we have City Council recommendation for approval, and Planning Commission recommendation for approval on every one of these variances that we're asking for. So we -- like I said, I'm here to answer any questions. I do want John to discuss one of the
variances, though, in particular regarding the number one bedroom units.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you.
Sir, before you start, would you please state your name and your address and then be sworn in. MR. WOODS: Sure. My name is John Woods. I'm with DTN Management Company in Lansing. The address is 2502 Lake Lansing Road, Lansing, Michigan. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand, please.

MR. WOODS: Oh, I'm sorry, yes.
MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. WOODS: I do.
MR. OLSEN: Thank you.
MR. WOODS: So just to pick up where Albert left off, you know, from our approach at DTN, this has probably been one of the most collaborative and fruitful projects I've personally worked on in a long time, you know, as far as trying to balance what the City was looking for and what we were looking to accomplish. You know, we really think we got about 99 percent of the way there.

The only thing I would add to Albert's comment is there is perhaps an item or two on here, and I'll ask that maybe Sri from the city clarify, where we didn't have clear staff support on. And one of those items is -- actually the first item, the maximum percentage of one-bedroom units, the current ordinance requires a maximum of 50 percent one-bedroom units. And as we explained in the narrative in some of the discussions we've had in the past, I'm not exactly quite sure what that ordinance was predicated on, so if it doesn't parallel with your ordinance and the underpinnings of that, I can clarify, but, you know, we looked at it purely from a market perspective. And to give you a little bit more background on DTN Management, we own well over 100 properties, many of them market rate, including urban high rises in downtown Grand Rapids, and other buildings very similar to this in Lansing Township that are imbedded into DDAs and commercial and retail districts. And, you know, what we found is the apartment business has really changed a lot in the last six or seven years. We've seem that in home ownership percentages where 70 percent of all new
household formation across the entire United States, I can't speak specifically in Novi, but is rental. And even more importantly is a lot of those renters are what we would consider renters by choice.

So our property in Lansing that looks very similar to this building, it's not quite as large, but it is next to a 700 car ramp and a very large -- the Eastwood Mall and theaters and kind of very similar to downtown Novi. Our median income of our tenants are well in excess of $\$ 8,000$ a month. So when you make $\$ 8,000$ a month or 96,000 or $\$ 100,000$ a year, you have options. You can buy a house, you can buy condos, you can rent an apartment. And what we're finding more and more with our new development sites, whether it be Lansing or downtown Grand Rapids where we've got three newer buildings between 10 and 12 stories, is they are renters by choice. They're fairly significant median incomes and there are people that are there because they've decided they're going to rent and they're going to rent in a specific area as opposed to buying a home or buying a condo. And as a result, you also get -- you get a different demographic mix.

A lot of the older bedrooms or one bedrooms
in suburban projects historically have been sometimes you'll have two renters. Two bedrooms were typically always two people. And then three bedrooms sometimes you might even have a blended family or a mixed family, grandpa and grandma, you know, maybe raising a grandchild. What we're finding now is one bedrooms have one person. Most two bedrooms have one person. And in rare cases where we're building a small mix of threes, we do get either families or we get a couple of people that are using the bedrooms as dens or home offices or whatever it may be. So it's definitely changed.

And in this particular case on this project we're request a $581 / 2$, roughly a 60 percent mix of one bedrooms. Again, being quite frank, that's light. We've got other properties we're getting 70 percent one-bedroom blends depending on where they're at. And it's not only the renter by choice, but it's also the style of these buildings. This building clearly looks very different than what's on the rest of Novi Road and other areas of suburban Novi and lot of suburban communities. It's not on a 30 -acre piece of land with a bunch of two-story buildings spread across a
sprawling, beautiful piece of earth. It's a building that's more we call it surban. It's kind of a suburban/urban mix. This isn't downtown Detroit, this isn't necessarily -- this isn't a Royal Oak. This is -- it's a blend between people live in the entire property, they don't live necessarily just in their unit.

There are four courtyards, and it's really hard to describe this property without having full elevations, but we have over 20,000 square feet of common area in this building. That's highly unusual based on the total square footage of around a quarter million square feet. In most of the buildings probably around Novi you'd have a clubhouse and you'd have some walking trails and you have some growing areas, but you don't have massive courtyards that are 40 or 50 feet by 130 feet that have both what I'll call active and passive social programming in them that might have gaming areas, reading areas, Zen garden-style facilities, town center architectural feel in between the building where we've got some pools and open areas and some congregation areas. We've got bike rooms inside of the buildings and we
have a 700 feet long parking deck on the back that provides covered parking and a sense of security. So it's very different from the architectural and design appeal all the way through to way people live inside the building. It's a different animal. It's a completely different animal. And as a result of that, it's a different mix as well.

And so, you know, that's why we're at 58 1/2 and we're not at 50. You know, on a property like this, we probably could have gone as high as 70, but we just weren't sure with Novi where that breakpoint was, so we felt 60 was a good point. So again, I'm not exactly sure how the ordinance is written at a 50 percent max of what the concerns were, but that from a marketing standpoint and design standpoint supports our appeal for the 58 1/2 percent departure.

The other thing I would mention, too, is the allowance to increase the average minimum light level ratio, $I$ don't recall if that has got staff support. It does, okay. I'm not going to say anything then. But my only point there would be much like the parcel -- the rest of them really relate to
parcel size that Albert really discussed, so it's kind of -- I don't know if it's a correct term to say it's an orphan site, but it's clearly an isolated site in Novi, there aren't many neighbors. We dedicated the additional space for the right-of-way, so now we've got a site that's a little bit pinched. But as it relates to the light, it bleeds over the south property line a little bit. It's my understanding that that was to protect neighbors from for lack of a better term some light pollution and encroachment upon their property, and I guess my only comment there is there are no neighbors. So we've got CVS behind us, we've got railroad tracks behind us, and we have a cemetery. And then on the other side of the creek, you know, we've got a mixed use, we've got a commercial building. So I believe it meets the intent in the sense that it doesn't harm anybody and it doesn't have the potential to impact any of our neighbors.

And beyond that, again, I think the rest of them all relate to parcel size and right-of-way dedication, and part of that balance in compromise that we felt we struck with the City throughout this
stage or throughout this development process. That's all I had. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there anyone else from your group that wishes to speak at this time?

MR. WOODS: I don't believe so. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment in the matter of this case?

