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Novi, Michigan.
Tuesday, October 11, 2016
7:00 p.m.
** ** **

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good
evening. I would like to call the October 11 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals people meeting to order.

I will ask Member Byrwa to
lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Please rise.
(Pledge recited.)
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, can you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Here.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Here.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger is absent, excused.

Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Here.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Here.
MR. FERRELL: Member Sanghvi is absent, excused.

And Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Here.
Thank you. This evening we will run the meeting following our normal rules and conduct, and I'm asking everyone to please shut off your cellphones at this time.

The cases will be called to
the podium. At that point, you will
represent the information to the board.
After the petitioner gives all the information, it will be at that time, we will ask if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on that particular case.

Are there any changes in the agenda this evening?

MS. DRESLINSKI: Yes. The first case, Case PZ16-0034, has been postponed to the November 15 meeting.

variance from the City of Novi to allow installation of one additional wall sign of 65 square feet on the north elevation of the building.

Sir, if you would -- if you are both going to testify, please state your names, spell it for our recording secretary, and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.

MR. SIEWERT: Bill Seward, 50617
Fossett Drive, Macomb.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
spell your last name for us, please.
MR. SIEWERT: S-i-e-w-e-r-t.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Are you
the only one giving testimony this evening?
MR. SIEWERT: Jessica.
MS. HUTTENSTINE: Jessica
Huttenstine, $H-u-t-t-e-n-s-t-i-n-e$.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you both raise your right hands.

MR. MONTVILLE: Would you both
raise your right hands. Do you swear to tell

MR. SIEWERT: Yes.
MS. HUTTENSTINE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. SIEWERT: Good evening. We have a medical establishment that we have clients that have appointments that are critical to keeping a timely agenda for the clients here, people need to get there on time and be able to get out of there on time to keep the flow.

And that's the hardship that we are proposing for a sign on the exterior of the building so that people can have ample time to find the single drive that is into the establishment so that they can keep their appointments.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Anything else that you would like to add?
MS. HUTTENSTINE: There is so much
I could say, but --



| $B-u-n-t-o-n$, for the record. <br> MR. SIEWERT: It's not a type of |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sign that's going to be -- that's going to |  |  |
| MR. MONTVILLE: I understand. The |  |  |
| size and dimensions are necessary so we know |  |  |
| that there was a thought process that went |  |  |
| into it for the record. I mean, it looks like |  |  |
| there was. I'm not trying to beacon you off. |  |  |
| I'm just curious. |  |  |
| MR. SIEWERT: Yes, there was. We |  |  |
| kept their logo in proportion to the size of |  |  |
| the building to, you know, compliment what's |  |  |
| out there and not overpower, you know, how |  |  |
| many -- the wall, but it has esthetic value. |  |  |
| MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. Quick |  |  |
| comments from my perspective. |  |  |
| Going west on Ten Mile, it's |  |  |
| a fast road. We have had issues with that |  |  |
| address before, especially with medical |  |  |
| facilities and customers and potentially |  |  |
| missing the signs. I think it's warranted. |  |  |
| I'm in favor of the sign as applied for. |  |  |

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: So is the lighting
like that much brighter than normal signs, is it average lighting, typical sign that would be on a building?

MR. SIEWERT: It's LED lighting.
MR. FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone
else? I will tell you that I did drive, after I saw the letter, because it was part of our packet, and I specifically drove around the entire neighborhood trying to get an idea if there would be a negative impact. I will tell you that $I$ did not see any negative impact.

I will, for the record, say
that the residents behind the building on Bunton Drive, the property line abuts, but there is no lighting, and this particular sign is not on that side of the property, it's on the north side of the building, and I think that what the objection was maybe perhaps you thought it was going to be on the
south side.
But after looking at it, there isn't anything that $I$ could see that would contribute. I don't even see any spotlights or anything for at night, security lights or anything. I thought maybe that's what they were talking about, but that's not -- this case does not have any of those issues.

So I will be in full support as well. I think that where you are located, the setting of the building, it sets back, as the two previous speakers, we have had other issues with this building, given the speed limit, the traffic flow, and then it's Ten Mile Road in Novi, people that are going for physical therapy, you're not thinking 100 percent to begin with, with all due respect, and when you're driving, the last thing you want to do is miss the driveway and have to turn around at Haggerty or go all the way down. Yes, it's not a good sign.

So whatever we can do to
help. And I think that this sign is within the spirit of the ordinance.

I think that given the
frontage of the building, it's a nice fit, and for where it is and when you're driving up west on Ten Mile, you catch it right away.

And the same thing when you're coming east, so yes, it was me driving back and forth all night on Saturday.

So, with that, if there is a motion. Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

In Case No. PZ16-0039 sought by the petitioner, the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the sign. Without the variance, petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, due to the petitioner stating that it's difficult for patients to see the location and has had several complaints from patients trying to find the location.


MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:
Congratulations. Your
variance has been granted and I'm sure you
will be in touch with the building department. Good luck to you.

