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CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I'd like to call the August 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

Would you please all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa, absent, excused.

Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger, absent, excused.

Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Here.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Here.

Thank you.

A copy of tonight's agenda and the rules for the meeting are on the back of the podium. I'm asking everyone to please shut off your cellphones at this time.

We do have -- although we're minus two board members tonight, all decisions will be final.

Are there any changes or additions to the agenda this evening?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, all those in favor of tonight's agenda, say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Tonight's agenda is approved.

Are there any changes or additions to the June 14 minutes that were in our packet?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing
none, all those in favor of the approval for
the June 14, 2016 minutes say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The
minutes are so approved.

At this time, is there
anyone in the audience that wishes to make
comment in front of the board regarding any
other issue other than what's on the agenda
this evening may do so now. Anyone in the
audience.

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing
none, we will move onto our first case.

Case No. PZ16-0023, Mr. and
Mrs. Ahern.

Are they here this evening?

Come on done down, please.

The applicant is requesting a variance from
the City of Novi zoning ordinance to allow a
reduction in an exterior sideyard setback to
allow construction of an addition to an
existing residence.

Would you please state your
name and spell it for our recording secretary
and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.


MR. FERRELL: Do you swear to provide the truth in the testimony you are about to give?

MR. AHERN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. AHERN: We just would like to do a small addition at the end of our house. It's for a bathroom and storage. We want to tear out the existing bathroom.

It's a side setback on a corner lot. You have two front setbacks. I could go out four feet and be within zoning, but we would like to go out 10 feet, so I'd like a variance for that six feet from the distance from the end of the addition. The new addition out to the road is still 45 -- it's 46 feet.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you like to put your drawing on the overhead so everyone can see it.
MR. AHERN: It's 46 feet from the addition out to the edge of the road. That distance right there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So can you tell us why it cannot be put anywhere else on the property?

MR. AHERN: If I go forward, it's in the middle of the driveway. If I go back it's -- you know, there is a room behind it, so there is nowhere I could go up, it kind of doesn't make sense, putting a second story bathroom. So this is the only thing we could do.

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

MR. AHERN: No. I think that the letter from the subdivision, you know, our sub is -- all four neighbors have signed off on it.

It included pictures of the house. The front of the house has a garage, the beams and wood and everything, the shake, that's what this addition would look like on the end, you know, it would be -- carry the
same look around to the side of the house.
That's about it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make testimony in the matter of this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none. Is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were 29 letters mailed, one letter returned, five approvals.

First from Edward Popchick at 24061 Woodham Road. I don't object to the variance requested. He notes the previous additions made to their home have been done carefully to match the original style. And the new addition, I will not approach any neighbors, boundaries on their properties.

The second approval from Glenn and Sharon Melnick, 24117 Woodham.

Third is from Elizabeth Mancini, 23971 Woodham.

Fourth is from John and Diane Demetski, at 48246 Cedarwood. They
comment that they have a very nice and well
maintained home and would expect the same in
the new addition.

The fourth is from Joseph
and Patricia Roma, at 24137 Woodham. They
note their approval.

Then lastly, from the
neighborhood, Echo Valley Civic Association,
addressed by John A. Kunzel at 23819
Heartwood, Dear Mr. and Mrs. Ahern, this
letter is to inform you that the required
four members of the board of directors of the
Echo Valley Civic Association board of
directors have approved the design you have
proposed, 10 by 29-foot bathroom addition to
your residence at 24022 Heartwood.

The privy members of the
board, Ed Popchick, Gina VanHorn, and John
Kunzel. We believe that this addition will
be architecturally compatible with your
existing structure, as is required by the
subdivision rules and will enhance the value
of your home and of our subdivision. We also
require that all building codes and
expectations of the City of Novi
We wish you much enjoyment in your new addition.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department, do you have anything to add?

MR. BUTLER: No questions at this time. Standing by for comments.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Sir, could you come back up for the board members if they have any questions.

Board members? Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: I came and looked at your property last month, I think.

MR. AHERN: I was supposed to be here. I had at a coast guard meeting. I got the dates mixed up.

MR. SANGHVI: You have a lot of mature landscaping behind your building. And are you going to disturb any of that when you do the --

MR. AHERN: There is one bush and one small tree that would come down. But we will replant something accordingly. That's mostly myrtle along in there, which I want to
dig up and preserve and replant once it's done.

MR. SANGHVI: I have no problem. I think you're doing it and (inaudible). I support your application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Can you just take us through the thought process of what the bathroom is for, how it's limiting you not having it, just why it would be beneficial for you. Besides not having a bathroom. Kind of the dynamics of what's going on.

MR. AHERN: There is a lot that's going to be closet space, too. We are on a slab, so storage always is premium, no basement. So there is going to be quite a bit of closet space in there, too.

MR. MONTVILLE: Given lack of basement, you need the property. I have no problem in supporting this as requested.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else? I concur with my two previous board members. I also, in looking at this, this is the least negative impact that you
could have. Because if you went on any other place of your yard basically, the back room was going to be -- or the addition was going to be put anyplace else, you would probably request even a bigger variance, or you would need a bigger variance, given the setbacks, the side setbacks, then there is the well in the back, which disturbs that.

I believe that the configuration, and given the existence of the current home I'm also in support of your request. So, if there is a motion anyone?

Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0023, sought by the petitioner for a sideyard variance setback.

Practitioner showed practical difficulty requiring a variance from the required 30 feet to 23.3 feet, due to the size of the lot.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably be prevented and limited with respect to the use of the
property.

The property is unique, is such a smaller lot, that putting the addition to the side or the front would actually meet at the driveway.

The petitioner did not create the condition, as the original house is located on the lot. It will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. It's a small addition.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Is there any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

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

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted. Good luck to you. I am sure you will be in touch with the building department.

MR. AHERN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our next case is PZ16-0025, Signarama of Troy is requesting a variance for a 120 square foot oversized real estate sign for several lots. Is the petitioner here?

MS. DAMICO: I am.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please state your name and spell it for our recording secretary and then if you are the only person giving testimony, raise your
right hand to be sworn in, please.

MS. DAMICO: My name is Marissa Damico, D-a-m-i-c-o.

MR. MONTVILLE: Raise your right hand, please.

Do you promise to provide the truth in the testimony you are about to give testimony?

MS. DAMICO: I do.

MR. MONTVILLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may go ahead.