Seeing none, is there any correspondence?
MR. OLSEN: 51 letters mailed, 7 returned. 0 approvals, 0 objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. And I think at this time $I$ think we can hear from the City, and I understand for clarification the Planning Department is here this evening as well to help us. So do you have anything to add at this point?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I'm here to stand by for questions if you have any.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BUTLER: Madam Chair, I'd just like to say that the City Council did approve the preliminary site plan based on the Planning Commissions
recommendations, of course subject to the ZBA approval of the case. Most of the deviations are as he has spoken was due to the unique shallow shape of the lot.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Board members?

Member Byrwa?
MS. SAARELA: I just wanted to note, did you get my draft motion because of the size of the variances requested. I just wanted to make sure you're able to work this out.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It helps a great deal.

MR. BYRWA: I had a quick question. How many of these units are handicap units? Sooner or later we'll all be handicapped some day, but --

MR. WOODS: I can't tell you, but from a building code requirement, there will be a number that will be required, and I'm guessing based on the size of this building it probably -- perhaps the City if anybody from the building department can give you a more accurate number, but on the size, I'm guessing there's probably going to be five or six units.

MR. BYRWA: Thank you.

MR. WOODS: Again it's code required.
MR. BYRWA: Right.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Was the 58 percent included with what the council approved?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?
Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. First of all, I just wanted to mention that $I$ 've been in this city for about 45 years, and $I$ have seen it grow the way it is. We never had a downtown, and you can't have a downtown without people. So I'm so glad that you're trying to put people in that area by this particular project you are planning to do. And so I'm very happy you are doing that.

The second thing I note is that I know that area, I drove around, and I've been there quite a few times before. It's a very shallow area, and I'm very happy to hear that the City is trying to do realignment of the Flint Street, and you have spared some land to be able to do this, and I also appreciate that you are donating some land for this project. I
know you need a lot of variances to do that, but when you're trying to do a project like this and trying to make a modern downtown, I think the old requirements of ordinances sometimes are out of place and perhaps even out of date.

So looking at all these things, I have no problem supporting your project, and I wish you all the best, all the power to you and go ahead and do it. God bless you.

MR. WOODS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Chairman. How
many units are you planning on this?
MR. LUDWIG: The total between the two buildings is 253.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: 253. And the covered parking?

MR. LUDWIG: The covered parking is the first floor. The second floor of the parking structure is not covered.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Are you planning to do anything for outside the structure for parking? Any idea? The parking, is it shelter parking for the
second floor people?
MR. LUDWIG: We talked about possibly putting some carports up there in the future, but we understand we would have to come back. That will be more demand driven, just find out how many people really are looking for it, willing to pay for it.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: The project is very beautiful, and the pictures are very beautiful. I wish it will come out like that, and I wish you good luck. I have no objection. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I guess that leaves me. So when I first started reading it, I couldn't believe that was the area. How exciting. Right now that area is not very attractive. And so for what you're planning, and I'm just going to go through this very quickly, there are 13 requests for variances. This is probably in my 11 or 12 years that I've been on this board the most variances we ever had, but rightfully so. This is an extremely unique piece of property, and I think that when you use the phrase out of the box, you guys hit it out of the park. It's very creative. It brings Novi into the 21st century. Who knew one bedroom apartments were going to be in
demand. And thank God that the City of Novi had a group such as yourself to come and bring it to us.

Some people are voicing that there's too much building going on, there is too much growth going on. Novi is a growing city. And to utilize such a unique piece of property that is so narrow and is such an eyesore if you will at the current time to the city is just amazing to me.

I will also be supporting your 13 requests. In your packet you have explained that this has very minimal impact. I don't see any negatives to it at all. You've addressed all of the issues. You've worked very hard with the city. I understand that there has been a great deal of work with this, and that's why I'm going to be big proponent on this and I wish you all the best of luck.

MR. LUDWIG: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And with that, I'm going to call on Member Olsen, because we did a little homework. And because of the longevity and the thoroughness, Mr. Olsen has a prepared motion that he's ready to read.

MR. OLSEN: I move that we grant the
variance in Case Number PZ18-0036 sought by DTN Management Company and Tricap Holdings, L.L.C., because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty in meeting strict requirements of the ordinance with regard to the following.

> With regard to maximum number of
one-bedroom units, to grant the variance from Section 4.82.2 to increase the maximum percentage of one-bedroom units allowed for this development by 8 percent. This variance is granted because the petitioner has established that the property is unique because it is in the Town Center District, which is intended to encourage an urban main street with mixed land uses and shared parking, and the petitioner has proposed a use meeting the spirit and intent of the ordinance to the extent that it is proposed for a development as a multi-family residential development and provides an urban apartment living style by providing for additional on-site services and amenities such as and including a dog park, bike repair, dog wash, gyms, studios, and conference rooms, as well as providing the appropriate mix of luxury one-bedroom units with numerous site amenities.

Without the proposed mix of on-site amenities and services and luxury one-bedroom units, the development would not be marketable as an urban main street development. The need for the variance is not self-created because the property is located in the Town Center District and the use proposed is consistent with the uses permitted in that district. Furthermore, the strict compliance with dimension regulations of the zoning ordinance including providing for a greater number of multiple bedroom units would reasonably prevent petitioner from using the property for the permitted purpose as an urban main street development.

The petitioner has established that the variance is the minimum variance necessary, because a lesser variance would not provide the proper mix of upscale one-bedroom units to support the on-site amenities and services necessary to market the development as an urban main street development. The requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or the enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or zoning district because the use is consistent with the

Town Center District uses and is not near low-density, single-family family residential developments since it is located in the TC district and is immediately surrounded by existing railroad tracks, a road, and a cemetery.

With regard to the parking in the side yard and in the front yard, to grant the variance from Section 3.27.1D --

MS. SAARELA: Let's do them separately. So let's vote on that first one and then move on.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Kate, would you please call the roll on the first motion.

MS. SAARELA: I think we need someone to second it.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second.

Kate, would you please call the roll on the first motion.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
MR. OLSEN: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0036 sought by DTN Management Company and Tricap Holdings, L.L.C. because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty in meeting strict requirements of the ordinance with regard to the following.

With regard to the parking in the side yard and in the front yard, to grant the variance from Section 3.27.ID to allow parking in the side yard for the commercial building for 49 spaces, to allow parking in the front yard for the residential use, approximately 38 spaces, and to allow parking in the side yard for the residential use, approximately 50 spaces. This variance is granted due to --

MS. SAARELA: You missed part of that one. MR. OLSEN: Approximately 50 spaces on the
east side and 35 spaces on the west side. This variance is granted due to the practical difficulty associated with the shallowness and narrowness of the property which was created in large part by the petitioner's donation of the land to the City for the purpose of realigning Flint Street in accordance with the City's plan. The variance is not self-created because there is a need to realign Flint Street for public health, safety and welfare purposes. The variance is the minimum variance necessary because petitioner has taken all steps available to minimize the variance by providing the two-level parking structure as allowed in the rear yard. The requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding property, property values or the enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or zoning district because the use is consistent with other Town Center District uses and will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is immediately surrounded by the existing railroad tracks, a road, and a cemetery.