Our next case is PZ16-0040
Metro Detroit Signs for Chipotle, 43345
Crescent Boulevard.
Is the petitioner here? I think he is going to be taking up residence this evening.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow installation of one additional sign on the west elevation of the property.

Your name, please.

MR. DETERS: Good evening. My
name is Paul Deters. I'm with Metro Detroit Signs, 11444 Kaltz Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please raise your right hand and be sworn in. MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you're about to give?

MR. DETERS: I do. Thank you for your consideration this evening. Here we have Chipotle. As you can see, they have sort of an unusual circumstance there, that the sign -- we have applied for a sign and received approval for one phase of the parking lot.

The second sign, which is actually the rear of the building, is the sign that traffic would see. And we were hoping for the board's consideration in light of the fact that it's such an unusual circumstance for how their clients would enter into that property, so that really only one sign is visible at a time, and it would
be difficult for anyone to identify the business, if there were not a sign on the property which would face -- we have it at the -- sort of the intersection of Crescent and Ingersoll, I know that Primanti Brothers has a similar circumstance there, we are just hoping that you would like to consider granting approval for this.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else?

MR. DETERS: No.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Could you perhaps describe the additional sign that you are going to be -- that you're proposing this evening?

MR. DETERS: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Maybe if you could put the sign up, if that helps.

MR. DETERS: The sign that we are proposing is an identical sign to the one that has been approved already by the building department.
So the one that's -- really
just go over the entry, as a marker for where their patrons would enter the store, the sign that requires the variance is the one that would actually be seen for traffic that drives around inside the center, and the sign is within -- when it's approved, it's within what the ordinance would allow for that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you for that clarification. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case?

Seeing none, building
department?
MR. BUTLER: No comments at this time. Standing by.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Are there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 85 letters
mailed, 11 returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Board members?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How big is the
sign? Same size you have current?
MR. DETERS: Yes, 32 square feet.
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything
else? Anyone else?
Member Montville.
MR. MONTVILLE: I would just
reiterate that that is a unique parcel directionally, from the west where Novi Road is, the main entrance coming into the Town Center. I have no problem. I think it's warranted. Esthetically it's the same design as the original sign, so I'm in full support as requested.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. When are you opening?

MR. DETERS: I don't know exactly when that is, but it's going to be fairly soon.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Hopefully when the construction is done.

MR. DETERS: It wasn't easy to get here tonight.

respect to the use of the property and making it difficult to find the location from the back of the building.

The property is unique due to
its location. The petitioner did not create the condition.

The relief will not
unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance, also due to the way the building was designed. The lot again, is really difficult to see which business is actually for which part of the building because there is no signage in the back.

MR. MONTVILLE: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
accept a friendly amendment. Instead of using back, can we just use west elevation?

MR. FERRELL: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will
remove the back and the use west elevation for the motion. Thank you.

| Page 22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. FERRELL: Sure. |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been |  |  |  |
| moved and second. Any further discussion? |  |  |  |
| Seeing none, Monica, could |  |  |  |
| you please call the roll. |  |  |  |
| MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell? |  |  |  |
| MR. FERRELL: Yes. |  |  |  |
| MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? |  |  |  |
| MR. BYRWA: Yes. |  |  |  |
| MR. FERRELL: Member Montville? |  |  |  |
| MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. |  |  |  |
| MR. FERRELL: Member Peddiboyina? |  |  |  |
| MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |  |  |  |
| MR. FERRELL: Chairperson |  |  |  |
| Gronachan? |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. |  |  |  |
| MR. FERRELL: Motion passes five |  |  |  |
| to zero. |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your |  |  |  |
| variance has been granted. Good luck and |  |  |  |
| welcome to Novi. |  |  |  |
| MR. DETERS: Thank you. |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I don't |  |  |  |

think you're going too far. We get to see you again.

As a matter of fact, $I$ think
you're going to stay right there. Are you on the next case?

MR. DETERS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The next case is PZ16-0042, 43575 West Oaks Drive. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow installation of an oversized wall sign. This is for Rally House.

Would you please state your name for the recording secretary.

MR. DETERS: My name is Paul
Deters. I'm with Metro Detroit Signs, 11444 Kaltz Avenue in Warren.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Raise your right hand, please.

MS. SAARELA: It's okay.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It carries over. Please proceed.

MR. DETERS: You know, I would also like to call up with me, there is a
representative from Rally House here.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you state your name please, and spell it for our secretary.

MR. MELNAR: John Melnar,
M-e-l-n-a-r.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
raise your right hand and be sworn in, please. MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to tell the truth in the testimony you are about to give?

MR. MELNAR: I do.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please proceed.

MR. DETERS: So before you this evening, I have a case where Rally House is requesting relief from the board to consider allowing a slightly larger sign than what would be permitted based on the frontage that they have there. And like some of the other tenants in that center, who have come before you before, they're hoping for a little larger sign, just due to the setback that they have
there.
The sign is set back quite a bit for the driveway, as you know, for anybody entering along West Oaks there. And what we feel is the sign that we are proposing is still within the spirit of the ordinance.