MS. DAMICO: The current size sign that we have at the property is 12 square feet and it cannot be read with any visibility from the freeway.

We are looking to maximize the exposure of the property for sale to potential prospects from both westbound flow of traffic on I-96 and side streets.

The property is being marketed with potential development up to 300,000 square feet and it is important to have visible signage in order for all clientele to easily notice the availability.
The signage does not negatively impact any surrounding businesses. We are just looking to have the maximum exposure for the eight parcels that are for sale.

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

MS. DAMICO: I do have like a proof. I have copies of it, if you guys would like.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Go ahead.

MS. DAMICO: It's a picture of the current sign, which is three-by-four, the 12 square feet in comparison to a mockup that I did to show the bigger sign that would be visible from the freeway.

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

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none. Is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. There were 63 letters mailed, three letters returned,
one approval from Marissa Damico, 1017 Naughton Drive, Troy, Michigan.

The current sign size at 12 square feed cannot be read with any visibility from the freeway. Two, to maximize exposure to the property to potential prospects from both westbound flowing traffic on I-96 and all side streets.

She mentions the 300 square feet available, visible signage in order to get clientele, as mentioned in the testimony. Of course, the sign does not impact negatively on surrounding properties.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Building department.

MR. BUTLER: The sign is perfect for the location. I think it will provide good visibility from the highway, has no impact on any surrounding properties, and would enhance the capability for marketing some good decisions they are trying to make.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Board members. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Is 10 by 12 the kind of standard for freeway signs?
MS. DAMICO: Yes, we have to limit the pass, just to maximize the exposure from such a far distance, we think it would be the best, especially for the size lots that are for sale.

MR. MONTVILLE: Okay. I am in full support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anyone else? You're only going to have one sign on the property, correct?

MS. DAMICO: There would be the three-by-four, which is currently on the site where the bigger sign would be, but we will be placing the three-by-four off the Twelve Mile, which is on the other side of the property. Just so we can get the side street exposure as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I have a question for the building department. So is this property allowed two signs then or --

MR. BUTLER: Yes, they can have two signs.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It wasn't too clear in the -- thank you.
Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: I have a question for the city. Is there an allotment of time that they can have the sign for? Should we have a --

MR. BUTLER: It's just a temporary sign. There really is not an allotment on it. Because they know that once they start developing, that sign would go away. It's just temporary for marketing purposes.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you.


MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0025, sought by the petitioner, they show practical difficulty requiring a larger sign than the current sign that they have in place which is 12 square feet, having difficulty seeing the sign from the expressway.

Without the variance the petitioner would unreasonably prevent or be
limited with respect to the use of the property.

   The property is unique because due to the topography of the land, the difficulty seeing the sign on the expressway. The condition is not self-created. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. The relief is consistent with the intent of the ordinance.

   CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Sanghvi.

   MR. SANGHVI: May I make a solution to the problem, that you put a time limit of two years, or whenever it is used before that.

   CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is that friendly amendment accepted by the motion maker?

   MR. FERRELL: Absolutely.
   MR. SANGHVI: I will second it.

   CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved, amended and seconded. Is there any further discussion?

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your motion has granted. Congratulations.

Welcome to Novi. Good luck.

MS. DAMICO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Our next Case is P16-0027, 24269 Novi Road, north of Ten Mile and west of Novi Road. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow an addition of five tenants and to allow for
a 70 square foot ground sign.

Is the petitioner here this evening?

MR. POTRYKUS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please come down. A 34 square foot ground sign is allowed by regulation. Gentlemen, are you both giving testimony?

MR. POTRYKUS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please state your name, spell it for our recording secretary then be sworn in.

MR. POTRYKUS: Steven Potrykus, P-o-t-r-y-k-u-s.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand, please.

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

MR. POTRYKUS: I do. These are some drawings that were all supplied to the board members.

We have a case with an old strip mall, back when Novi Road was a two lane road. They have roughly -- five tenants
stores that are facing north only. It creates a very hard safety issue when you're heading southbound on Novi Road, seeing those stores. It's always been an issue throughout the years. We do have new owners of the plaza, who are redoing the whole plaza, and they would like to take down the old sign and make a multi-tenant sign for the -- especially for the tenants on that south end of the building facing north that cannot be seen from the road.

The issue with the square footage, they are redoing the whole mall and all the way through the planning, actually starts construction next week. They're trying to incorporate all the same characteristics of the mall, with the stone, the brick, everything else.

But in order to do that, the 70 square foot sign is getting large, but the actual square footage, the tenant panels and the name comes out to 22.74 square feet. It's not as large as the sign.

If you just square out the square footage and that, they want to use for
the multi tenant panel of the signs.

There is another just kitty-corner from this mall is a collision shop who also has northbound facing stores who has wall signs and they also have a multi-tenant sign out front.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else?

MR. POTRYKUS: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to give testimony in the matter of this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none. Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: 32 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department?

MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Board members? Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I have
known this place for a long time. And Novi Road has been also widened for quite a while now. It's not just a recent development, a few years ago. How many tenants are there in that complex?

MR. POTRYKUS: There is 15 right now with two extra spaces, I believe.

MR. SANGHVI: How many are you going to put on that?

MR. POTRYKUS: What I believe they are looking to doing is putting the tenants that are -- have the hard visibility that are facing south, that you can't see or in that corner.

Like I said, there is a big obstruction when you're driving northbound, even southbound you actually have the same -- the trees overgrew in that mall from being there for so long. They block most of that corner of the mall. It sets back so far.

MR. SANGHVI: I see the need for identifying this on your sign, but I just wondered how you were going to do that.

MR. POTRYKUS: That's going to be
between the owners as far as allowing which ones have the hardest -- probably the hardest impact from the road being seen.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Can you just take us briefly through the design process. Why an additional 36 and a half, why would that be the minimum you guys need to get that visibility for those tenants?

MR. POTRYKUS: Mostly was the line of site, which I don't know if you have these drawings in front of you.

So based on it being on the far lane, heading north on Novi Road, if you were at the red dot right there, looking into the far corner at 158 yards, you're not seeing those signs. If you guys had a chance to drive by, there is a lot of blockage. You could never get over in the left-hand turn lane in time to get up to -- the turn in and safely, and turn in, if you happened to see the sign, their sign in the corner.

Heading southbound there
it's pretty much -- the blue lines showing right across, you can see the westbound facing stores at 30 yards from the entrance. But there is no way to see any of the southbound -- south side facing stores until you're actually right on the entrance and you're looking backwards.

