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CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good evening and welcome to the May 14th, 2013 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.
First can we rise and call for
the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And now if
could we have a rollcall, please.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick

is absent, excused.

Member Ghannam is absent,

excused.

MS. SAARELA:

MR. IBE: Present.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Present.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Present.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Here.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.

Public hearing format and rules of conduct,
they would be in the back of the room as you
walk in, or that -- there are some rules for
governing the meeting this evening.

Please turn off all cellphones
and pagers. The agenda for the meeting
tonight is in the back as well, and you may
have a copy.

When we call your case, if you
could please come to the podium, state your name, first name and last name and spell it for our reporter. And if you are not an attorney, to please raise your right hand and be sworn in by our secretary.

You will be allowed five minutes to make a presentation and then you will get a chance to be asked some questions by the members of the board, and at the chair's discretion can be allowed to have more time for your case.

Any modifications -- are there any modifications to today's agenda?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Yes. Case No. PZ13-0018, has asked to be tabled to the July 9th meeting.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Can I have a motion on the table to accept that?

MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

MR. IBE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have tabled that to the next -- to the July meeting.

Tonight the -- our meeting we have less than a full board. So if anybody
would wish to have their meeting (sic) tabled to another meeting, please come forward when we call your case, you can ask to have it tabled to another meeting.

Onward for the minutes. The minutes for the -- we have two, approval of the March 12 minutes. I'd like to -- any --

MS. SAARELA: Before we move onto the minutes, can we do an approval of the agenda?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes. Can I have a motion for the agenda, please.

MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

MR. IBE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, we can move forward.

For minutes, for approval of the March 12 minutes, do I hear any additions or subtractions or changes?

If I could, for my -- if I could just read off the page numbers. Page 20, line 13, it said, "Simps". I don't exactly remember the name, but I don't believe it was Simps.

Page 54, line three, "I'm not
opposed if we could put that.

And page 94, line 20, page 100, line 19 and 20, page 101, line two, page 104 line 25, page 109, line nine, to change the M-r to M-s.

Anybody else?

I move to hear a motion to approve the March 12 meeting?

MR. SANGHVI: May I make a motion to accept the amended minutes.

MR. GEDEON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none. For the approval of the April 9 minutes. Could I hear any changes or a motion?

MR. SANGHVI: I have a couple of amendments for that.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Sanghvi, go ahead.

MR. SANGHVI: Some of them are typos. One on page three, line 11, should be may I propose and not proprosed.

Another one, on page 32, line three, it reads Ms. Skelcy, it should read
Member Ferrell.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Do I hear a motion with the changes?

MR. SANGHVI: So moved to accept the amended minutes for the April meeting.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, we have the minutes for March and April approved.

Public remarks, if anybody has a remark in the public, if they would like to come forward that is not related to the cases, if you would like to come forward, please do so.

Okay. Seeing none, we move forward to Case No. PZ13-0014, for 26401 Novi Road, Qdoba Mexican Grill.

If you could please come forward.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Could you spell your name, please.

MR. WALTER: R-i-c-h-a-r-d, W-a-l-t-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I'm sorry, we don't have a secretary. So Jeff Gedeon is our secretary. If you are not an attorney, if you could raise your right hand and be sworn in by our --

MR. GEDEON: You both are going to be speaking tonight?

MR. WALTER: He may. Introduce yourself.

MR. POLLARD: My name is Chuck Pollard. I'm the regional construction manager for Qdoba Mexican Grill or Qdoba Restaurant Corporation.

MR. GEDEON: Could you spell your last name for the reporter.

MR. POLLARD: It's P, as in Paul, o-l-l-a-r-d.

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0014, Qboda Mexican Grill, do you swear to tell the truth tonight?

MR. WALTER: Yes.

MR. POLLARD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Proceed. Thank you.

MR. WALTER: Charles, you asked
me to bring these along. This is the front elevation. You have the drawing, which shows the
elevation, which we are requesting the variance, but we didn't show the front elevation. Charles asked us to bring that along because since the building just got up -- we couldn't put up a mockup for you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I'm sorry, if you could go back to the podium so the people at home can hear you, too.

MR. WALTER: Oh, my gosh. Are we being televised?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MR. WALTER: Oh, my goodness. I didn't do my makeup.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Could you also put a copy of the drawing on the overhead.

MR. WALTER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thanks.

MR. WALTER: Is that it? There you go.

Now, while that is the front elevation, as you see on the variance request, it's the same sign as on the side. Is that the best we can get that to zoom in or anything.