And also if you might
consider too is the fact that Rally House probably could make the identification larger, if they just included just the lettering, like some of the other tenants have.

However, their logo is such
that they have some decorative elements in there with the flags, sort of their corporate identity, which takes away and not only that, but the irregular configuration of their sign also takes away from the allowable area that they would have. They think that that's much more an esthetically pleasing sign to have it the way it's drawn there, and we are hoping that if you were to grant this, it would just
allow the lettering that's on there, the Rally House lettering itself, to be slightly larger than what the 65 square foot sign that would be permitted in the ordinance would allow us for and just make it easier for folks identifying them as you're traveling along the entry drive to the shopping center. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Would you like to add anything else? MR. MELNAR: I believe the current design as you see it on the front of the building, too, really adds to what the size comparably is to the rest of the stores. Our sign is not oversized, $I$ would say, in that manner, but comparably to the two signs, Michaels and the Container Store, left and right to our sign, we have tried to make it so that it is all -- it looks uniform in that manner.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case?

Seeing none, building
department?
MR. BUTLER: Just only comment, due to the fact that it's because of a setback, their requirement for an oversized sign is justifiable just so people can see it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay,
thank you. Is there any correspondence?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 34 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. Thank you. Board members? Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. For the building department. Do we know what the other size of the signs on the buildings are over there?

MR. MELNAR: I have got a picture of the front, if you want to see it.

MR. BUTLER: We don't have the dimensions. Around 60 square feet, they're pretty close. From driving by there, they're pretty close to that size. I think as esthetics provices, it fits in.


#### Abstract

not?


MR. FERRELL: Okay.
MR. DETERS: I believe the Container Store is 100 some square feet, is it

MR. BUTLER: That could be a little bit bigger, but --

MR. DETERS: When we had worked with T. J. Maxx, it was 100 and some square feet as well, but those were larger store front, as the gentleman there had said. I think this is -- what we are asking for is in proportion with the store front, so it's still keeping within the ordinance and spirit of the ordinance as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anything else?

MR. FERRELL: No.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: I would just make the comment that it is a unique situation with the setback being so far back, and clearly,
the esthetic value of the property has been well thought out by the applicant and the team and from a relative size standpoint to the frontage that they had to work with, I am comfortable with the 79 feet that's been requested versus typically 65 allotted, additional 14 feet are warranted, I would be in support of the sign as it's requested. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?

We have had several people up in front of us in the past from this strip mall, and the challenge still is the same. The setback and the fact that you guys are at an angle, you're not facing straight onto any major road. Granted there is a side road, but by the time you're not normally traveling, that's not a through road. And especially at night, with the increased traffic in Novi, I think that you did a good job on this. I appreciate the fact that you went in -- you didn't over -you didn't go overkill. I think it's
consistent and it's uniform as you mentioned, and I am in full support of this request.

Is there a motion? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance requested in Case No. PZ16-0042, sought by Metro Detroit Signs for the oversized sign of 79 square feet requested versus the allowable 65, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring an oversized sign. Without the variance, as being requested, petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to the use of their retail consumer property due to the limited visibility and also the high traffic, high density area and potential safety concerns with customers finding that location.

The property is unique due to the significant setback from any major roads. The petitioner did not create this particular condition, as I mentioned, the unit and the current store location is at a considerable
setback.
The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, as the esthetic value will be enhanced due to the professional design due to the time that was put into the the design.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. For those reasons, I move that we grant the motion as requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Monica, will you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted and when are you opening?

MR. DETERS: We'd like to before Thanksgiving if we can get a building permit.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That's out of our jurisdiction. Good luck and welcome to Novi.

Our next case is PZ16-0044, Walsh College of Novi campus. Is the petitioner here. Come on down.

The applicant is requesting variances to allow construction of a one oversized ground sign at 73,000 -- am I reading this right, 73,125 square feet, to allow the second 42 -inch directional sign.

MS. BERGERON: My name is
Stephanie Bergeron, B-e-r-g-e-r-o-n.
MS. STOUT: My name is Christine Stout, S-t-o-u-t.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Will you raise your right hands to be sworn in, please.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you are about to provide.

MS. BERGERON: I do.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If you have any renderings of your sign, you can put them on the overhead for the audience at home.

MS. BERGERON: While Chris is
doing that, I'll start with an introduction. I am Stephanie Bergeron. I am the president and the CEO of Walsh College. I am here today to personally apologize because we want you to know the highest level of the institution, we are very sorry that the sign was installed without meeting the ordinance requirements for sign size.

I am here to tell you that it was done without malice, without intent. It was done because of an oversight within our institution in terms of communication, an oversight by our contractor. But we are here to make it right and we want you to know that we feel that way from the highest level of the organization.

We have been in Novi since 1993, and in our current location since 1998. We value our relationship with the City of Novi, its residents, its communities, its businesses. We want to be viewed to be a respected value of the community. But we are here tonight to set it right.