MR. MONTVILLE: That makes sense. And then from a -- I've got a viewpoint angle, trying to it get into the center. How about getting out, does that block any visibility for people trying to get back on Novi Road?

MR. POTRYKUS: The minimum setback of 10 feet is the setback. The full side mockup was out there. I'm not sure if anybody actually went in there. It gives you one car space, as you come up, that you can see all the way down Novi Road to the north.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question. I didn't happen to see any cars come out at the time, but if -- the bike
that I'm looking at in the picture, I'm looking at here, someone is riding a bike, a car was coming up, back up past the sidewalk, could that car actually see the pedestrian or bike? Looks like the height of that sign is well above the car. I don't know if that's just the picture or not.

MR. POTRYKUS: You do have 11 feet to sidewalk from the edge of the sign, so --

MR. FERRELL: Eleven feet from the front of the sign as you were pulling in?

MR. POTRYKUS: From the front edge of the sign to the sidewalk is 11 feet. It's a ten foot setback, one foot off the sidewalk. So you have 11 feet there. When you're pulling up in the car, the stop sign is actually at the sidewalk. You have to stop before the sidewalk in order to turn out any way to see the pedestrians or bicyclists.

MR. FERRELL: From the picture I'm looking at here, it looks like it's right on the sidewalk. It's on the very last page.

MR. POTRYKUS: First one I had up?
MR. FERRELL: That one is good, too. Looks like it's on the right sidewalk there. That's just a concern for me for safety.

MR. POTRYKUS: The full size mockup was measured that's out there right now. That's measured from the setback.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You're talking about this one?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's right off the plants. Any other questions?

MR. FERRELL: No. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Peddiboyina.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Can you show me the old one and the new one (unintelligible).

MR. POTRYKUS: The old sign that is up there. That I don't -- they were planning on tearing that down anyway. I do -- I don't have any information on that old sign. That was one of the biggest thing they wanted, that old sign taken out of there. From guesstimate, I'm assuming that's
a 60 square foot sign, it's a six by ten up there. It's a pretty large sign.

MR. MONTVILLE: If you look at page 105 in the packet as well. It's actually on the screen right now. If you look at the top right corner.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I have a lot of concerns. I will tell you that back in '97, '98, I worked in that complex, my office, it was my first job in Novi that I worked in there. And traffic has always been an issue and identification has always been an issue.

So being a long term resident of Novi, I spend a lot of my life on Novi Road, stuck in traffic, looking for stores.

My concern on this sign is I wonder if there isn't a better design than long, but to go up. I'm not a sign expert. But I echo Member Ferrell's concerns about the safety.

When I drove out there, but the first thing I looked at in the mockup is
that there is plantation under the sign and
already there is a plant that's blocking part
of the sign.

MR. POTRYKUS: That's all going
out of there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That's my
first question.

MR. POTRYKUS: We just had to
stick up that temporary sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I was
hoping that was going to be the answer.
Nonetheless I had to ask it.

I just wonder, especially
with having five, if there just isn't a
little better design that maybe going up, so
you could see it coming from north of Novi
Road and going south on Novi Road.

My concern is the fact that
as Member Ferrell talked about the bicyclist,
you know, Novi is getting more and more
sidewalks, people are doing different modes
of transportation, walking, biking, there is
strollers, there is everything out there
these days. And I would not want to see
anything come up -- and people don't stop at
sidewalks. Realistically. We are all out there, we know in the real world we are supposed to, people are in a hurry, they are frustrated and accidents happen.

So I don't know how my other board members feel, but I would like to see a different design of this. If the place where it's at, but almost going up, as opposed to going out.

MR. POTRYKUS: That would change your --

MR. SAARELA: You can propose that, you wouldn't approve the variance as requested.

MR. POTRYKUS: That would be another ZBA. You're dealing with another issue with the height now. Because that's going to be out of your height restriction for a ground sign.

MR. SAARELA: It would have to be reposted, it would have to be renoticed.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I cannot -- well, if that's the case then, I cannot support this the way it is and for those reasons. The safety issues, as
discussed, the lack of -- I don't think it solves the problems for all the businesses. And I think that all the businesses do need to be identified. It's not my call, but that's where I'm thinking that it's going to present a problem later on. And that the biggest issue, my concern is the safety, and visibility from the south.

When I was coming up Novi Road to the south, with all the traffic, it's because it's on that other side, but if it was just up a little higher, then you could really see it.

MR. POTRYKUS: We would like to put it up. Like I said, that's only getting into another change in there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I'm not the expert, but maybe that's the approach that should be taken as opposed to this.

My other concern is, that there is so much here on the sign, and if it's truly for identification purposes, there is the a lot of extra that may not need to be there. I will put it that way. So if it's truly to identify the businesses, I just
don't feel that this sign meets the purpose of -- meets the spirit of what the request for the variance. So I'm just one person and I will turn it over to the rest of the board.

Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: The only hesitation is we are tasked with making sure certain things are taking place. And when I -- I would agree, the businesses on the north side of the center facing south have some challenges, visibility-wise. We want to help and address that.

Is it the minimum -- I think you could reduce some of the frontage right now on the sign, still getting the businesses exposed. And biggest thing is the safety issue. Other than that, I don't have any problems with it.

I'm not going to tell the applicant how to do his job, but if you could resolve those and table it for a month, I would be open to that.

Those would be the two main focuses I have as far as not moving forward.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
MR. SANGHVI: The discussion is very important from the safety point of view. I just wondered, like you said, the new design, they could put (unintelligible) on the top of the other one and bring the sign further north of where it is showing here. So that the entranceway is not blocked and it also doesn't block the additions and the bicyclists and all that. So there is definitely room for improvement of the sign itself and also the location also of the sign.

And the way we are here today, you know, five of us, and if two people say no, see, this won't pass. You need four votes.

My suggestion would be that maybe you want to redesign it and table it and come back next month and hopefully we will have more people back from vacation and also will be more acceptable to the board the kind of sign you are trying to put there.

So this is the suggestion, if you like us to table this for the next
month, or you want to go ahead and let us all work and see what comes out. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Ferrell, did you have something to add?

MR. FERRELL: Yes, Madam Chair. I just have a question about the -- if we table it, he comes back with it elevated, does that have to be reposted?