You're all familiar with the former Big Boy site, and they have torn it down, I'm sure you have all been involved
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with the redevelopment of it.
It's going to have, I think
it's four tenants in there, or is it three,
do you recall?
MR. POLLARD: It is four tenants.
MR. WALTER: But right now Qdoba
is going to be on the southern most portion
of the building closest to the driveway and

on Novi Road.

As you see, we are requesting
the variance because, first of all, it's
consistent with much of what we see on Novi
Road, Grand River, in that it's just -- the
community has recognized that a single sign
on a building, in this case, especially on
these roads is not sufficient.

So the second sign, which will
be on the -- like I said, the south wall,
will provide good visibility as you head
north on Novi Road.

This is important in that it
helps make certain that drivers as they're
coming along -- I'm hoping that I'm not
repeating a lot of stuff you have heard in
the past. I don't want to sound too
simplistic, but we have, you know, these
elements, we call vehicular -- driver
reaction times and the necessary amount of
time when somebody is driving down a road at
a certain speed at which they can see
something, recognize it, make the safe maneuvers to get over and such.

Since we are going to have obviously people needing to cross over, make a left-hand turn into this on many occasions, this will improve that, that driver reaction time, and the time necessary to make a decision.

Reduction of driver anxiety is very, very important. These are the things that help create accidents, and you know, so therefore, it's beneficial to us as a whole that if we have -- and us, I don't mean Qdoba, us I mean as our community here, that we have visible signage, signage that is visible, conspicuous, readable, legible, so that people can see it, make the decision, do it safely and -- safely. That's the important thing we are talking about here.

If, you notice here, we have talked about the need for these visual cues. This building is -- it's replacing an older building that -- and developing it for multiple tenants. It's not going to have -- at least not that I see anywhere on the site plans, some of the other visual cues we need, in that, you know, drive-thru sign, any kind of way of finding signage as, like for
instance, in the Wal-mart area, you have signage there that helps people get around that development, more safely because -- you know, direct people more easily.

This improvement, of course, is not going to effect negatively any of the supply of light or adjacent area. And it's important to notice that -- to note, again, I don't want to belabor the point, but when we have properly signed buildings, this helps appreciate the value of the properties.

This is beneficial to our community in that, you know, property which has appreciated in value, brings us more revenues, which often pays for the police and fire all those associated needs.

I think that you will see that it's esthetically with everything else along Grand River and Novi Road.

Any questions? I work better with questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. With that, would the city have any questions or anybody in the public as well?

Does somebody have a comment regarding this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, thank you, close the public remarks.

And for the city, any
MR. BOULARD: I just wanted to clarify that the (unintelligible) that's up on the screen is actually the east elevation, the front. That's a sign that's allowed by right.

And so if you wouldn't mind just putting the other one up there, it's comparable.

And then one question, if I could?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MR. BOULARD: There is going to be more than one tenant in this building. Is there -- is it expected that each of the tenants will come and want an additional sign for the same reasons that you have brought up?

What's unique about your spot that your client is --

MR. WALTER: We are on the end.

MR. BOULARD: How about the other end?

MR. WALTER: I can't speak for them. I think, between me and you, common sense would indicate that they will do so.

Again, like I said, visual signage, you know, more than adequate signage is important to not just Qdoba, but all the tenants in this building. And certainly most
importantly to all the, you know, visitors to Novi and the citizens of Novi.

Quite frankly, if the northern tenant has, you know, an additional sign, and it's in conjunction with our signage, it does nothing but benefit everybody all the way around.

And -- what else? I think that's it.

MR. BOULARD: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: From our board, questions? Oh, secretary, please if you could read in the correspondence.

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0014, there were 16 notices mailed, two return mailed, zero approvals and zero.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

Now open it up to the board, if the board members have questions for the applicant.

Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Good evening, sir. Will you kindly show me on your display where exactly this restaurant is going to be located.

MR. WALTER: You know what, how about this one. There we go. This is the location here, this is Novi Road, of course. And this is Fonda Drive.

As you will notice, there is...
no front parking, all the parking would be in the rear.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. This is the second sign you are applying for. Where is your first sign going, in what location?

MR. WALTER: The sign is going to go -- we have an approval for this sign over here in the front, on Novi Road. Then we are requesting a variance for this sign over here (indicating), on the south wall.

MR. SANGHVI: The sign -- Mr. Boulard, the sign that has been approved is going to be on the south side?

MR. BOULARD: The sign that's approved previously or that's already approved is the sign on the east side, which would face Novi Road.

MR. SANGHVI: East side. I thought you were showing the picture for the --

MR. BOULARD: I asked the gentleman -- in the packet there was a picture of the proposed sign on the south. I asked him to bring the picture of the sign on the east, just for reference.