We think that there are some good reasons to obtain the signage variance. I'd like to be able to ask Chris Stout, our assistant vice president of facilities to explain to you some of the reasons why we think the signage that's installed is appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. MS. STOUT: Hi. I'm Chris Stout. I am in charge of the facilities at Walsh, as Stephanie has mentioned, we certainly regret our oversight in terms of the size of the sign permitted. So we have put some internal measures in place to insure that that will not happen again. So, we are committed to being good citizens of Novi. Consistency of branding for the college is an important factor both for our students and our faculty, as well as for the overall image of the college. We recently went through a re-branding process, when we did a renovation at our Troy campus. That included changing the signage at Troy.

When that process was completed, what we were trying to do was to consistently brand Novi as well, and make the signage consistent so that our students would understand that we were a multi-site campus, and that they were part of that institution.

When we requested the sign, we used the same contractors that performed the work at Troy and unfortunately they simply replicated the size of the sign that's utilized for our Troy campus, without confirming that the dimensions met the ordinance of the city or permit process.

As Stephanie has stated, our administration was not aware of this fact and only became aware when the compliance officer let us know.

The particular signage at issue is an expensive sign. It was over $\$ 50,000$ for that sign, for the two signs actually.

We believe the sign does
enhance the overall look of the area, and is
a significant improvement to the prior signage, which $I$ think is in your packets. These are attractive. They are high quality. They're extremely expensive and I believe they add to the overall esthetic.

We have spoken with the neighbors and the landowners and they have given us letters of support, which are also in your packet, and they also indicate they believe that the new sign is an attractive addition to the area.

More importantly, as we have stated in our application, the sign is necessary for visibility, particularly due to two issues, one is the vegetation that grows along Meadowbrook Road over the -- by the overpass of $I-96$, and the other is for especially the southbound traffic on Meadowbrook Road coming over the overpass. The site line visibility makes it very difficult to see where the driveway is there. I'm sure you're aware that the entrance at Gardenbrook, Meadowbrook
and Eleven Mile there is all very close, so there is not a lot of time to make a decision. So a bigger sign we feel is a little bit safer for those people who are coming into the campus, especially those who are new and that are unfamiliar kind of where that driveway is.

So we are an $I 1$ district, the sign is I think comparable to other signs in the area. It is not out of range and doesn't appear to the South University sign that's at Twelve and Meadowbrook, and we are hoping that you will understand how we got in this situation.

So in closing, we believe that the dimensional variance should be granted for the following reasons.

The variance will enhance visibility and provide greater safety for those coming to the college traveling along Meadowbrook. It is not detrimental to the nearing properties and the property owners that express their support.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Page } 39 \\
& \text { intent of the ordinance, which was insuring a does support the } \\
& \text { traffic business area. And a smaller sign } \\
& \text { does not do as well with the objectives of } \\
& \text { both safety and visibility as well as our } \\
& \text { branding. } \\
& \text { Do you have any other } \\
& \text { questions for me or Stephanie? } \\
& \text { CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. } \\
& \text { Well, we'll get back to you. } \\
& \text { Is there anyone in the } \\
& \text { audience that wishes to make comment? Seeing } \\
& \text { none, building department? } \\
& \text { MR. BUTLER: No comment at this } \\
& \text { from Woodward Avenue in Bloomfield Hills, JF } \\
& \text { time. Standing by. } \\
& \text { mailed, two letters returned, three approvals. } \\
& \text { Montville, is there any correspondence? } \\
& \text { CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member }
\end{aligned}
$$

Investment Company. He notes his approval.
The second approval is from
Ms. Teldrin, her address is a P. O. Box in Novi Michigan, P.O. Box 8002. She is the HR director for Michigan Milk Producers

Association, they note their lack of concern. They have no concerns for the sign as proposed.

And the third approval is
from Freddy Simpson, who is the president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance, Way (ph)

Employees Division, their address is 41475
Gardenbrook Road, Novi, Michigan. And
similar to the previous two approvals, notes zero concerns regarding the variance request from the college.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
Board members? Member Montville.
MR. MONTVILLE: To just clarify
too. So the two requests, the one for the oversize sign and then the second for the additional sign, which I think is a delivery sign on campus.

MS. STOUT: Yes, the monument sign is on Meadowbrook and Gardenbrook. There is another sign into the driveway off Gardenbrook, that kind of directs traffic. MR. MONTVILLE: The oversized sign, I agree. I think it fits the lot, especially with the vegetation and I-96 overpass. There is limited visibility that vegetation has grown out. Clearly it's very well thought out, the design and esthetic value to the property.

As far as the second request for the delivery sign, again, it's a big property. I don't know what your acreage is off the top of my head. I'm sure -MS. STOUT: We are at 11 acres. MR. MONTVILLE: I'm sure trucks coming in and differentiating between -- where they are going, I think that's wanted to label where the delivery area is, too. I support that variance request as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Thank you. Member Ferrell?
$\square$
MR. FERRELL: Being a student at Walsh, I know coming over Meadowbrook, going north -- southbound. I saw the sign for the first time, $I$ didn't know you guys had it. It was like, oh, there is Walsh. But I have in the past come the other way northbound, and had passed the driveway. I do know you guys need a bigger sign.