MR. SAARELA: As long as it's a smaller variance, it doesn't but if it's -- if he needs a greater variance, it does need to be renoticed.

MR. FERRELL: Even if he goes up, instead of just --

MR. POTRYKUS: If we stay at the same square footage and change the shape and go up, then it doesn't have to be?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Are you in favor of tabling it next month?

MR. POTRYKUS: With a few more questions if you guys could answer them, so I can kind get the idea of when I go back to the customer.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will certainly do our best.
MR. POTRYKUS: Going higher, yes, that would -- that does get the sign where it's more visible, even from the northbound, I agree with that.

The number of tenants, are you looking at -- you mentioned more tenants, but to get more tenants, we have to have a bigger sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I am not -- I can't give you that. I just saying if it's truly for identification purposes, then maybe doing it a little different design, you may be able to fit more tenants. That's not a requirement though for us.

MR. POTRYKUS: Our only concern, it can be moved back to the north. The number of big trees that are in that area would block it. Because if I go to the north, there is some -- let's see if I have it.

I can hardly see -- these trees right here on the north side, there is, I believe, five of them in there, that are quite large that would block more of the sign.
We can try to find a better spot a little bit to the north, but I know we looked at it, when we were out there. If it's a matter of moving it to the north, to get it approved, we'll find the best spot for it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Hold that thought. I have a question for the city.

So if there is a tree in the way, obviously we are not going to cut the tree down. But can the petitioner or the owner of the property trim the trees so that visibility isn't an issue?

MR. BUTLER: The extent of how much he could trim the tree would be in question, we would have to take up with our residents with the landscaping, which would be Rick Meader. But I'm sure he would be -- but we would have to take up that discussion with Rick and find out how much he could trim that tree.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That could be part of his assignment when he's researching this, that's an option for research, there may be something there that
opens the door to you. I don't know one way
or the other. But that --

MR. POTRYKUS: While we were out
there looking at it, originally before we
came up with, and there was a concern, our
concern at the time to get the long sign
keeping it at five feet high, it would go
back into those trees, but if we do shorten
it and go higher, then we could probably find
a spot a little bit north of the driveway.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: It doesn't have to
go to the north. I mean, why are we -- we
keep saying to the north. We could go to the
south, right?

MR. POTRYKUS: When the north --
the building is facing south, when you're
driving south, if you don't see the sign
until you are after the driveway, you don't
have time, you can't turn in.

MR. FERRELL: Would it be the
same if you are coming other the way?

MR. POTRYKUS: When you're
heading north, you actually can see those
signs on the wall.

The southbound is the safety issue. You want to catch that traffic before they get to the driveway in order to give them time to turn in.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So, we're going to do a motion -- or I mean --

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: The most important thing we discussed with the board members, the safety one thing, this is -- the sign is this wide one, now we have to go up. You said the tenants in this -- we mentioned five tenants?

MR. POTRYKUS: Yes.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: It actually said 15 tenants.

MR. POTRYKUS: In the whole mall. In the whole mall there is 15 present with extra spaces.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: What about them? They are going to -- like a sign board. The most important is safety.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: In regards to -- we are not able to just dictate
that all 15 tenants be on there, no. That's what I didn't think.

So we need a motion to table -- or Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Yes. Didn't mean to cut you off.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Go ahead.

MR. FERRELL: I move that we table Case No. PZ16-0027 to one month.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can we have the date for the next meeting.

MS. DRESLINSKI: September 13th.

MR. FERRELL: September 13, 2016 to allow the petitioner to redesign and research for a new sign placement and size.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved, is there a second?

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion? Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion to table Case PZ16-0027 to September 13th, 2016 passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: See you next month.

MR. POTRYKUS: Do I have to put another temporary sign up there for that meeting?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please. That would be to your advantage. See you next month.

Next case, B and B Sign and Lighting PZ16-0029, AT 43443 Grand River Avenue, south of Grand River, west of Novi Road.

The applicant is requesting
a variance to allow installation of an additional rear sign of 30 square feet. Is the petitioner here?

MR. BONGIORNO: Yes, I am.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And would you please state your name, spell it and raise your right hand and be sworn in.

MR. BONGIORNO: Name is Bob, last name is B-o-n-g-i-o-r-n-o.

MR. MONTVILLE: One quick second. We skipped over Case No. 4. Is that okay, come back to 4?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I flipped it over. My mistake.

Would you mind. We are going to go back to Case 4. My mistake. I flipped it before I was ready.

Let's go to SignArt at 27200 Beck Road, north of Grand River, east of Beck. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow construction of an additional multi-tenant monument sign of 30 square feet.

Good evening. All right. I was going to save the best for the last, I guess.

Would you please state your
name, spell it for the recording secretary
and be sworn in.

    MR. CONROY: Mitch Conroy, C-o-n-r-o-y.

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

    MR. CONROY: I do.

    CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

    MR. CONROY: So basically we are just looking to put up a monument ground sign, with three tenants, where the ordinance basically states that you have to have four tenants to be able to put up a ground sign.

    We are meeting all restrictions of the zoning code, height, area restriction. We are even actually set back far enough to allow 45 square foot sign, in the event that we have four tenants. So we are actually at the minimum 30 square foot proposed, so basically just looking to put something up with three tenants instead of four.

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

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Fourteen letters
mailed, three letters returned, zero
approvals, and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Building department?

MR. BUTLER: No comment at this
time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you. Board members. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I have no
problems supporting this sign. It's clearly
within the spirit of the ordinance, just one
less tenant, but everything matches up. It's
a good design and I'm all for it. I'm
prepared to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I'd like
to say that I think it's a great looking
sign. And I think that more importantly, the
importance of this type of sign for that
area, given the configuration, the traffic,
the widening of Beck with the turning signs,
I think you did a great job. I have no
problem as well.

If there is a motion, please do so.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance requested in Case No. PZ16-0028, sought by SignArt, Incorporated, as the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty for the need of the sign, and stated within the ordinance as currently written.

They would have to essentially create a tenant that they do not have, so it's within the spirit of the ordinance, as designed and as presented.

Furthermore, the sign will increase safety on the highly traffic traversed area, Grand River and Beck Road in that intersection.

The petitioner did not create this particular condition as they only have three tenants, given the size of the building and the lot, and this variance, when requested, will not unreasonably -- when approved will not interfere unreasonably with any adjacent or surrounding properties, and
as it is within the current ordinance sign
dimensions, and will increase the property
value for this business owner, and the
economic positive impact for the tenants at
the location.