MR. SANGHVI: How big is the first sign?

MR. BOULARD: The first sign is already approved. The variance request is
for the second sign on the south side.

MR. SANGHVI: What is the size of the approved sign?

MR. BOULARD: Thirty-seven and a half square feet.

MR. SANGHVI: That is within the required limits?

MR. BOULARD: Yeah.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I'm asking you all this because it's very hard to visualize when the building is under construction.

MR. WALTER: That's true. That it right there. That's the proposed variance right there.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Other board members? Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: More of a statement. Thank you. Having the second sign, is it really going to be that much more noticeable to the building since it's on a street, there is really nothing back there where the old expo center was?

What is it --

MR. WALTER: This sign is going to be visible mostly to northbound traffic. As you're heading north, you will be able to see this sign first, which will help you make
a decision to, you know, get your car over in the appropriate lanes to make that left-hand turn.

As you notice here, this development has placed the building closer to Novi Road than where the old Big Boy was, all right.

So what we -- what you have a problem with there is now you have very limited visibility, that close to the road, reduces the amount of time which you can see the sign, given the speed of the road, given the traffic of this road, we know that there is something what, 18 to 20,000 cars there in a 24 hour period. That's a lot of traffic. It's a lot of traffic, as you know that bunches up there trying to get into the Town Center and head south. Signs are real close to the road, buildings are close to the road.

It's a nice detail in the sense of we like to see more buildings closer to the road because it gives us the sense of more village center and such. The drawback is, especially without any front parking, is that signs are close to the road, we are limited to just your portions of a second which to see it, recognize it, and make a decision, which we are going have a difficult time with.
There is going to be -- you know, that's going to be a challenge with this location regardless, especially coming southbound.

There is no solution for that. Pole signs would be a nice solution, we know there are issues there. The entire north wall there, having a sign for each location is a good solution, not one that's in Novi.

And so what we are going to have is that as we are there longer, as people, you know -- I don't know, have any of you ever been to a Qdoba, or tried the products -- you have been to Qdoba?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: No, if you could explain, that would -- thank you.

MR. WALTER: It's a quick serve restaurant. Okay. It's Mexican theme food. It's not a huge menu, but it's a good size menu.

And you walk in at one end, you present your order to the people, and you move along, and they make it, custom make each one for you.

And it's good -- one of the things that's -- you know, I'm sorry, you may be thinking how does it equate to a Taco Bell. If you're not -- unfortunately I didn't want to throw that out, but one of the big differences -- it's not just a big
difference, I think it's an incredibly huge
difference is this food has far less sodium,
it's much more natural, it's a better quality
of food. All right.

So you're going to go there,
not only does it taste good, it's an
interesting atmosphere, and it's going to
move you through quickly. It's not freaky
fast. But it's going give you a nice seating
area and you're going to have good quality
food, you're going to really enjoy it.

So you're going to have here,
you're going to have two things going on. As
people come in and seek it, there are going
to be people who come in, and they're going
to carry out, and there is going to be those

who are going to be sitting down. So we are
going to have a certain flow.

As you know, during the high
traffic times with lunchtime, we want to make
certain that is -- you know, able to be done,
in a very safe manner.

If somebody is trying to find
it, and they can't see it because they get to
the sign too late, we are going to have some
problems, you know, negotiating turns there.

Again, and the longer it's
there, the more you enjoy it, the more people
are going to be able to safely get into it,
they're going to know it, particularly
heading northbound.

Visitors to the area, well, we may have challenges, but hopefully not too bad.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: I just still -- I don't want -- I don't understand. Not that I'm confused. I understand what you're saying.

It's just how -- why is your business more important than the one that's going to be in the middle as far as having this signage? Like you're going to -- you're saying yours is going to be more seen coming from the north side, but I mean, why --

MR. WALTER: The associated --

MR. FERRELL: Hold on a second.

So all three businesses are going to have adequate signs in the front?

MR. WALTER: No.

MR. FERRELL: No?

MR. WALTER: No. We already established, they're going --

MR. FERRELL: Different sizes?

MR. WALTER: The signage that is allowed by the City of Novi isn't necessarily -- well, it's not adequate.

Okay. It's going to be so close to the road, we are going to have issues there. Everybody
is going to have an issue there.

What we are doing is that by having additional signage, we are going to help provide others in that mall with the benefit of visibility.

The guys next to us are going to be able to, you know, say, hey, we are next to Qdoba because it's easier to find.

Or if the northern one is easier to find, be able to say that.

They are going to derive benefit from our signage, as much as -- if not more than us.

MR. FERRELL: Okay. No more questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Sir, thank you so very much for your presentation. I haven't been to Qdoba, but maybe this will be first time.