One thing I don't like is you built the sign first then came, that does bother me. However it is needed. I do agree with the size of the sign. I think it is definitely well placed, well done. Branding is great.

As far as the other sign, I do agree that we do need a sign. It is a big lot, big piece of property, people will know where the deliveries are and such. So I am in support of this as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Member Peddiboyina.
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, I do agree with my board members. I also do a couple of
classes at Walsh. We need the education purpose. This is very important.

But only one thing, what he said, the installation. That's the only thing. I support this.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I am happy
that it's lighter. I live on Meadowbrook Road, driving all the time, and the one concern that I had about your signs, although I am not a student at Walsh, because I don't have enough time in my life to go. One day I will be there. I will get there one of these days.

One of the things that I did not like about the older signs is that it was too dark, and Meadowbrook is a very dark road. I am hoping that this is going to end that conflict. Because there are night classes, and with the increase in amount of traffic on Meadowbrook, they can be very dangerous.

It is unfortunate that they
built it without going through the proper
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grant the variance requested in Case No.

PZ16-0044, sought by Walsh College, the Novi campus, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty, properly providing sufficient exposure on Meadowbrook Road, both due to the I-96 overpass and the current vegetation of lot. Additionally, at night the visibilty was an issue and this will be an improvement of the additional lighting and also with the heightened sign during the winter months especially.

The property is unique again, due to the vegetation, as previously mentioned, and the I-96 overpass creating the elevation of drivers going south towards the campus.

Petitioner did not create both particular conditions as they were preexisting.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, again, due to the increased esthetic value of the signs and also as noted by several of the neighbors in
their incoming correspondence.
The relief is consistent with the spirt and intent of the ordinance, and for those reasons, I move that we grant the oversized sign and the second request also of the delivery sign on campus, again, so the applicant can have proper use of their land as zoned for proper deliveries notifications and efficient of traffic on campus. MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Any other further discussion?

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell? MR. FERRELL: Yes. MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? MR. BYRWA: Yes. MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville? MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
motion has been granted. Please see the building department. I don't know what other paperwork --

MS. STOUT: I would like to thank you for your support in consideration of our request. I promise you, we are a learning organization, we will make sure we will never do this again.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Next Case PZ16-0045, Out and Out Quality 2481 Glenda Street, north of Ten Mile, east of Taft. The applicant is requesting variances to allow construction of an 850 square foot attached accessory garage, where 620 feet normally is allowable. Petitioner is here, both of
you are giving testimony this evening?
MS. DRESLINSKI: The address is 24831 .

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: What did I say?

MS. DRESLINSKI: You switched the numbers. 24831.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Correct that on the record, sorry. You are both giving testimony this evening?

MS. TARPINIAN: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please state your names and spell it for the secretary and then raise your right hand to be sworn.

MS. TARPINIAN: I'm Melinda
Tarpinian, last name is $T-a-r-p-i-n-i-a-n$.
MR. TAWSE: Robert Tawse,
T-a-w-s-e.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
raise your right hands to be sworn in.
MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to
tell the truth in the testimony you are about
to provide?
MS. TARPINIAN: Yes.
MR. TAWSE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. TAWSE: We originally sent this in to basically put an addition onto the house with a new garage.

The present Tarpinians have lived in the area for 32 years, the same structure, they're getting a little bit older, planning on staying here in Novi. We are moving the laundry facility from the basement up to the main floor, and then the garage that's there now is basically following part back from the day when it was built.

I was having some foundation issues and the thought process here as to make it easier as they get older to get in and out of the house with their vehicles and bring the laundry to the first floor.

Since we had turned this
stuff in for the variance, in the process, we were originally over 174 square feet, garage size to house size. Since that time we had gotten a building permit for the egress window for the lower level, so that should take care of the square foot issue of the garage being larger than the home.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anything else?

MS. TARPINIAN: Our plan is to bring my mother to live with us, which is why we want to bring the laundry up. She is 83 and still somewhat independent. That's kind of we thought -- we talked about just rebuilding the garage. We knew we couldn't fix it, it's just too many things wrong. But we thought this would be the time to move it over. We plan to die in this home.

I think some of the
variances, just because we want to cover the porch at the same time. So the garage will come forward more, it's not increasing car space, it's not going to give us a three car
garage, it's just more esthetic to bring it -- you know, so we can cover the porch and it will just look pretty, look really nice. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else?

## Is there anyone in the

 audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Please come on down.Would you state your name and your address.

MR. JILG: My name is Dan Jilg, J-i-l-g, I live at 24817 Glenda Street. I'm the neighbor just south of the Tarpinians. We have been their neighbors over 23 years. And what they're doing to the house makes the neighborhood -- I mean, brightens up that area. I mean, what they have done in taking care of their elderly parents is phenomenal. I reviewed the plans myself. My background is in architecture, education. The esthetics of it are beautiful and just make the whole house flow better. I think they have done an awesome job of how to live -- I have no
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problems -- I live right next to them. I have
been there for 23 years. They have awesome
neighbors. I just want to give them my
support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.
Thank you. Is there anyone else? Seeing none, building department.