Do I need to keep going?
MS. SAARELA: Well, you can stop there, and
then we'll vote.
MR. SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. It's been moved and second.

Kate, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
MR. OLSEN: Make the third motion?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please.
MR. OLSEN: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0036 sought by DTN Management Company and Tricap Holdings, L.L.C., because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty in meeting strict requirements of the ordinance with
regard to the building setbacks to grant variance from Section 4.82.2.e, to allow for the reduction of minimum building setbacks for Building 1 on east side of the building, 15 feet required, a minimum of 12 feet with overhang of 8.81 feet proposed for an approximate length of 12 feet, total building length is 283 feet. Building 2 on east side of building, 15 feet required, a minimum of 8 feet with overhang of 3.8 feet proposed for an approximate length 16 feet, total building length is 283 feet.

Parking garage on the west side of the building, 15 feet required, 5 feet proposed for entire structure. Total building length is 283 feet.

This variance is granted due to the practical difficulty associated with the shallowness and narrowness of the property which was created in large part by the petitioner's donation of land to the City for the purpose of realigning Flint Street in accordance with the City's plan.

The variance is not self-created because there is a need to realign Flint Street for public health, safety, and welfare purposes. The variance is the minimum variance necessary because petitioner
could not construct a viable building within the required setbacks. The requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or the enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or zoning district because the use is consistent with other Town Center District uses and will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is immediately surrounded by existing railroad tracks, a road, and cemetery.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second.

Kate, please call the roll. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi? MR. SANGHVI: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina? MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen? MR. OLSEN: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan? CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?

MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
MR. OLSEN: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0036 sought by DTN Management Company and Tricap Holdings, L.L.C., will because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty meeting strict requirements of the ordinance. With regard to the exterior lighting, to grant the variance from Section 5.7.3E to allow for the increase of average to minimum light level ratio for the site, 4 to 1 maximum is allowed, 4.8 to 1 proposed. And from Section 5.7.3K to exceed maximum allowed foot candles along the south property line abutting railroad tracks, 1 foot candle maximum allowed, up to 1.7 foot candles is proposed for a small area.

This variance is granted due to the practical difficulty associated with the shallowness and narrowness of the property which was created in large part by the petitioners donation of land to the City for the purpose of realigning Flint Street in accordance with the City's plans. The variance is not self-created because there is a need to realign Flint Street for public health, safety and welfare purposes.

The variance is the minimum variance necessary because smaller candle lighting would not provide adequate lighting in or about the area of the railroad tracks for safety purposes. The requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or the enjoyment of property in the neighborhood or zoning district because the lighting is consistent with other Town Center District uses, and given that there is no residential development near the property, the lighting will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is immediately surrounded by existing railroad tracks, a road, and cemetery. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I need a second. MR. SANGHVI: Second. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second.

Kate, please call the roll. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa? MR. BYRWA: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan? CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?

MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: One last one.
MR. OLSEN: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0036 sought by DTN Management Company and Tricap Holdings, L.L.C., because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty in meeting strict requirements of the ordinance with regard to the variances for loading areas in the side yard, the reduced public walk and pathway widths, and the reduced parking bay deck. The variances are granted due to practical difficulty associated with the shallowness and narrowness of the property which was created in large part by the petitioner's donation of land to the City with the purpose of realigning Flint Street in accordance with the City's plans.

The variance is not self-created because there is a need to realign Flint Street for public health, safety and welfare purposes. The variance is
the minimum variance necessary because a lesser variance would not permit for either a viable size apartment development or for the appropriate realignment of Flint Street for safety purposes. The requested variance will not cause adverse impact on the surrounding property, property values, or the enjoyment of the properties in the neighborhood or zoning district because the lighting is consistent with other Town Center District uses, and given that there is no residential development near the property, the lighting will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is immediately surrounded by an existing railroad tracks, road and cemetery.

MS. SAARELA: I need to suggest one change. I think that last lighting should have been the loading areas and sidewalk and pathways are consistent with the Town Center District uses.

MR. OLSEN: Okay. So to amend that the lighting be reduced public sidewalk and pathway width and the reduced parking bay deck.

MS. SAARELA: Correct.
MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second.

Kate, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Gentlemen,
congratulations. All have been approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. We wish you the best of luck and welcome you to Novi.

MR. LUDWIG: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
The next case is PZ18-0031, Pulte Homes of Michigan. Is the petitioner here? Please come on down.

East of Novi Road and north of Nine Mile. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi for a 40-foot building setback along north property line, 37 feet building setback along west property line, 27 feet building setback along east property line, where a 75 feet minimum is required along all property lines.

The petitioner is here. Would you please state your name and then raise your right hand to be sworn in, please.

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. By name is Bill Anderson. I'm with Atwell, 311 Main Street, Ann Arbor.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand?

MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, I do.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.
MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. Again, my name is Bill Anderson. I'm with Atwell. We are the planners and the engineers for the project we're talking about tonight. Also tonight depending on the
conversation and questions, Joe Skore, Vice President of Pulte Homes, is also here and available.

Just I'd like to give you a brief overview of kind of how we got here tonight, and then talk about specifically the actions that you guys are considering. So I'll briefly go through a presentation we gave to the Planning Commission in May. Again there is a picture of our project. 40 for sale condominium units, all three-bedroom at the corner of Novi and Nine Mile.

There is the site again at Nine Mile and Novi, northeast corner. We have apartment complexes immediately to the north of us. We have industrial zoned and retail, restaurant parking areas to the east of us. We have commercial retail to the south of us. And then we have Novi Road and a residential development immediately west of us. So we are that corner piece, just over 9 acres.

A little zoning. The existing is RM-1, which allows a residential density attached unit of about 5.4. The Master Plan calls for even a more significant density of 9.3. We're proposing again single-family town homes to meet that missing middle
housing product, again two-story town homes. We're at a density of about 4.3 dwelling units an acre. So we're well within the range of what is contemplated currently, and certainly under the density that is talked about in the future. The reason being is kind of the unique nature of the site.