But I'm going to do a quick follow-up on the last comment you made about the other tenants in the building.

Now, sir, do you know who your other tenants are?

MR. WALTER: No. Do you?

MR. POLLARD: I can tell you right now that one of the other tenants opposite of us on the endcap is a Verizon Wireless. The other two middle tenants, Five Guys. What's the -- the one is not --
question is, what leads you to conclude that they will not need any signs?

MR. WALTER: I didn't say they wouldn't need any signs.

MR. IBE: Think the gentleman asked you if the other ones are going to have signs in the front, and you said no.

MR. WALTER: No, no. He asked, you know, were they adequate signs, and I said, no.

The signs aren't going to be adequate. Novi's sign ordinance does not allocate signs based upon scale. They're based upon square footage.

Even though in many respects the minimum square footage is helpful, it's not effective, okay.

This is just scientific.

Since the building is so close to the road, you have to imagine you're heading down that road, you need about a second and a half at the very least which to identify something to make a good decision and to start to begin your actions necessary to move over.

Coming down that road, you're not going to be able to see these signs since they're so close to the road, until you're...
very close to them, which is less than a second and a half.

That's why when the tenant on the north and the tenant on the south are going to be a benefit to the other tenants in the building. That their signage -- you know, by having any additional signage, people can then say, we are in the same building as Verizon, or we are in the same building as Qdoba.

MR. IBE: Sir, you still didn't answer my question. I'm going to be very particular, because I'm not a big fan of this sign.

What you are asking, sir, is going to open up the flood gate of all the tenants in that building asking for the same signs. Before we know it, the walls on that building are going to be covered with signs on the north as well as the south, as well as the east elevation, all covered with signs.

I don't believe your sign will serve a purpose for which you think is going to really work for you, because this sign for the northbound traffic.

Now, remember, we are talking about two-lane traffic here, plus a middle lane, that's five lanes. Two going north and two going south with a middle lane. You can hardly turn left right now and see
anything -- you know because of how the cars moving, it will be a very dangerous part to even place a sign.

If we put your sign, and Five Guys ask for a sign and Verizon ask for a sign, by the time you know, this will be called a sign building.

Sir, I understand your need. I understand the fact that you want more signage.

Frankly, every business, if you ask them, will tell you they need more signage, but I don't think that's a solution. I think there are better ways to market your product, so that people know where it's located on Novi Road.

I must tell you right now, sir, I am not very impressed.

MR. WALTER: I --

MR. IBE: No, sir, there is no question on the table. Thank you.

MR. WALTER: I got to say, I'm not following what you are saying.

MR. IBE: Sir, it was just a comment. There is no question.

MR. WALTER: I understand that. You have a building with four tenants. Right now the ordinance allows each tenant to have a sign on the wall. Each tenant will have a sign on a wall.
So the tenants on the north and the south, which have a second wall are going to request the variance to allow a second sign to increase the visibility of that building.

I'm not following -- it sounds like you're saying that nobody has a sign. I think we are having a confusion here.

MR. IBE: Sir, maybe I should make myself clear.

MR. WALTER: Yes, please.

MR. IBE: There are four tenants.

My question to you is, do all four tenants have required signs?

MR. WALTER: All four tenants will require a sign, yes.

MR. IBE: My comment is, those signs are good enough. Additional signs I will not be in support of, considering where this building is located and the proximity to the road, it will not look esthetically pleasing to the eye.

MR. WALTER: I beg to differ because the sign is quite attractive. As you can see on the wall there, that's an attractive sign. It is -- you know, it's not large. I'm not sure what esthetic sensibilities you are questioning here. The color combinations are quite nice. We are, you know, quite
successful in many other communities with attractive signage in nice locations. They are good, you know, corporate citizens out in the communities they're in.

So I think that if we're going to have a discussion about esthetics, that we have a rather strong discussion to have. But let's say if you want to talk simply mathematics and science --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Excuse me, Member Ibe, are you done -- you have any other questions?

MR. IBE: I have no other questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Gedeon, do you have a question?

MR. GEDeon: No, I do not.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: My comments are that I suppose if you are coming northbound, the signs apparently they're going to be different square footages on the east and the south or the same?

MR. WALTER: The same.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And then the Qdoba Mexican Grill, the whole -- Qdoba -- the square footage -- the Qdoba part will be bigger than Mexican Grill, so you have some open space?

MR. WALTER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And
then also the elevation, the Big Boy before
was at a lower elevation, so they brought the
building up to the same as the road, is that
correct?