For those reasons, I move
that we grant the variance as requested.

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
Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your motion has been passed. Thank you.

MR. CONROY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: When do you open?

MR. CONROY: October I hope.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Back by popular demand, B and B Sign and Lighting, PZ16-0029, as previously stated. One sign after another what can I say. That's where the confusion was.

We did not get to the swearing in, so would you please respell your name again.

MR. BONGIORNO: Last name is Bongiorno, B-o-n-g-i-o-r-n-o. Would you raise your right hand and be sworn in.

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

MR. BONGIORNO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.
MR. BONGIORNO: Pizza Hut is requesting a variance for a second wall sign on the back of the building at the above listed address. They're looking to get visibility for customers at the intersection of Grand River and Novi Road.

Without a second wall sign, they feel that there is a little chance to succeed at this location. Where that unit is in that rental property, and a building to their west blocks the view for traffic going east on Grand River.

So where they're located in that plaza, they feel that they -- without the second wall sign, they don't want to pursue any further to get -- rent that property out. Looking for a variance for a second wall sign on the back of the building. They feel that's the only chance they had to succeed there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else?

MR. BONGIORNO: Nope.

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

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: 46 letters mailed, 10 letters returned, one approval, from Kathy Tombat (ph) Diversified Members Credit Union, and she just notes her approval and her address is 25880 Novi Road.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department?

MR. BUTLER: Just noted that he is allowed one square foot identifying wall sign for every two linear feet of building, which is having two smaller signs would not have any adverse impact on the building. I believe on the signs. Did he bring any pictures of what the sign looks like on the building, that we could see on the overhead?

MR. BONGIORNO: Yes, the mockup sign was installed prior to the meeting. Here is a mockup of a drawing of the sign on the building, too, 30 square foot sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else?
MR. BUTLER: Nothing else.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: That is a unique location, certainly. That's interesting. There is so much traffic there, yet it's so hard to see, if you're coming down on Grand River, going west up Grand River, it's tough. If you're on Novi Road, it's difficult. The design of the sign looks good, it's within the spirit of the ordinance from that perspective.

I think that the uniqueness of that location for me would justify why they need that second sign. I would open it up for further discussion. At this point I'm supporting this.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. Member Peddiboyina.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I think we agree on that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there
MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance as requested in Case No. PZ16-0029 sought by B and B Sign and Lighting for an additional second sign. Petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring the additional sign due to the unique location of the proposed business, also from a safety perspective, cars coming west and east on Grand River and also on Novi Road, trying to look into the location. Visibility will increase the safety aspects.

The sign is well designed and within the spirit of the ordinance from a dimensional perspective as well.

The relief, when granted, will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, and again, due to the commercial retail area of the location and also the well laid out design of the sign.

The relief is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance, again, for the -- being within the dimension requirements, and being well-designed and for
those reasons I move that we approve the variance as requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Is there any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Tell
Pizza Hut to come onto Novi.

MR. BONGIORNO: They will now.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Good luck.

So, now that takes us to Case No. PZ16-0030, Coy Construction. The petitioner is here? For 23384 Winnsborough Drive, north of Nine Mile, west of Novi Road, the applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the rear yard setback from 35 feet to 29 and allowing construction of the screen-in porch on an existing deck.

Good evening and you are?

MR. MCCOY: My name is Mike McCoy. I am the owner of Coy Construction. And Mr. Fridenberg, Rob and Chris Fridenberg, are our customers. We built their deck about 20 years ago on there.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Before you go any further, could you please raise your hand and be sworn in by our secretary.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to provide the truth in the testimony you are about to give?
MR. MCCOY: I do. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. Now you can give us the history.

MR. MCCOY: We built a deck for the Fridenbergs I think about 18 years ago in there. And since then -- well, in that same subdivision, we have built about I think four or five screened-in porches almost identical to the one that we are proposing now. The screen porch would be built on the existing deck. It wouldn't be encroaching back in the wetlands any further than the deck is now. There is a lot of mosquitoes back there and they really are not able to enjoy that deck as much as they would like to, and for several years now they have been thinking about having us build a screened-in porch, like we have done about 60 times I think in Novi in the last 20 years.

We have gotten, I think, maybe about a third of those we have needed variances for, and you guys have been very accommodating granting variances for my customers in the past and it's very much appreciated.
So we would love -- they have enjoyed several of their neighbors who have screened porches we have built and now they would like to have us build one for them, too.

There is wetlands in the backyard, so there is nobody behind them. And there a lot of privacy and trees and stuff on both sides, so it would -- it's not very visible at all, but it would be a nice feature to add to their homes so they could enjoy that backyard more than they have been able to.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you have a picture with you this evening, that you could put up on the overhead?

MR. MCCOY: I have got the survey that shows where the porch would be. I am not even sure --

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You're doing just fine.

MR. MCCOY: You can see the existing deck with the setbacks and the room -- the code is 35 feet to the lot line, but the deck now is 29 feet. It's only going
up 13 feet, which is a pretty modest size
room, if we were requesting a variance
smaller than that, we would have to really
chop the deck back in order to accommodate
that, it will kind of make it almost too
small to make sense of it. So it just seems
like the way to do it.

I kind of designed the
original deck 18 years ago, with the idea
that at some point in the future, there may
be a good chance we would be building a --
hope to build a screened-in porch. I wasn't
even aware of it, that there would be a
setback issue at that time.

But when we decided to apply
for a permit, we realized we were lacking
about six feet there, in order to comply with
the setback.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Anything else you would like to add?
MR. MCCOY: I can't think of
anything.

MR. FRIDENBERG: I would like to,
if I can.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can you
raise your right hand, be sworn in.

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

MR. FRIDENBERG: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Just state your name for our recording secretary, please.

MR. FRIDENBERG: Rob Fridenberg, F-r-i-d-e-n-b-e-r-g.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MR. FRIDENBERG: Yes, as Mike says, we have been living in Novi. We have been lucky enough to live up against a nice nature preserve, and given the wetlands that are around there, the mosquitoes in the evening are pretty much unbearable. After 17 years we finally decided it's time to do a porch.

I think the other -- like Mike says, it's not encroaching on the footprint we have, not making it any larger. And I think the distance from the back of our lot to the nearest house, is probably over
300 feet packed with trees. I mean, this summer, all you can see is a wall of trees, so we didn't think there would be any impact to the neighbors. Even our board association president thought it was a great idea.