Here is a little more on the site. Again, we're the northeast corner there. We have the steep slopes coming down. That's that blue there. It's quite a bit of relief north to south, unbuildable if you will, about 30 to 40 percent of the site there. We have wetlands, flood way and drainage way right on that corner. We also have just from a woodlands perspective fairly low-quality woodlands on the northern side, which is our buildable area, and a little higher-quality woodlands on the southern area of the site. So those are kind of the site constraints if you will that we dealt with once we got into the zoning process. We went through multiple modifications. We've been working on this site since last May or June, just over a year in concept meetings with the staff and consultants, and we started off coming off
of Novi Road and about 46 units. We had a lot of geometrical constraints. As we got into more discussions, our second generation, these are just formal submittals, we went for a PRO submittal with an R-2 -- RM overlay and that would have allowed a lot of deviations approved at council. Again we've had grading constraints, and even found out we had an access constraint. Given the steep grade of Novi Road, we were actually forced to come off of Nine Mile Road, which is the latest iteration, which is a straight zoning RM-1 site plan, and given the variance dimension and variations we were needing, we have to go to Planning Commission, to ZBA before you, and also board. Again that was kind of the procedural recommendation from staff and consultants.

And so here is just a little bit of the plan again. It's a little secluded enclave development. All our units are on the north end, kind of the buildable half of the site, constrained in there. A nice winding entrance drive off of Nine Mile. We've got some recreational nodes. A lot of open space available to the site.

Again when we went to the Planning

Commission, we kind of broke down. We have planning deviations that we talked about, perimeter setbacks and building orientation, which are actually deviations and variances that you guys are formally looking at tonight. We have engineering variances, drive access separation, taper lengths, and secondary road connections. And, again, the Planning Commission considered all of these and staff recommended approval, as did the Planning Commission. We also had some landscaping variations based on street tree locations, perimeter berms, and actually the tree mix that we were proposing on the development.

So again, we went through all that, went to the PC in May, got recommendation for approval. So we're here tonight for your ZBA consideration talking about the physical condition limits. Certainly the physical conditions of the site is the southern portion of the site is really not developable based upon all the natural features and constraints. We actually have the Novi Road limitations, we don't have access there. It's certainly not a self-created environment there. Parcel shape and strict compliance considerations. A lot of the -- we worked with
engineering and planning through the last 15 months talking about what geometrical requirements are life safety and health, what are meaningful and acceptable variances. So we've gone through those. And again, we think we're here today with the minimum variances that are necessary for an economically viable development.

No adverse impacts to the surroundings areas, that's something you guys consider as well. Again, we have apartments and we're surrounded by retail, so we think we're a less intense development certainly. And again this isn't really a density matter. We're quite a bit under the density with what the township or the City envisioned for this property originally.

Specifically to point out the areas, again, we're here requesting perimeter setback approvals from you. From the west we're looking for a 37 foot building separation off the ultimate right-of-way at Novi Road. 40 feet to the north end property line. Again we're probably 100 foot to the nearest apartment building there. And then to the east we're looking at a 27 foot variance, 20 feet proposed to the east
property line. That property owner is the restaurant. It's zoned industrial, but it's an operating restaurant, it's actually the seller, and we're doing additional landscaping and stuff on that property, so they're certainly supportive of it.

The other variance that's talked about for your consideration is building orientation. In the RM zoning you guys require that buildings be oriented at a 45-degree angle to the property line. I don't understand the necessity or how that was even developed. I assume it adds interest, but that's certainly a variation -- a variance that we're requesting tonight as well.

That's really it. We gave a previous formal summary of why we think we meet all the reasons for your support tonight, and again we're here for any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Please come down.

MR. ARKIN: Good evening. I'm Irwin Arkin,

43100 Nine Mile Road. I swear to tell the truth.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. You're not on the -- you're not with the petitioner, you're a resident, is that correct?

MR. ARKIN: I represent the subject property, owner, and the adjacent property to the east at 43180 Nine Mile Road known as Shiro Restaurant, and the adjacent property to the east of the adjacent property at 43100 Nine Mile Road known as the Arkin Building.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. So now would you raise your hand and be sworn in by our secretary, please.

MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. ARKIN: I do.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please proceed.
MR. ARKIN: Thank you. The terrain of the property has its challenges with the Rouge River, the wetlands, the woodlands, along with the 24 foot drop-off. The proposed development is part of a long-range plan where as we gifted the land to the City reducing our footprint on Nine Mile Road and Novi

Road to allow for the widening of the Nine Mile and Novi Road intersection. We went through a land split in 2016 when we added acreage to the corner site while saving the landmark Shiro Restaurant. We feel the requested variance approvals will not negatively impact any neighbor or alter or change the land. The owners of all three parcels strongly support with total approval all the requests made. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Is there someone else? Please come on down.

MR. OLSEN: Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Mike Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive.

MR. OLSEN: And please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter? MR. DUCHESNEAU: Sure, yes. I'm one of those residents that has been against increasing traffic and been rallying the various committees on that behalf since Pavilion Shore Village showed up on our radar asking for $\mathrm{RM}-1$ and $\mathrm{RM}-2$ type zoning, which has really sensitized me to the requirements for these
districts.
As far as this proposal, I would like to applaud the developers of Woodbridge Park for their RM-1 development, for following the zoning ordinances, the intent substantially. They didn't use the PRO option, they decided to go straight up with the requirements. The development has as was stated 40 two-story town houses on approximately 9 1/4 acres. That's only 4.3 homes per acre. That's the gross. But that's well within the allowable density of 5.4 if they build three-bedroom units, or 7.3 if they build two-bedroom units. So this does reduce the traffic, even though it's a highly congested area.

The property is zoned RM-1, it's being built as RM-1. They're not hedging on three stories. These are two-story buildings. They're for sale, not for rent. Again, all things I support.

I also find that to the north is Saddle Creek Apartments which doesn't show up very well on the plots, but they have buildings that are within 33 feet per the measurement on the land map of their property line to the south. As you've heard the people to the east are in support, they are zoned I-1,
light industrial. I think that this is a very good proposal, and their variances should be approved. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
If there is anyone else in the audience, please come on down to the podium.

MR. HIGHLAND: Good evening. Mark Highland with Beztak Companies, 31731 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills. We are the owners and operators of Saddle Creek.

MR. OLSEN: Please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter? MR. HIGHLAND: I do.

We support the projection. We think they're doing a great job. This will be a good use for this land. Our only request is that if the variance to the north is given, it takes away almost half of the buffer that would be there, and then there is a road in it, and there's a bunch of 6 foot tall evergreens at the base of a 3 foot tall wall. So they really aren't going to be an effective screening. So I would ask that the petitioner work with us to put a little more screening up on the top of wall just so
there is some break up of the views along there. We're even willing to work with them about accessing it through our site if need be or something like that. But that's our only request that some additional attention be paid to the screening because it does impact our site in that the views are going to change and it makes those apartments a little less desirable from just a visual standpoint. So we just want to work on that a little bit. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

Seeing none, is there any correspondence? MR. OLSEN: 30 letters mailed, 2 letters
returned. 4 approvals from Mr. Irwin Arkin. One objection from Mr. Mark Highland.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. And the City?