MR. BOULARD: I believe that's the case, yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Then also speed is a thing. I guess suppose if you're coming northbound you're going to know you're at Qdoba. So if your residents would know if you're coming southbound, the eastbound, would you be more agreeable to Qdoba just being on the east side versus having south and east, if your south sign has already been approved?

MR. WALTER: East wall has been approved, that's what is allowed by ordinance.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You're asking for the south wall?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, asking for the south wall.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: From the previous speakers, they don't seem to be in agreement with all concerned because of the signage that the whole area will be covered. So there probably will also be a ground -- I don't know -- Mr. Boulard, will there be a ground sign?
MR. BOULARD: No, each of these -- in this case, each suite within the building would be allowed signage based on the linear footage of the frontage.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So they would be on the building?

MR. BOULARD: Typically, yes. There is not really room to put a ground sign in front of the building.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: There is going to be four, are they all going to be on Novi Road, frontage?

MR. BOULARD: Each suite would be allowed to. I would imagine they would put them there. I would imagine that's what they will choose. Each suite would be entitled to one sign.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So once they're parking in the back, directional, they would have to know where they're going.

MR. BOULARD: There is also directional signage that would be allowed, in terms of, they could put something on the backdoor. That's all allowed by the ordinance, but it's nothing that's going to attract your attention or that's this big.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: It's very nice that Qdoba is coming, but with -- I would have to agree that in the long run that there will be so much signage, we won't see
anything.

So in this matter, can I hear a motion, either way.

MR. SANGHVI: Can I make a comment?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, go ahead.

MR. SANGHVI: Okay, I have a request for you. Understand, that is, looking at the general consensus here, I don't think that there is a possibility that your request may be granted.

So I would like to give you a choice between the two. Would you like to have a southern sign, or would you like to have an eastern sign between the two?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Boulard?

MR. BOULARD: The single sign is allowed by right. He could have either side.

MR. SANGHVI: He picked the east side?

MR. BOULARD: He could pick either side if you decide not to grant the variance. If he wanted to move his sign to the south side, he could.

MR. SANGHVI: I think that probably sounds better to me in every respect.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So either a
motion to approve or deny.

Do you have further questions, Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: No.

MR. WALTER: Can Mr. Pollard make a comment real quick?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead.

MR. POLLARD: I would like to just make sure that I’m following you guys on this.

Are you worried about other tenant’s signage along that side of the road, on Fonda Road?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: It will be either north or south.

MR. POLLARD: All of the signage for the building, for each individual tenant would be facing Novi Road.

So I want to make sure, sir, regarding your comments, you had mentioned what’s going to stop other tenants from asking for signs along this road, if we were granted this variance, is that correct?

MR. SANGHVI: That was the question -- that was one of the questions that was raised during the discussion by the board members.

MR. POLLARD: What it is usually, in typical municipalities across the nation that I have dealt with, and building all over
the place, we are only allowed that
individual tenant that has street frontage.
So any kind of street frontage that was
facing towards that, would be required or
would be enable them is signage.

So that's why we are trying to
have signage on both directions, in regards
to way finding and reaction times and things
of that nature, regarding north and south
direction on the streets of Novi. Since
that's one of the busiest intersections in
the City of Novi, too, we just want to make
sure that there are appropriate reaction
times that we can actually get patrons to
come to our place, whether or not even though
they're new patrons, existing, old or
whatever, we are going to have that -- you
know, everything out there.

But the thing that I want to
make sure is, that no other tenant will have
a sign on that side basically because we are
the ones that are paying for that tenant
space. We have all that linear side signage
on that side that's facing Fonda Road is
ours.

So according to the lease that
we have, there will not be any other tenants
that will be able to put signage along that
road, it will just be Qdoba.

I just wanted to bring that to
your attention. I felt like there ma be some misconcerns about somebody else putting signs along our side of our building, or where we are renting, or leasing from. So I just wanted to state that real quick.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Are either of you involved with the development in -- I don't know if it's Northville Township at Eight Mile and Haggerty, which is also Qdoba and Five Guys?

MR. POLLARD: That is Northville.

Yes, I actually built that store, too. That's the same. In fact, our contractor, met with developer, and I asked him to join us tonight.

MR. GEDEON: Are you aware whether or not that development has -- that's a similar -- it's a little bit different because it's pushed back farther, I think, from the road, but it also has -- the main facade is east facing.

MR. POLLARD: Correct.

MR. GEDEON: Do you know if there are signs on the north or south of that building?

MR. POLLARD: We have both on our front and our side and plus we also have an
additional monument sign there, too, where we have our presence known to actually cue people for proper way finding to the establishment, because that particular establishment does have a right-in, right-out. It doesn't have the singlalized intersection like what we are experiencing at Fonda and Novi Road here.