MR. BUTLER: I want to say. We had our inspector come out, and walked the property with them, looked at it. And the numbers they have come up with, it is a doable thing.

It's going to to -- of
course, it's not overly sized or anything like that. But they crunched the numbers and said that it is doable.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I have a question for you. Can you address the egress window that he spoke of in his testimony?

MR. BUTLER: The egress window for the basement would be if they had made it so someone sleeping and using the bedroom in the basement, that is required to have an egress
window in case there is a fire, they have another way of getting out.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: How does
that affect the square footage?

MR. BUTLER: It adds to the square footage because it is considered a living space, because somebody is sleeping there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were 29
letters mailed, zero letters returned, seven approvals and one objection.

The first approval is from
Sandra Turner, at 24903 Glenda Drive, she notes her residence is immediately adjacent and she approves the variance as requested. Second is from Talio and Peggy Pachela (ph) at 24759 Glenda Drive, they note their approval.

Next is from Sharon and Martin Brooks at 24924 Glenda, they note their approval.

And Daniel and Deborah Jilg
at 24817 Glenda, that's the previous testimony, approval.

Joel and Margie Shimshock at
24741 Glenda, they note their approval. That is a copy.

And then there is an
attachment of an objection from Lee and Ginger Berrons at 24777 Glenda, they have three pages. I will summarize the highlights. Say that the building is a combination of the older sheds that are built, when the home was originally built.

They note they believe that there is loud machinery, the current building is used for either work or hobby running loud machinery often.

They note that the
correspondence asking for letters of support, they note they believe that does not describe the actual detail of the project and leads one to believe that this is just common garage replacement.

They note they had lived on
the street for 33 years and they would like it to remain a place of quiet residential enjoyment, and reiterate their objection. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Boards members? Member Ferrell. MR. FERRELL: Thanks, Madam Chair. How many years, 33 years, your mother -MS. TARPINIAN: 32, it will be 33. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your mother lives with you --

MS. TARPINIAN: No, we would like to bring her in. She is 83 and she's needing to -- we raised our five kids there.

MR. FERRELL: Your laundry is currently where?

MS. TARPINIAN: In the basement. MR. FERRELL: What's the age of the home?

MS. TARPINIAN: '60 or '63, we bought it in '84.

MR. FERRELL: In regards to the person that isn't approving you to do this, what was meant by loud machinery? What do you
guys do --
MS. TARPINIAN: We are insurance agents. We work very long hours a day. Clearly that doesn't make any machine noise. But we do have a table saw. I have a grown son that occasionally comes and -- works on something, it's not very often anymore because he doesn't live at home.

My husband is handy, so he does, you know, he will fix -- we don't really have -- we have got a table saw. Anybody is welcome to look at the table saw, skill saw, just typical laymen carpentry type stuff. We have an air compressor. We use that, you know, taking tires off cars and our cars and rotating our tires. That's about all we do for maintenance.

MR. FERRELL: You don't have a construction shop? MS. TARPINIAN: No. MR. FERRELL: 24 hours a day you guys are running machines? MS. TARPINIAN: No. All you have
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to do is call the police department and fire department, they could tell you about that complaint. We knew we would get that one. She doesn't live next door to us.

MR. FERRELL: No further
questions. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. How big is the house?

MS. TARPINIAN: 1,041 square feet right now.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How many bedrooms?

MS. TARPINIAN: Three.
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Now you want to move your mother --

MS. TARPINIAN: The back bedroom, part of the plan is to put in like a senior bathroom in that back bedroom and add on just that little bit back there. It's going to be a walk-in shower. It's just my husband and I now. Our kids are grown and moved on. It's a
beautiful house.
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: No objection.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: I would suggest that
if you're not aware of it, I believe the City of Novi has a construction -- that's tied to like a noise ordinance, and it only permits construction doing certain hours. You wouldn't at 5:00 in the morning be running a table saw.

MS. TARPINIAN: No. My son
doesn't live with us. He's grown --
MR. BYRWA: They don't want you going too late. But there is hours of work that you can do, not weird hours at night or weird hours early, early in the morning. So double check with the City of Novi construction ordinance.

MS. TARPINIAN: That's not an
issue we have.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything

MR. BYRWA: No.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: If I could just ask two things.

First for the building
department, just my understanding so if the egress window wasn't added, would they need a variance at all for that 174 additional square feet or is that irrelevant?

MR. BUTLER: They still would.
MR. MONTVILLE: Just on the garage structure that's deteriorating so that would -- it basically needs new construction regardless, would that be after that --

MS. TARPINIAN: Yes, and soon.
MR. TAWSE: The slab is cracked. It was originally back in the day, they used to do a monolithic floor, where they poured the floor, then they poured the slab all in one shot. Then they set the plate right on top of it. So, you know, after that many
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years the plate starts to go. Then you get a
little water underneath the foundation a
little bit, you get a crack in it. It's going
to crack by the time you start trying to go
through there, trying to fix that, it's kind

MS. TARPINIAN: I did email pictures showing that it's really sad now.