MR. BUTLER: I have no comments on this. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. And we have the Planning Department here this evening. Would you like to come and --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I'm Sri Komaragiri. I'm the project planning for this project. I just wanted to add a point of clarification to the applicant's presentation. It's just regarding the density. It may not affect the deviations much, but the density he sited that's being proposed, 4.3, is calculated based on gross site acreage, but for our purposes when we calculate the maximum allowable density and what is proposed, we use the net site. So when you take away the 1.6 acres that they're dedicating for the right-of-way and then about. . 09 acres of wetlands, they're left with the 7.48. That would result in a density of 5.3 , which is still under the maximum allowed, but $I$ just wanted to clarify.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Who do we ask the question to about the -- from the resident who was from Saddle Creek Apartments about the screening?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I can respond to that. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I have some notes from our landscape architect who reviewed the plan, and per our landscape ordinance requirements, typically screening
is not required between residential uses. It's required between residential and industrial, in this case the one to the east. And the applicant is currently proposing a line of narrow evergreens over here. A mix of red cedars and arborvitaes are proposed below the retaining wall. And the access that's in the north, it's not a through-access, it's only used for secondary emergency access only. It's only used in case of emergencies.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's not going to be a daily drive street.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: No. There are gates on either end of the access. And then depending on the varieties used, the proposed screening may reach between 6 to 30 feet tall. And they also had a number of woodland replacement trees required, so the mix required site landscaping trees as many with the replacements, and staff believed that it creates a dense screening which would benefit the residents of both developments.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Board members? I don't expect we're going
to hear from Mr. Olsen for a little bit, he's resting. MR. SANGHVI: Okay. Well, I been driving around this area for all these year, and I've always wondered what is going to happen to this property because there's so many difficulties there with the wetlands and woodlands and different terrain and all the gradient changes all around that. So I'm glad somebody has accepted the challenge and tried to come up with some idea of how to use this property that is beneficial to everybody including the City, and I'm so happy that you have tackled it. And realize that you can't do it, build anything without variances in that area. You are going to need variances for any kind of building. And all I want to say is I'm glad you are doing it. And I've looked at your plans, I know this property very well for years, and I recognize my friend sitting over there for all these years. Those of us old-timers know him very well. And so good luck to you. I have no problem with your variance request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else?
MR. OLSEN: The Planning Commission is okay with the proposed north end of it?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Right. Like I said, the ordinance doesn't require any screening, so what the applicant is providing is wall and trees.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Mr. Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I don't have any questions or anything. I wish you good luck on your project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Mr. Byrwa, do you have anything to offer?

The only thing I would like to say is that we have had some challenges before us tonight, and this is another one. And kudos to all of you for such an outstanding job. I think that it's important to reiterate some of the challenges on this piece of property.

When we're granting variances, it is important to look at the piece of property and notice the lay of the land, the uniqueness of the shape of this piece of property, and the amount of unbuildable area. So if all of that was buildable, the petitioner would not be in front of us. We wouldn't even know this was going up until it was actually done.

So the challenge is the piece of property
in itself. And I think that the petitioner presented this case very well. It is duly noted. I appreciate the Planning Department coming and helping us clarify about the screening. I do think that the petitioner is going above and beyond helping with Saddle Creek. I think that's been addressed somewhat. And therefore I have no objections and will be supporting this and would entertain a motion at this time.

Anyone? Silence is golden. I'll help whoever jumps in, how is that.

MR. SANGHVI: I move that we grant the variances in Case Number PZ18-0031, Pulte Homes of Michigan, L.L.C., east of Novi Road and north of Nine Mile Road, Parcel Number 50-22-26-300-015. The applicant has shown hardship in -MS. SAARELA: Can we say practical difficulty instead of hardship? Let's change hardship to practical difficulty.

MR. SANGHVI: Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty and requires the variances they have requested which $I$ will enumerate in a minute. The variances requested are from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.17.D for a 40-foot
building setback along north property line, 37-foot building setback along the west property line, and 27-feet building setback along the east property line where as 75-feet minimum is required along all property lines. And also Section 3.8.2D for the perimeter building orientation to be less than minimum required of 45 degrees from all property lines. And this property is zoned low-density multiple family. Without the variances the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to use of this property because of the topography, the presence of wetlands and woodlands, and also the difficulty in gradient and the terrain of this area. The property is also unique because of many of the characteristics which I just enumerated, and this petitioner did not create these conditions because these are the nature and characteristics of this particular region. The relief granted will not unreasonable interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is well-screened by the woodlands and wetlands, and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinances because it does not really interfere with any of the
surrounding property or their values. And so I move that we grant the variances as enumerated. Thank you. MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and
second. Any further discussion?
Seeing none, Kate, would you please call
the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variances have been granted. Congratulations and welcome to Novi and good luck.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our next case is

PZ18-0035, My House Fitness and Signarama at 43443 Grand River Avenue, I think that's Suite 230, west of Novi Road, south of Grand River. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Code of Ordinances Section 28.5 for the installation of an additional wall sign for a back of building, one wall sign allowed per business. This property is zoned Town Center.

Good evening. Your name, please? MS. JENNINGS: Good evening. My name is Anita Jennings, and I'm the franchisee/owner of My House Fitness personal training studio. The address is 43443 Grand River Avenue, Novi, 48375. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Would you please your right hand and be sworn in. MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MS. JENNINGS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed. MS. JENNINGS: Thank you. I moved into this location in February of 2017, and I've noticed throughout the year and a half that I've been here, that I've received feedback from prospects and clients
that they've had a difficult time finding the location due to some of the obstructions from both directions, eastbound and westbound on Grand River Avenue.

So as far as the store front, it's blocked by another building and the trees. So potential customers or clients driving eastbound on Grand River cannot see the My House Fitness sign due to the obstruction. And also driving westbound on Grand River cannot see the store front sign either. And driving westbound on Grand River, you can see the back of the building, and if you notice there are two other businesses located in that building, which one is a Pizza Hut, and the other is Athletico, and they both have signs both on the front of the building and the back of the building as well.

And so we're requesting to have a variance for a sign to be placed on the back of the building. I can show you a picture here. This is the front of the building, and if you're eastbound on Grand River, you cannot see our My House Fitness sign which is blocked by a building and a tree. So people will miss the driveway to turn in and come directly to the location, and then they may have to take a detour. So
sometimes that can be a little frustrating for people trying to find a location that they've never been to before.