But yes, we do have, to answer your question, signs on two sides.

MR. GEDEON: Thank you. I guess I think I might have a different viewpoint than some of the other board members here. I don't really have a problem with this. I think we could, you know, come up with some legitimate reasons to approve this, including the fact that they have, you know, two road frontages, if you count the Fonda Street as a second frontage. You know, we have got neighboring municipalities, you know, with, you know, similar signage that they're requesting, and -- I don't know. There is one -- there is another building, I don't know the address on Novi Road, near this area, it's a very small square footage. I think it was designed to be some sort of restaurant type building, and as far as I know, it's been vacant since it was built and
I would -- you know, I don't want to see this be another one of these abandoned developments, you know, brand, new and you can't fill any tenant space, that would be a shame.

I don't have a problem with approving this -- I don't know if I'm alone here on that though.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you, Member Gederon.

My worry would be that like along Kareem Road, Pheasant Run development, that they have got the one side signage, on the east going westbound, but eastbound there -- you can just see the back part of their building.

So considering Novi Road is a high -- there is similarities and differences. But it would be having too many signs, I have a concern with that.

So back to we have a motion to agree or disagree?

MR. IBE: I'll make a motion. In Case No. PZ13-0014, 26401 Novi Road, Qdoba Mexican Grill, I move that the petitioner's application be denied for the following reasons.

The building in question here is located on a very busy road, known as Novi Road. There are four tenants, and four
tenants obviously, that will also need similar visibility as the applicant.

The applicant has requested a second sign other than the one that's allowed to be placed on the south wall of the building, and the applicant believes that their sign will be not only beneficial to its business, but to the other businesses that are located within the facility.

However, based upon the presentations and questions asked by the members, there are concerns that this building may end up requiring -- may end up having more signs than there are walls accommodated, therefore, the request for this sign should be denied. On the grounds that the features of the building are unique in the sense of where it's located. Not granting this sign will not prevent the -- will not prevent or limit the use of the property, as the applicants already have an allowable sign on the east elevation of the building.

The request is not based on circumstances or features that are exceptional and will not -- and is inconsistent with what is acceptable in the area, generally acceptable in the area or in the city.

The grant of the relief will
the denial of the applicant's request will not prevent the applicant from achieving any goal that is set for itself.

I believe that a denial is consistent with the ordinance as well as what is seen in the surrounding area.

Therefore, I move that the applicant's application be denied.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, Ms. Saarela, counsel?

MS. SAARELA: Can I just suggest based on the standards, based on what I'm hearing you say is that the reason that you're moving for denial is that the petitioner will not be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the property because the property is not unique and it shares the same visibility concerns as the rest of the tenants in the building?

MR. IBE: That's correct.

MS. SAARELA: And that the conditions that are causing the difficulty apply generally throughout the city?

MR. IBE: Very well. That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Do I hear a second?

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ms.
Pawlowski, please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?
MR. GEDEON: No.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

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

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes four to one.

MR. WALTER: The proposal that we made is not inconsistent with other businesses across the street or on the block.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you, sir. I appreciate --

MR. WALTER: I just want to say that this proposal saying that this is consistent with the rest of Novi, is false.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

We now go to Case No. PZ13-0019, for 27145 Karevich and 27155 Karevich, the Genji Steakhouse.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, everyone. Madam Chairperson, it's a pleasure to appear in front of you for the first time on this matter. Gentlemen, good evening.
My name is Matthew Quinn. I'm here representing PI Distributing, the owners of Genji Steakhouse, Asian Cuisine and Sushi Bar.

For those that have been in it, I'm sure you will agree that this is a first class restaurant, and something that Novi has needed for many, many years.

What is unique about this particular restaurant and parcel is, it's now been open for a few months. And this is a -- first of all, I want you to understand a multi-million dollar development, when you consider this half mile stretch of two parcels that contain two significant buildings on it.

Since the restaurant has been open for a few months, as I stated, what we found out is that it's very difficult for the clientele to find it, much like it was difficult for people to find the Sheraton hotel in the old days and now replacement hotels. It's extremely difficult to find. In fact, in days of modern technology people are now using their Iphones, GPS to find locations. Well, the city didn't do this restaurant any favors by changing the name of the street right in front. It was Sheraton Drive and now it's
South Karevich Drive. When people log in on their GPSs, Sheraton Drive doesn't exist. When they look to find Genji Steakhouse, they end up on Art Van on North Karevich Drive.

So the need for signage for this particular business is of utmost importance both for its future success and its viability.