MR. MONTVILLE: One small point of clarification.

So the additional square
feet, this might be for the building department, is part of that the overhang, so it's not actual --

MR. BUTLER: It's just that overhang to cover the porch, they're talking about.

MR. MONTVILLE: Okay. From a self-creation standpoint, I think the garage deteriorating, $I$ think that is going to create -- it's not a self-created situation for the applicants.

To kick this off, that's --
one of the things we have to -- we are tasked with judging is it self-created. We all want extra space. It seems like the design is well thought out, but $I$ think for me, that garage deteriorating, that makes it not a self-created situation for me, which is no thought process for us. So I would open it up to the fellow board members at this point. I'm leaning towards approval, being in support at this time.

MS. TARPINIAN: The architect is not here, but he could voice the fact that $I$ am the opposite. I am a minimalist. I do not like extra space. So it's just -- this is going to be really pretty. You won't find anything in my house. I am not a -- there is nothing under the beds, the cupboards are empty. It's more just to, you know, match up with the covered porch and that's really all it is.

MR. MONTVILLE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think
that perhaps, I detect nervousness. It's been


I think that given the
request that you have, because of the additional requirements that we have with the easement, with the window, for the basement, I think that that adds to it, and I don't think that you would be asking for as much if we didn't have additional ordinances, now that you're doing the construction.

So given those indications, and given the condition of the current garage, along with all the full support and with the plans, reviewing the plans and seeing that going smaller wouldn't necessarily -- you would still need some sort of variance, $I$ am in full support of the request, based on all the testimony given here this evening. I would entertain a motion. Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0045, sought by the petitioner for an additional garage.

The petitioner has shown
practical difficulty requiring the addition to allow movement of the laundry of the main floor for her 83 year-old mother that they plan on moving into the house. The garage being in poor shape and the cracked cement.

Without the variance the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, due to having trouble possibly with the mother moving in, using the laundry that's in the basement, planning on living there forever and trying to utilize the residence further for the amount of time they have already been there, 32 years.

The property is unique because due to the age of the home, that was built in 1963, as the petitioner stated, the garage is deteriorating and there is cracks in the cement.

The petitioner did not create the condition. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties and actually enhance
the neighborhood by improving the home.
The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion?

Seeing none, Monica would you
please call the roll.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
variance has been granted. I told you you could take a deep breath. Please see the building department and good luck.

MS. TARPINIAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. Our next case is 814 Development, LLC, PZ16-0046, south of 96 , and west of Beck. This applicant is requesting a variance from city code to allow absence of required loading area.

Is the petitioner here?
MR. BLIGHT: Rodney Blight. I'm director of construction for Rainbow Child Care, 814 is our development company, our general contractor (unintelligible).

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please spell your last name for the secretary and be sworn in by our secretary.

MR. BLIGHT: Blight, B-l-i-g-h-t.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Raise your
right hand.
MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to
tell the truth in the testimony you're about
to give?
MR. BLIGHT: Yes. We are asking
for a variance for the requirement of a loading zone for our child care. We own and operate 120 child cares across the country. And we do a heat and serve type menu at our centers. We don't have large semi deliveries, we don't have big trucks coming in and out. And typically do a delivery for the first year of school, typically every other week, and then once we get a full capacity school, hopefully within a year, we have maximum once a week deliveries and it's typically a van, a box van or a cargo type delivery. So they typically pull into a parking space, and then wheel stuff in on a hand truck, very small deliveries.

We have the requirement for the parking ordinance, we are trying to match that requirement and leaves the loading zone there, to provide us -- prevent us from being able to meet some of the parking ordinances that we are trying to comply with, plus we
typically would like actually a little more parking than most ordinances require to make sure we don't have problems with parents coming in, dropping off and have congested neighborhood. We like to have a little extra room, if possible.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Anything else?
MR. BLIGHT: No, that's pretty much it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Building department?

MR. BUTLER: I researched it and it's not required by state, so it's not like they're required to have it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: For the record, there is clearly no one left in the room to voice an opinion at this point.

So we would go to our
correspondence?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 58 letters
mailed, six letters returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

Board members?
Well, you know I'm going to
go out of order here. I watched the whole Planning Commission with this complex. And there is a great deal of detail and work. You have had some challenges with the uniqueness of the lot, and I think that you paid very close attention to this and I -based on this type of business, I don't see a purpose for it.

Especially, given the -- it's
kind of good that you don't have those kind of deliveries given the traffic on Beck getting in and out there, so this type of business is good for that location and the fact that you don't need large trucks coming in, and that your delivery is going to be limited.