And this is another view of the front. So you can clearly see the Pizza Hut sign, and I'm right next door. And you only can see partial from that particular angle, a partial view of the My House Fitness sign.

This is the picture of the back of the building. Again you can see the Athletico sign and the Pizza Hut sign as well traveling westbound on Grand River. And by adding a sign to the My House Fitness, it will make the area -- the building look more aesthetic, a more uniform look if we are allowed to place this sign as well.

And again this is just another picture where we would like to place the sign, which is right next to the Pizza Hut. And this is what it would like if we are granted the variance, the My House Fitness sign, which is actually smaller than both the other signs from Pizza Hut and Athletico.

So again, we're just requesting the sign. We think it would definitely increase my business.

And as I said before, I've received feedback from clients or potential clients that they've had a difficult time finding the location. You know, they use the GPS of course with the address, but if you're looking for the My House Fitness, then you're not going to see it with the absence of the sign on the back of building.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there anything else that you would like to add?

MS. JENNINGS: Not at this time.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good job. Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to add to this case?

Seeing none, is there any correspondence?
MR. OLSEN: 77 letters mailed, 14 letters
returned. 2 approvals, no objections. The first approval, Mike Knight and Milton Knight at 43500 Grand River Avenue. And the same as for the second approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. And do we have anything from the City.

MR. BUTLER: I just wanted to say that due
to the difficult location with that busy intersection, we all know how busy it is, to see the sign, there is sign currently at the back of that building which definitely be missed, you'd have basically a potentially, you know, elevate the amount of accidents with people breaking to see what they missed or where they went bad. So that's difficulty of wanting to have that sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Board members?

Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came around on Saturday looking for your place, and I had hard time finding it. And I think you're one of the businesses that -- what kind of business exactly is this fitness? Because I saw there is a physical therapy outfit just next door to you more or less.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. So it's very
different. As you said, the Athletico is a physical therapy. We do personal training, one-on-one, small group training and classes. So again we focus on strength training and interval training and cardio. We also offer nutrition as well.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I have no problem with this. There's obviously a practical difficulty trying to identify the business from any side of the street anywhere unless you go really looking for it. So I have no problem supporting that application.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else? Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I have no objection. Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I have to say that that building has faced many challenges, and I think it's great that we're going to join the fitness club and then we'll walk over to the new apartments or we'll be able to walk after we get the workout.

I think that the uniqueness of where this building is located, the angle doesn't help with Grand River, the speeds that everybody goes at on Novi Road and Grand River. And even the unfortunate part as I was sitting on Grand River staring at your building, you still can't see if from that angle. So you have many challenges, and I think that you did an excellent job in presenting this to us this evening. We are all
familiar with that area, and because of your testimony and you stating that there is people that are not able to locate you, I will be in full support of this and I have no problem supporting that. MS. JENNINGS: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I would entertain a motion.

Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0035 sought by Anita Jennings for My House Fitness because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty without a variance by the City of Novi Code of Ordinance Order Section 28.5 for the installation of an additional wall sign at back of the building. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably limited and prevented with respect to use of the property because the building store front is block by another building and the trees. Due to the lack of visibility, My House Fitness may lose potential customers. The property is unique because another building and trees are blocking it. Petitioner did not create the condition because other tenants have
their sign at the back of the building. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of this sign will be at the back of the building, and other tenants already have their signs. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the building store front is blocked by another building and the trees. Thank you.

MR. SANGHVI: I second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and
second. Any further discussion?
Seeing none, Kate, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.

| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. Your variance has been granted. Good luck to you, and you may see all of us there pretty soon. <br> MS. JENNINGS: I hope so. I can give you a card. Thank you all very much. <br> CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good luck. Thank you. <br> Our next case, PZ18-0027, Araneae, Inc. and Ascension Providence Hospital, 47601 Grand River, west of Novi, south of Grand River. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi for the installation of additional wall signs for the back of -- wait, I'm sorry, I'm reading this wrong. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi to allow installation of 19 additional wall and ground signs. Some of the additional signs exceed the allowed height and area limits. A wall sign and ground sign are allowed by right. The property is zoned Office Service Commercial. And I just want to amend the record. The address is 47601 Grand River Avenue west of Beck and south of Grand River. There is a lot of Grand River going on tonight. <br> So would you please state your name? |
| :---: |

Luzod Reporting Service, Inc.

Good evening. My name is John Carroll from Araneae Sign Group.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. And would you please raise you right hand and be sworn in.

MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I do.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.
MR. CARROLL: I represent Araneae as I said and Providence Ascension's rebranding. I'm sure you've all visited the site and are very familiar with it and know what a complex property it is and there is a lot of way finding to get in there. Are proposed signs are -- the majority of them are replacement for existing signs meeting or less than the square footage in place now. There are a few exceptions to that that we can go through. We're looking at about 19 different signs here. I'm not sure how you want to approach them, one by one, by number. What makes the most sense to you?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Why don't you start at the beginning and just run through like we have in our packet. And if you want to point out the unusual
ones. I know some are directional, correct?
MR. CARROLL: Most of them are directional.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Why don't you start with the ones that are not directional. That may narrow it down a little bit.

MR. CARROLL: I believe we're talking about one additional wall logo. There are presently two sets of channel letters on the building. We're proposing to remove one permanently and replace the other with new channel letters. There's also a new logo, which I believe is Sign Number -- Charles, can you help me with that one?

MR. OLSEN: I have it on here, E36.
MR. CARROLL: That would be a new logo, Ascension logo without letters.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So do you have your drawings there that you can put up on the screen so we can take a look.

MR. CARROLL: I do not have a 46. I'm sorry, these are all directionals. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Let's see if we can help out here. Do you have this with you? MR. CARROLL: Yes, I do. That is all the
new locations, this one?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So I have Page 46.
Is that what you're looking for?
MR. CARROLL: Sign E46?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: E46.
MR. CARROLL: So this would be the replacement set of letters for the sign directly above it. It's very close in square footage. We had 11 foot by 88 in dimensions, and this sign is 9 foot by 69 feet. So we've lost 20 percent or so of the square footage that was existing there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So the new sign that you're proposing for Ascension Providence with the insignia is actually smaller than what is currently on there?

MR. CARROLL: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. So before we go any further, board members, do you have anything -any questions on this particular sign at this point? MR. SANGHVI: No, I don't. MR. PEDDIBOYINA: No. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. All right. Then let's proceed.