Now, as I stated, I'm looking at the overhead now. There is a very unique parcel. It runs on the east from now South Karevich Drive approximately a half mile to the west to Donaldson Drive. It's really two parcels, one parcel with Genji restaurant and the other parcel with PI Distribution. But for flow-through and traffic, it acts as one parcel because you have continuous parking all the way through.

Now, the signage that we requested is necessary, first of all, to identify going to look for Donaldson Drive first. This is a picture of Donaldson Drive just taken yesterday it shows the mockup signage here, that says, Genji on top and PI Distribution on the bottom.

As you look from Donaldson Drive, if that sign wasn't there, what do you see. You see absolutely no identification of what's in this parcel at all. In fact, the first structure you see is the hotel which
lies immediately here (indicating). They have their sign at the other part of this driveway identifying it as the hotel. But as you look to the driveway going to PI Distribution Center, and then on the other side of it, Genji restaurant, there is absolutely no identification. So anyone using Donaldson Drive will have absolutely no idea where they're going, whether it's a truck going to PI Distribution Company, or if it's a client, customer going to the Genji Steakhouse. So the sign that is requested to be placed on Donaldson Drive, is a very nice sign, it says Genji on the top and PI Distribution on the bottom. Now, the issue for the variance is, you're only allowed to have one business per sign. And yes, on this sign we could just have PI Distribution, but what sense does that make. If somebody is coming from Twelve Mile Road, to go to Genji restaurant, they're going to use Donaldson Drive, because it's a straight shot right to the driveway that I showed you in this picture, and they would drive all the way through. They will not have to deal with that terrible intersectional layout at Karevich Drive and the main road there coming into West Oaks Mall, they can totally avoid.
it, but they won't know where to go.

So this sign here is necessitated by people needing directions to know where to go.

And this same sign is being requested at the South Karevich Drive entrance. Because if someone is coming on South Karevich Drive, trying to find PI Distribution Center, again, there is no identification whatsoever at this entrance into the property as to where PI Distribution Center is, and that same sign that says Genji and PI Distribution be used there, to allow the traffic to access.

Again, we could just put Genji at that sign, but what sense does it make not to identify PI Distribution. Additionally it's common ownership, all right, common parcels, common ownerships, common businesses.

In fact, PI Distribution Center acts as a catering building, it's actually food preparation for some of the food that's brought over to Genji, and it is also a distribution warehouse where the owners have a patent on the steak cooking tables, that you see in Genji restaurant and the distribution network is from there. So you have the truck traffic who needs to know where to go.
And merely by having the additional name put on the sign, serves the purpose. It will allow people to find where they have to go.

The third sign is such a small sign, doesn't even show up here. This is on the portico right in front of the restaurant.

Once you pass -- once you gain access to the site, and you're in the parking lot on this side of the building, there is no identification whatsoever. And therefore, they're asking that a very small one foot ten inch sign be placed on the wood area, there is a -- was a little confusion on the drawing, here it shows underneath, but it really is intended to be on the wood just as it is on the mockup, which is placed right on the wood area, just a very distinct, but very nicely done sign that just identifies the restaurant once again.

The final feature that we need to address is really, in my opinion, an architectural feature, not a sign.

And this is the flame that is being proposed to go on the top of the tower right here, and it's a natural gas flame. There is no letters on it, no anything. The flame will be roughly 24, 30 inches tall, as identified in this exhibit that was submitted as part of the application. And it is a
flame that people will be able to see from around the area and hopefully assist them to find the restaurant and it can be used as a trademark for the restaurant.

And in that manner perhaps, it is under your definition a sign. All right. Therefore, for tonight’s purpose, we are here asking for the variance for that flame to be allowed, as we have requested.

Now, tonight, if you have any questions, we have Henry Pi, the owner, we have his son, we have the architects, we have the contractors, we have everybody you would ever need to ask any questions about to answer questions on what we are presenting here.

But the purpose of the ZBA, this is a unique parcel because of the layout, because of the two businesses that encompass this overall parcel, it’s unique because of the location of this parcel. The fact that we have modern GPS devices that can’t find it here, we have a terrible intersection on the street to deal with, we have no identification on Donaldson Drive whatsoever.

We’d like to get more people to Donaldson than anywhere else to be able to
come to this first class restaurant. This is very, as I said, a heavy investment. It needs clientele, and it needs your assistance by allowing this signage to come through. These signs obviously aren't going to effect anyone else because there really is nobody else around. You have the hotel next door, well, they have their own problems, as you can try to find them. Farther to the north you have West Oaks, they have got enough signage, nobody up there needs anymore. But this particular parcel is stuck in between and it needs the assistance of the city to make it a success and we are hoping you will do that this evening. If you have any questions, we'd be more than happy to answer them. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. Is there any public remarks regarding this case? (No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, the city, do we have a questions or remarks?