What are the hours of your delivery? When you say a once a week, and a smaller truck, is it --

MR. BLIGHT: Typically once a
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CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.
Anyone else? Member Montville.
MR. MONTVILLE: I have no problems
in supporting the motion as requested at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's not a motion yet.

MR. MONTVILLE: The request as being posed.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board
members? Any other input? I would entertain a motion. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0046, sought by 814 Development, LLC, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty by
including the delivery zone preventing the optimal and required amount of parking spots. That the petitioner can properly use their land for their day-care business.

This property is unique due to the location and the uniqueness of the angles of the lot and the incoming traffic petitioner did not create this particular condition due to it being preexisting.

The relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance, especially as the limited amount of deliveries that the business does entail will only take up one single parking space, it will be very limited and will be during low traffic hours for the business. For those reasons, I move that we grant the variance as requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
moved and second. Any further discussion?

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
variance has been granted. Good luck. When are you opening?

MR. BLIGHT: Well, I don't think we are going to get started before the frost hits, so we are -- things go well, we get an early spring, we are hoping early summer.



CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case?

Seeing none, building
department?
MR. BUTLER: No comments.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.
Is there any correspondence?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 47 letters
mailed, seven letters returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Board members. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Can you confirm it's the same design as the current sign that they have on the west exposure I believe?

MR. DETERS: It's a little bit different. In fact, if I could put up. Here is a rendition of what they have on the front of the building. The signs are in essence almost identical, the same sign, real close anyway. The front of the building, it's a stacked configuration, and what we are
proposing on the east elevation is a linear layout, so it's just one layout that the band on the east elevation is not as tall as the store front side, so a stack one wouldn't really work there. It would just be too crowded in, didn't quite look right.

MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. Again, affirmative that it is a unique location, with Grand River, Novi Road being such a high volume traffic area, in that particular development, not at any fault of the petitioner, with the Athletico business is at unique angle where anyone going southbound on Novi Road, really any eastern exposure from the building is without that second sign no one -- it's going to be very difficult to locate. I would be in support of this variance as been requested.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else? Member Peddiboyina. MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How big is the sign?

MR. DETERS: The proposed sign
here is 55 square feet.
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Is there any
other color or just the blue color?
MR. DETERS: It will be the blue colors. The raceway itself is painted to match the building, so it blends with the facade.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else? This complex is a challenge for all businesses and especially as the traffic grows, I am -- I have no objection to this.

I think that it's a minimal size that you are asking for, and I think that the configuration of the lot as well as the roads that were -- the intersection that it's at presents the difficulty for these businesses, and therefore, I have no objection. I would be in full support of your request.

Anyone like to entertain a motion?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

sign was carefully thought through and the layout of the building was carefully considered, so adds esthetic value and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

So I move that we grant the variance as it has been requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second, any further discussion?

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, ma'am.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
motion has been granted and which room are you going to be renting soon?

Anyway, Athletico, when will
they be open?
MR. DETERS: Very shortly, I
think.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please
tell them we welcome them to Novi and congratulations.

MR. DETERS: Thank you for this evening.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You're welcome. For other matters for this evening, I would like to take a moment, board members, and if you noticed that had we have a new face sitting next to Monica. And Monica has received a promotion, and so she will be moving onto bigger and better things. I don't think she is like president or anything, but
it's pretty good. One of these days. So this evening, we have Carol sitting with Monica, and Carol is going to be Monica's replacement. Monica will be with us for a couple of months. So first I would like to congratulate Monica on her promotion.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Not really a promotion. It's just Andy's job, just a chair over.

## CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Nonetheless, congratulations.
And we welcome Carol who is new to the City of Novi as an employee, who lives in Green Oak Township and has extensive background in this and she is very excited, after talking to her this evening. So we want to welcome you and congratulate as you well.

MS. CHAPUT: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Having
said that, $I$ will tell the board members that next month we have ten cases, so anybody has Ipads that are not working, please get with

Monica before --
MS. DRESLINSKI: Not on the day of the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: But like the week before.

MS. DRESLINSKI: The third Tuesday, the 15th.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So everybody check their calendars, and please let us know if you can't make it. And also, have they posted that we need an alternate yet?

MS. DRESLINSKI: I will ask
Courtney.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If you could that, please.

Then that's it. If anybody would like to entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. BYRWA: I have one comment here. On the signed write-ups here, I think it would be helpful if the allowable in the zoned district, be put into the write-up. You know, we are kind of -- you know, just seems

asked that we do away with the non-applicable and just put -- you know, if it's a choice between a couple different things for one standard, like it is in the sign ordinance just but or or, just so they know they have to write something there. I did notice a lot of missing information in the packet today. MS. DRESLINSKI: Believe it or not, I had a lot of people, when they turn them in, they don't write anything, so I have to reach back out to them and say, you got to put something.

MS. SAARELA: They are supposed to meet every standard.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Because we were talking about that last month. And it does make it difficult, especially when you're reading these cases, and you're trying to piece them together.

So I think that Member
Byrwa's suggestion would be very helpful, and city attorney's recommendation on that would help things. Especially on this side of the
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