MR. CARROLL: So we go back to the map and start at Sign 2 and go through every one?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Sure.
MR. CARROLL: Sign Number 2, the existing sign is a 5 foot wide by 8 foot tall ground sign. The proposed is 6 foot 9 by 3 foot wide, a 20 square foot sign compared to the 40 square foot sign that's existing.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. So again a reduction.

MR. CARROLL: A reduction in size in height and square footage.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: E3, I believe we have the same scenario there of a 5 foot by 8 square feet sign, 40 square feet. This one is a little different because it is 9 foot 4 in height now and so 41 square foot. So we gained one square foot and a foot and a half in height. It's a narrower, taller sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: E5 is an identical situation, as 3, 9 foot 4 in height and 41 square feet as compared to 40 square foot existing. 6 isn't on
there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So it looks to me like most of these signs, with a couple exceptions, are actually not as big, maybe a little taller because an actual office has been added or a location has been added which is the whole reason for all of this to begin with.

MR. CARROLL: And the new design is a little narrower and taller on a few.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. For me you don't have to go through each and every one of them. I think that everybody is -- are we in agreement to that?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. So if you have anything else to offer at this point.

MR. CARROLL: Just any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I'm sorry?
MR. CARROLL: Whatever questions you may have regarding other signs.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to offer anything in regards
to this case?

Seeing none, is there any correspondence?
MR. OLSEN: 77 letters mailed, 4 letters returned. 0 approvals. 1 objection from a Joann Ward at 47460 Eleven Mile Road. It just seems that her objection is to the idea of adding more than allowed for the number of signs.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. And from the city?

MR. BUTLER: Basically I'll just say that wall signs and ground signs are allowed by right. They're trying to upgrade their signs to allow for more direction around the area for guidance. I would like to defer to Charles if he has anything else to add.

CHARLES: I'll stand by for questions.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members?
Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: I don't want to go into the history of the Providence Hospital presence in the Novi community going back over 25 years, but the current campus I'm very familiar. I used to play golf in that place a long time ago, but now that campus is
so big that you're going to need a lot of signs. And new buildings are coming up almost every year with different departments opening up like dialysis unit and orthopedic unit and all that. So you're going to have them coming up every so often to change the signs to make it bigger to make it easier for the patients and the visitors to go and find these different places.

So I have no problem with the changes with the signs and also increase in the height, because of the snow and all that on those roads, sometimes the signs are covered up during the winter, and they need to go a little taller than what they have been to be able to be visible. And I appreciate actually they are changing it, because there are times it's quite challenging to find the places in this campus. And I have no hesitation in supporting their request for sign variations.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else?

Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I have no objection
because in that building there are lot of offices and
people coming, and you need to have more signs for the building where it is, and $I$ have no objection, $I$ support that.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?
I am in full support. I think it's great. I think it's minimal. I think it meets the spirit of the ordinance. I think that given the uniqueness of the lay of the land out there, any kind of direction is very helpful. And I think that this is a minimal impact of what you're doing. So job well down in my opinion, and I will entertain a motion from anyone? Don't be shy gentlemen.

Member Peddiboyina?
MR. SANGHVI: One question. Do we do all this individually?

MS. SAARELA: This is just additional signs. You can just say installation of 19 additional wall and ground signs. That's the way the request is written, so it's not --

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: I move that we grant the variance in the case of Case Number PZ18-0027 for

Ascension/Providence Hospital at 47601 Grand River west of Beck Road and south of Grand River, Parcel Number 50-22-17-400-046. The variance is to be granted because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the changes in the signs which are already existing on the campus of the Providence Hospital, and also for the new department's coming up on the campus. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of this property because these signs and variances are necessary for the patients and the visitors convenience without which it becomes difficult to negotiate around this large campus.

The property also have been unique because of its size and also because of its terrain. The petitioner did not create these conditions, and the relief granted will not unnecessarily interfere with the adjacent or the surrounding properties because all the different properties are quite far away from the hospital campus. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinances because the idea is to make it easier for the patients and the visitors to visit the hospital and make life easier
for everybody around especially under trying circumstances.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and
seconded. Any further discussion?
Kate, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variances have been granted. Congratulations and good luck.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We have are final
case for this evening, PZ18-0034, TBON, L.L.C. at 46100 Grand River, west of Taft and north of Grand

River. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi to install five new additional oversized full screened changeable copy signs. The allowable changeable copy portion of the sign shall not exceed two-thirds of the sign area. The proposed signs are in addition to those already installed and allowed by right or previous variances. This property is zoned OST with EXO Overlay, better known as the Suburban Showplace.

Good evening.
MR. BOWMAN: Good evening.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Could you please state your name.

MR. BOWMAN: Sure. Blair Bowman, TBON, L.L.C., 46100 Grand River, Novi, 48374.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand and be sworn in.

MR. OLSEN: Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

MR. BOWMAN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.
MR. BOWMAN: Thank you. I'm just going to give maybe a quick, brief background on how we got to
this point, also maybe just quickly run over the various locations of the signs that we're requiring the variance.

You know, standing here probably still right now a little bit more nervous than excited about our expansion that is coming rapidly to a completion, we're looking forward to having that available for the State Fair, and we're certainly looking forward then immediately after that a number of the large scale trade and industry shows, particularly the battery show which is one of the largest international events that we host. And really stemming from that show was one of the very major reasons why we undertook the expansion. But as a part of that process, too, these international show producers in particular are looking at what our available tools and resources are on our site from the standpoint of delivering information about what is going on in the facility, where it's going on in the facility. We have, you know, a number of what would be considered even main entrances in the facility, and it is getting to be of a decent-sized scale even when putting it on the scale of this nature.

So the key thing that we're looking to do is most of it is really for information, way finding, and information on site. Technically I believe that these are visible from the Grand River thoroughfare at points, but realistically with the landscaping and the berming that has grown up over the last dozen years, it really has been a challenge providing clear indication of even where the facility is. But once they get into the property, we're looking at now wanting to make sure that we differentiate the hotel section of the facility from the existing meeting and Diamond center portion of the facility, the current exposition halls, the Showplace halls, and then the new event center.

So tonight I'm looking to ask and hopefully receive reasonable consideration for a package of signs. I think I should first point out that we already did have two signs previously approved by this body that were located basically in the center section over the Showplace entrance halls and over on the Diamond Center wall. Both of the signs that we are proposing tonight are in fact, you know, full screen, changeable copy boards, whereas the previous signs
were static signnage, but these are less in size. The other two signs that we're suggesting is Sign 3, which is over our box office, which again I think probably is not technically viewable from Grand River, but I think because of the size of it it requires a variance. And then Signs what would be 4 and 5 are going to be on the opposing stairwells that go up and present kind of our architectural features at our new two-story entrance. The boards are going to be of very modest scale compared to the size of the facility, but it will provide the ability for us to even within that portion of the facility we have the ability to hold multiple events at the same time. So again the key thing here is for the changeable copy portion of these is to be able to very nimbly react to what is going on, changing information about the event itself. Also be able to direct people to the location which they need to be entering the facility.