MR. MCCOY: Another potential customer. You got his name and number.

MR. FRIDENBERG: We are probably going to be in Novi for another seven years, we will try to enjoy a porch for the remainder of that time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Seeing none, correspondence.

MR. MONTVILLE: 24 letters mailed, zero letters returned, two approvals. First, they only included their last name, Hammer, at 23229 Mystic Forest Drive, note their approval. The second is from Deanna Reed, at 23374 Winnsborough, and she also just notes her approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department?
MR. BUTLER: The only comment is
I need to confirm that they are encroaching
anymore into the setback. It's existing and
there is several in the area, they kind of
match there. There is a lot of similar
construction, so it matches the spirit of the
architecture in the area.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you. Board members. Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came
and visited your residence a couple of days
ago. I think that subdivision is one of the
best kept secrets of Novi. You have a
beautiful home. I know what it feels like to
have mosquitoes around, zooming around your
head as you sit on the deck. And I
understand the need to cover it up. I have
no problem supporting your application.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone
else? Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I don't have
any issue.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MR. MCCOY: I forgot to spell my name.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We are okay. Thank you.

Is there a motion anywhere, gentlemen? Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0030, sought by the petitioner. The petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring reduction in the backyard setback to build a screened-in porch for the homeowners to enjoy the property due to mosquitoes.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, due to the wetlands being in the backyard and the problems with the mosquitoes.

The property is unique
because due to the shape and location of the lot and due to the wetlands in backyard. Petitioner did not create the condition. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, and will actually improve -- let me repeat that.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties due to the backyard and wetlands and lot width and the size of the property.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. And the screened-in porch will keep the architecture within the neighborhood and surrounding properties.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

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

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, will you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

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

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted. Good luck. Congratulations.

MR. BONGIORNO: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our last case, is for the Suburban Collection Showplace expansion, PZ16-0031, north of Grand River and east of Taft. I note the applicant is here. The applicant is requesting multiple variances that are a part of the record.
I am not going to -- for
time brevity, I'm not going to read through
all of them. Good evening, Mr. Bowman.

Would you please state your
name and raise your hand to be sworn in this
evening.

MR. BOWMAN: Blair Bowman,
representing T-Bon LLC.

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

MR. BOWMAN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please
proceed.

MR. BOWMAN: We are here probably
as the very square peg in a round hole
situation. We need this, as a bounty to fall
into all the issues that we are moving
forward with our planned expansion of the
Showplace, and also the fairgrounds aspect of
the outdoor component. And I believe that at
least one of the variances as it relates to
lighting is one that is still a potential for
needing to be on the list.

We did actually include the
row of lighting in the parking area, and the photometrics have been submitted. There may be a light deficiency in some of the very perimeter areas, as it relates to the lighting, so I think that they chose to leave that on.

I also will tell you that the technical aspect of the parking requirement, as far as distance in relation to the adjacent site, that was one that was resolved primarily because of the fact that we now combined the lots. So we have actually done a parcel reconfiguration and submitted the paperwork and actually performed that. I don't know if it's technically been approved, but that will also deal with some of the setback issues as well.

So primarily what we are dealing with then is the variance relating to the adjacent seal of the building, let me do this -- this is a very small scale plan, but technically, the reading of the ordinances indicates that this is also a front yard, even though it's adjacent to the backyard of the property owner. And due to the shape and
the size and the configuration of the
driveway, we technically are a few feet short
technically on our front yard. But it really
is in the backyard of the adjacent property
owner's site. So it's a bit of a technical
deficiency, not an actual deficiency.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So could
I stop you for a second.

And if we take these,
because we have a massive amount of
information to go through. The first
variance, for lack of end island around
permanent parking places, can we do that in
that order, then we will make the motions as
we go through them. Otherwise I think it
would be --

MR. BOWMAN: Certainly. So the
end island situation is very similar to what
we dealt with on the far east side of the
property when we put in the research ride and
drive within the research lot. That has been
successful, we have attracted a considerable
amount of users and visitors, particularly in
the corporate and automotive related
department. And they have expressed a
serious and significant amount of interest in us doing something a little larger configuration on the west side of the site in association with this.

More importantly, it will be demonstrated with this coming Labor Day with the Michigan State Fair, and the growth of that, we have plans for this being now, frankly, a more level pedestrian friendly area for the midway, which is going to be expanding as well. And when we have islands in the way of any of those types of outdoor setups of events, tent locations display, locations have to be very -- last year we literally had to take down a parking lot pole and tent over a section of a curbed end island, which ended up in the surface tent, and not a very ideal condition for that. It was described pretty well, I think in the Planning Commission process, it really is an extension of the display space, just going from the indoors to the outdoors. We're going to have gathering spaces out there.

The three day walk is another really good example of what we just
held. They have to separate their locations, currently on our site because they can't find setup locations for their staging and their trucks and their tents layout that work in any one location, so we would like to be able to try consolidated that.

So we were successful in gaining the approval before on the east lot. We are looking for the same logic and reason to extend over to the west lot, even a little bit more emphasis because of the multitude of uses in the very different diverse uses for the end island being a real sincere obstacle.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else to add for this particular variance?

MR. BOWMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing there is no one left in the audience to make a comment in regards to this case, is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 44 letters mailed, 11 letters returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Building department, do you have any comment in this particular --

MR. BUTLER: We did review the prints and it showed that island is sticking out, probably increase more damage, told that it would be for anything else, due to the fact with the traffic trying to go through, also wouldn't hinder them bringing exhibits out to the parking area, put up their tents and stuff, so we saw that probably be no problem with them making those islands.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Board members, any discussion?

MR. SANGHVI: I really don't see anything to discuss.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Well, we are going in order. All right. So we have -- was there a motion to be made on this particular request?

MR. MONTVILLE: Make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Okay. I move that we grant the first variance in Case No. PZ16-0031, sought by Suburban Collection
Showplace to specifically remove or allow
construction of the parking lot without the
normally required parking lot end islands.

The petitioner has shown a
practical difficulty in a few different
areas, one of the unique nature of the lot
being parallel requiring some additional
adjustments, the nature of the business,
particularly with the Michigan State Fair,
and the foot traffic and the ability to
properly accommodate such a large project and
fair will require the lack of these end
islands within the parking area.