The one static sign that we are proposing is one that we clearly do intend to have people be able to view from Grand River because it's the number one complaint that we have is the inability to tell, you know, where the Hyatt Place Hotel is from Grand

River.
And I'll just conclude and answer any questions, but $I$ will say, you know, you look at the industry that we're in, and the very unique nature of this building, and the competitive nature of what we're dealing with. You look at what Cobo Hall has recently installed, and it's certainly a larger scale facility, but of much greater scale as far as the signnage. And they're using that in a way and in a manner in which the industry is really looking to be provided. It also is a situation where you compare that to what we've been doing within the ordinance limits, and it's literally changeable copy individual letters on small signs at all the entrances, and it is truly something that's become an embarrassment when dealing with some of these large scale international shows that we're attracting to the facility, and we expect with the expansion that it's going to just hopefully be something that we're going to be attracting even more of those types of shows.

So with that I would just conclude and certainly answer any questions that you may have and just respectfully request that you approve our
requests for variances.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comments on this case?

Seeing none, is there any correspondence?
MR. OLSEN: 43 letters mailed, 1 letter returned. 0 approvals, 1 objection from Rodney Masard at 46085 Grand River Avenue, Novi, Michigan. He objects I believe more to the existence of -- they're complaining about unintended guests parking in their parking lot. So it doesn't have anything to do with signs.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you.
Does the City have anything to offer?
MR. BUTLER: Just a quick note that due to the expansion of the project, there's much more area for people to have to look for signs and stuff, that would be great for direction and guidance to get them to -- since there's multiple entrances and exits, to get to those places that they're looking for. There is a need.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

Board members?

Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I'm quite familiar with this for lack of a better word huge convention complex. I go there almost every week to attend the Novi Rotary meetings, and I have been going there for a while, and I just can't believe how big it has become from what it used to be, and you can't find the hotel without a sign. As a matter of fact, there is no sign now, and when I ask people to come to the hotel, they say where is the hotel in this complex.

And, anyway, with all the big halls and all different kind of projects going on and the programs going on every weekend, I think you need adequate signnage really to find the spots where you are supposed to go. And I think coming again into the current century, I think we need some very, very more than signs over there. The signs we have are so far clearly not in tune with the kind of the building and the kind of the business they are trying to do.

So I have no hesitation in supporting their request for the changing signs and all that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else? Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Mr. Blair, this property, we are very, very fortunate in Novi, and many of our people, community are coming and using it and are very, very glad it's in our community and are thankful to you, and I have no objection because you're expanding a lot and you need to have signs and amenities going into the modern technology. I have no objections, sir, and wish you good luck.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I'm a fan. I'm a long-time resident of Novi, and I am very thankful that we have the State Fair here in Novi. I'm also a visitor there and volunteer there, and I think that we would be remiss if we didn't talk about the shape of the property. Granted it is an expansion, but it's in a unique shape to this piece of property. And even though you've been in front of this board a few times, I think it's important that we remind everyone about the uniqueness to this piece of property, and that's why there is such a need for those signs. Each building and each entrance lies at a different angle, and as you pull into this layout, it's not that easy
to spot each venue as you will, the hotel, the main entrance right now, along with this expansion that you're doing.

So I am in full support. I think also that I want to note for the record that these signs are not going to have any negative impact on the surrounding area, because it is well-protected with the buffering and the screening of the Suburban Showplace itself, the lay of the land if you will, and that goes to the management and their great care in laying this all out, and that's why it makes it easy for me to support these requests.

So with that, I would entertain a motion. Member Peddiboyina.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ18-0034 sought by Blair Bowman of Suburban Collection Showcase because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring a variance from the City of Novi of Ordinance Section 28.5 to install five new additional oversized full screen changeable copy signs. Without the variance the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the
property because of the size and scale of the Showplace building as it's being expanded. These signs will help facilitate visitors to know about the events and activities, and the attendees and participants to effectively navigate the site.

The property is unique because of the size of the building. The petitioner did not create the condition because of the unique nature of the building facility. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of the unique nature of the Showplace facility. The signs have no visibility from adjacent properties. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the signs will provide directions and event information with modern technology. Thank you.

MR. SANGHVI: Support.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Seeing none, Kate, would you please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MR. OLSEN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Acting Chair Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variances have been granted. Congratulations and good luck.

MR. BOWMAN: I do want to just a special note of thanks for the Planning and Community Development Department for meetings with us going over this, helping us really consider, even site visits from representatives walking with us and spending the better part of a day working on where the best locations for this were. So I just want to thank them very much for all their efforts.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Well, we appreciate that. Thank you. Good luck.

Having completed the cases, I understand
that we have dates to discuss for a meeting. Are we discussing that this evening or -- Larry?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, we need to discuss this for our training that we have. I believe I sent an email out, hopefully everybody had a chance to look at that, offering five days, and the days -- we had to move to September because of difficulties getting everybody through the summer, and the dates offered were 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19. We need to choose from the dates 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19th. Everybody should have received an email today with those dates on it. We just found out that we really need to get this training done, this is mandatory training. We need to get everybody in, everybody to participate so we can get this training knocked out. Please respond as soon as possible. I believe one of those days is probably on a Friday, so I have to wash that one out, but --

MS. SAARELA: And on the 18th $I$ have a consult with council, so Tom Schultz could potentially be there.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And when would you like to hear from everybody, because Member Krieger is
out of the country right now.
MR. BUTLER: Do you know if we could fly somebody out there?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes, I will go. I'll volunteer, absolutely.

MR. BUTLER: I don't remember when she said she was coming back. Was it the end of the month?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MR. BUTLER: That's fine. That gives us plenty of time to wait for her to get back. I'm sure she'll jump on the band wagon.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So my suggestion maybe would be to reiterate that email again out to everybody, because there was some confusion about the 23rd of August, so you may want to clarify that.

MR. BUTLER: 23rd of August is out. That was eliminated. So these are the new proposed dates.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And I will try to get a hold of Member Krieger as well as and see if she can't find a date and get a hold of you before then.

MR. BUTLER: Outstanding.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is there anything else?

```
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    Seeing none, is there a motion to adjourn?
    MR. SANGHVI: I'll make a motion to adjourn
    the meeting for today.
        MR. BYRWA: Support.
    CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor?
    THE BOARD: Aye.
    CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meeting is
adjourned.
```

    (Meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.)
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