Strict compliance with
dimensional regulations of the current
ordinance would prevent the applicant from
properly using the land as its designed for
the business and the petitioner has
established this particular variance as a
minimum as any of these end islands could
potentially be a safety concern from all the
foot traffic, it would be an impediment for
the use of the business and the fair
upcoming, and the request as provided from
the petitioner will not create an adverse
impact on any surrounding property as the petitioner is the owner of the adjacent and surrounding areas, and the lack of these end islands will not negatively affect any other businesses or nearby neighbors.

So with those reasons, I move that we grant this particular variance as requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second, is there any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, Monica would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: First one down. Let's move to the next one.

MR. BOWMAN: What is the next one you have because we have the one I started on was the one I had first on my list.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Variance for the proposed ordinance deficiencies with regard to lighting.

MR. BOWMAN: All right. Now, again, technically, I'm not certain that we still need that fully.

The only thing is that the photometrics, I don't know have been fully analyzed by the building department, and that we have feedback. So, I'm not sure -- we did submit a photometric plan. We do have parking lot lighting.

Initially there was some, you know, thought it could be made -- only use temporary lighting in the far west
western edge of the lot. We did include
actually a plan for the lighting.

So, I don't know how that
might -- it would be significantly less of a
variance than what we were originally asking
for. I don't know if it can be worded in
such a way that we would work with the
building department to meet the spirit and
intent in the maximum way possible with
minimum amount of deficiency, and then would,
if necessary, per any individual event
approvals, if we had to supplement lighting,
that we would do so.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Well, let
me check with my experts. Experts?

MR. BUTLER: I believe that in
your request, you had requested under 5.7 to
allow for the decrease of the maximum allowed
(unintelligible). Are you still planning on
going with that maximum amount?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: By doing that, then
we have looked at and we figured that that
was sufficient.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meaning,
so we don't need the variance or he should still use the variance if even though this may have changed what he's submitted?

MR. BUTLER: Still use the variance.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. So is there anything else -- do you want to tell the board members a little bit about the lighting issues. I mean, you covered some of it.

MR. BOWMAN: Again, it is a very unique situation in that we have that same struggle with the usability, the flexibility, the setup and the flow of the site, but also wanting to provide for as reasonable and safe and as consistent with the ordinance, lighting as possible.

So what we -- what's probably happening in that, and why the variance is still required, again, that might not meet exactly -- we might be a little bit higher to get the spreads, where we need to get them, we might not exactly get to the full foot candle at the one far edge without having to place another pole and those types
of things.

We are still planning on working with those within the guidelines we are planning on using our best efforts to meet every spirit and intent that we can, but I believe as proposed, there was still a couple of deficiencies in the plan as compared to strict ordinance compliance. That's where we might still need that variance.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think that the variance would be important than especially for the uniqueness and the layout of this property. I visited your property on many occasions throughout various venues, and that's exactly right. You know, I mean, given the configuration, given the building, given the expansion, given the growth of every venue that I've been to, I have been back four years and each year it's gotten bigger and better, with the exception of the horse show, just saying.

But it is important and I see -- as a board member I see the effort that this business has done for the community
and I am in full support of this variance and
if anyone has anything else to offer, or --

MR. SANGHVI: One comment. I'm
in.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: There you
go. So do we have a motion, Member
Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we
grant the second variance requested in Case
No. PZ16-0031, sought by Suburban Collection
Showplace specifically to allow the
installation of lighting with increased
maximum illumination levels along property
lines adjacent to non-residential districts.

The petitioner owns the
adjacent parcels which are used for the
common uses of the business, and thus will
not negatively impact the surrounding area.

This need is not
self-created as the petitioner owns several
areas around the business and due to the
unique nature of the expos and the events
hosted on the property, this is not
self-created.

Strict compliance with this
particular regulation would limit the ability
to host the upcoming events and would require
unnecessarily placing new light poles in
difficult locations.

The petitioner has
established this is a minimum variance
requested, again, to properly host and get as
much lighting as they can for the upcoming
events.

And due to those reasons,
the variance is still within the spirit of
the ordinance, for those reasons I move that
we grant this particular variance as
requested.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
moved and second. Any further discussion on
the motion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing
none, Monica, would you please call the roll.

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

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

The third one I have is variance for the parking setback deficiency and building setback deficiency.

MR. BOWMAN: Okay. Those are both are combined into one?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MR. BOWMAN: And I think they're related largely to two issues.

One is that the setback technically is at zero along the west line, but that property is not in the exact same entity now ownership. We have combined the main showplace parcel and the new paved and
surface area parcel. But we have owned in a separate entity the rest of the expanded fairgrounds property to the west.

So technically keeping those still seamlessly connected, paving right up and into the adjacent site, has created where there would be a zero setback. I think that's why they're saying that that's a technical variance.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department, do you have anything to add on this one?

MR. BUTLER: No.

MR. BOWMAN: The other one I believe is associated with a small portion of the very corner, where it gets down to where it's a 15 foot versus a 20, and it's because of the alignment of that lot, where the shape of the lot comes down, and it gets that five feet tighter at this corner. But again, this is the rear lot of a very good neighbor and associate friend of ours, the Belfour truck folks, they service our building on a regular basis, and are extremely good neighbors.

We are actually going to be
enhancing the back portion of this considerably because there is kind of a ditch area back there, kind of surrounding -- we are going to be landscaping around there and creating that as a part of our new through-way, pedestrian-way for the fair and also for travel-way for vehicles into the new west lot when we are operating as a parking lot.

And then a final one for the building setback is for the -- again, where I started off, which is this jog of the building technically ends up being deficient in a front yard setback, kind of oddly stated even though it's in the backyard of our neighboring property.

So given the totality of the project, the architecture, the whole framework of how this is going to be turning into a courtyard appearance, a bit of hard scape, turning radius and those things, we think that that's just a very modest adjacency issue, and this is very consistent with the overall use and flow of the site.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Board members, do we have any questions?
Seeing none, are you prepared to make a motion?

MR. MONTVILLE: I am.

I move that we grant the variances for two reduction of parking setbacks in Case No. PZ16-0031, sought by the Suburban Collection Showplace as the petitioner shown that in this particular unique circumstance they own the property to the west, and by furthering their flow into their property of the -- although different lot -- still the same business and for the purposes of the business, the sideyard setback is not required and eliminating the sideyard setbacks from the very -- from a set 20 to zero to 15, will not have a negative impact on any surrounding properties.

Again, this is a unique circumstance given the ownership of the applicant to the adjacent properties, and for those reasons, this is the also the minimum variance necessary for the property -- use of the property and for property being close to accommodate the right amount of parking for
the size of the given events posted at the Showplace.

And lastly, as I mentioned earlier, this will not have an adverse impact on any of the surrounding properties. For those reasons, I move that we grant these variances requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second. Any further discussion? Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
The last one we have, variance for deviation from minimum parking requirements.

MR. BOWMAN: This one is a bit of a technical one, too, because the on-site parking in the surface fashion is technically 28 spaces short of the required 75 percent minimum.

Now, that is taking the use of the entirety of the space for the maximum described and provided by the ordinance.

Now, I'm not going to say that that never happens because there is the infamous Comic-Con situation we have experienced, and even the State Fair we expect certainly will utilize most, if not all of our parking areas for either function space or parking space.

But in the extraordinarily vast majority of the times, the normal operation of the Showplace, even in combination with the new space, the surface space itself, even though it's only 75 percent of what is technically required,
will accommodate the full operation of the facility. I mean, literally with the nearly 3,000 spaces and a reasonable number of occupants per vehicle, you know, it exceeds at any one given time the totality of the attendance from 90 percent of our shows.

Now, for our bigger events, we will be working clearly on the scheduling of things, and then we are also now working on a program plan, what we are calling a major event, traffic plan, where we did institute this just -- worked on it over a two-year period, then instituted it successfully for the Comic-Con this last time, working with the State Police, our local police, county signalization department and administration and really -- and M.D.O.T. also used their signage to get people off different exits and give them messaging and things like that.

The schools played a roll in providing a shuttle situation from the high school, so all of those types of things will now be modeled into a major event planning process where we have, if anything, looks to
exceed a certain radio of attendance.

We have to notify the group, the committee now, and then we will formulate a plan. And that has to be done before actually booking the event.

So, it's one of those things, that, yes, it's a technicality, where we miss it by 28 spaces, but in very much reality, that will not be used where, you know, exceeded as far as the actual total use of the parking lot, and we do have another almost 2,000 adjacent safe surface spaces right flowing next door into the adjacent property.

Just for that purpose, and, you know, we are working and looking at the future as to what the growth will require, as to, you know, will it be more physical structures, will it be more surface parking or will it be some combination of both.

With a full mind, looking at what the future is going to hold as far as transportation, too, the convention bureau in Detroit just concluded in a study that they had to redo the study because Uber was not
even considered when they first started three and a half years ago in the study, the ride sharing, the Lyft, the autonomous vehicle component thing, I think it’s dramatically changed and probably even most communities are going to have to start looking at really what are they going to require now as far as surface parking areas and things of that nature.

And more and more than adequate, as far as our total operation of our building, specific events require it. We will engage in that master major event traffic planning with all the various stake holders.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Thank you. Building department, do you have anything else to offer in regards to this one?

MR. BUTLER: No comments.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members?

MR. SANGHVI: No comment.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That’s a lot. That is a lot to take in. I commend
you for this. For the uniqueness of this lot, and to have the insight for the future on top of it and plus all the traffic and everything. So I commend you for having the insight and the -- to look at the future and think, oh, my gosh.

My only question is have you thought about a high rise for parking at all?

MR. BOWMAN: Sure. That always does come up when looking at parking.

Now, structures are very, very difficult to maintain in Michigan, very expensive to build to begin with. Just to give a scale and perspective on it, if we were to build the parking area we are showing, just over 900 spaces, that would be somewhere around 15 to $16 million. That would exceed our total project budget of the entirety of what we are planning, just for that.

Now, parking structures also present a number of difficulties as it relates to not just the maintenance, but the accessibility issues. And for sure, again, for the various nature of things that we are
going to be putting in this surfaced area to use as, is isn't always going to be parking. You know, so, if you start to tear that, then you really start to eliminate there is some pretty classic examples where it didn't work, where some other community facilities attempted to do so, where they took structures and tried to also combine an event component to it. It just -- it didn't work.

So, I would say that we have certainly considered it and pretty much ruled it out of hand originally just because the expense of it.

Many, many times when you do see structures, they are going to be government funded, or they're going to be in such tight urban areas where the cost of the land and the development structure around it, would dictate that they can, you know, put parking either under the building or in a structured situation.

In this case, we have the ability to put adequate surface parking and to handle, you know, again, the overwhelming majority of events even as expanded. That's
really the most flexible and appropriate way
to go about it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Thank you. If there is no further
discussion, does anyone have a motion.

Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. I move
that we grant this particular variance in
Case No. PZ16-0031, relating to the minimum
number of parking spaces allowed,
construction on site as the petitioner has
established that amongst several different
other potential options for parking, but
additional parking will be nearby on land,
currently close to and owned by the
petitioner and close to the lot in the
project area in question.

This is not a economic
hardship for the petitioner, again it's --
he's proposing the minimum in order to
properly use the land and the lot for the
proposed businesses and for the events coming
the Showplace.

Petitioner has established
that this variance is the minimum variance
necessary again, for several different reasons, including the additional parking available offsite and also the extensive formal process that has been started looking very closely with several local agencies and government entities to insure proper transportation and availability for the lot in question.

The requested variance will not have an adverse impact on surrounding property, property values, or will impede the enjoyment of any property in the neighborhood or zoning district, as again, the petitioner owns the adjacent properties which are used in connection with the property that is being the center of focus for discussion today, so it will not have a negative impact on those lots as well.

So for those reasons, I move that we grant this particular variance, for the reduction of the minimum number of parking spaces as it has been requested by the applicant.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
moved and second. Is there any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, Monica, will you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay, your test is done. All your variances have been granted.

MR. BOWMAN: So the combining of the properties then took care of that other
final variance that --

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MR. BOWMAN: I do need to -- it's not only my test, and I owe a great deal of thanks to the administration, the legal team and everybody involved with helping to package this and make sense of it. It is so unique. It is something that's been very challenging, but our hope and expectation is that we can, you know, prove we are here and committed to this community and looking to grow and build with it for the long-term. We just really appreciate all the care and consideration that we received. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

Okay. Are there any other topics for discussion this evening? Seeing none, all those in favor -- is there a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. FERRELL: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meeting
adjourned.  

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.)
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