MS. SAARELA: I don't have any.

MR. BOULARD: Just one thing I want to mention. I did speak with the fire marshal regarding any concerns about the
flame, anticipating there might be questions. He indicated that the equipment as presented, obviously the installation will be key, and will be checking on that, but he was not concerned about the safety of the flame. So other than that, I will standby for questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. Member Gedeon, if you could read into the record the correspondence.

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0019, 13 notices were mailed, three returned mail, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And before I open it up to the board, I was wondering, question regarding the signage and the architect, we do that separate or all in one? For counsel.

MS. SAARELA: What is the question?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The flame, the architecture of the flame and then the signs, should we do that separate or together?

MS. SAARELA: Well, is flame is being consider as a sign.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I'd like to open it up to the board. Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Good evening, Mr. Quinn.

Thank you very much for explaining to us. I think we have a general idea behind all these signs and the flame, the torch, Olympic torch, or whatever you want to call it. It sounds like a neat idea to me.

And you are right, there is no way knowing from Donaldson, where is this property located, so you need some identification for your businesses on that side also.

The only thing that is different is that you are going to have a ground sign on each side with two businesses, which is not the norm in the city, as you know.

But considering that it's a joint partnership, and the same owner owns both the businesses, I have no objection to it. Thank you.

MR. QUINN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any other questions?

MR. SANGHVI: I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Comments or questions? Regarding the sign, the 30 inch flame, that would be self-retardant and then...
also considering, you know, rubber neckers is what you would call it, people wondering if there is a fire somewhere, it does draw attention, which is nice, but the fire being what it is --

MR. QUINN: It's a very subdued -- I don't want you to get the idea there is flames shooting up. It's from the top, it's only 24 to 30 inches. It's constant. It's not like it's flaming here and flaming there.

It's a constant flame, so don't think that it looks like a building on fire, or anything like that.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay, thank you.

MR. QUINN: Get sworn.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you could state your name and spell your name.

MR. BONISOAWSKI: Roman Bonisoawski, B-o-n-i-s-o-a-w-s-k-i, Ron and Roman Architects. I'm happy to be sworn in.

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0019, do you swear to tell the truth tonight?

MR. BONISOAWSKI: I do. Thank you.

First of all, it's a pleasure to appear in front of the board. It's particularly rewarding for me having appeared here for the specific waiver that was
involved in this project with regard to the materials, to say that we kept our promise and gave you a very attractive and well-designed building.

Mr. Pi has gone to every extreme efforts in terms of providing an absolute A-1 business.

I'm sorry to step on your toes with regard to this discussion of the flame, but he doesn't know what the flame is about, whereas we designed the flame.

It's specific to the restaurant itself. As an Asian restaurant, and the fact that you would associate it with Chinese, Japanese cooking, the flame is a critical component, and so we are using it in that regard specifically. This will be representing the grilling that's occurring in the restaurant, the things that occur with the woks in the restaurant.

I just wanted to make sure that it's just not pulled out of thin air and it's actually specific to the restaurant itself, and its placement with regard to everybody coming up to that intersection right there, especially coming off of 696, when they're westbound, that is one of the most prominent spots in the city. I think it's less about a rubber necking situation,
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Just a question for the city attorney.

Would we, would the board be able to use their authority for interpretation to interpret the flame as something other than a sign?

MS. SAARELA: Well, that's not what's in front of us. If that was going to be the proposal, it would have to be renoticed for that.

Right now I think what the city has determined is that it's under the definition of a sign and the sign ordinance. "Sign means a name, identification description, display, device, illustration, design, banner, flag, pennant, logo or trademark that is affixed to, painted or otherwise represented place, located or set directly or indirectly on a parcel of land, including a building or structure, in the manner so as to be visible from any public street, sidewalk, alley, park or other property that advertises, publicizes or directs attention to a service, product, activity, person, institution, organization..."
Then it goes onto list types of signs. So in this case, I think the city is saying that it is a trademark, the applicant hasn’t proposed their application to be for an interpretation. If they wanted to do that, and dispute that it fits a flag, pennant, logo or trademark, that would have to be done at another meeting.

MR. GEDEON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Would that Genji sign also be back lit?

MR. QUINN: You mean on the tower, on the portico?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: No, the tower, where the flame would be?

MR. QUINN: That’s an allowed sign. That’s already there.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Would the fire marshal, if he had any concern with it, whether we vote, how we vote for it, he can modify its needs?

MR. BOULARD: The fire marshal, as well as the mechanical inspectors, or the vendor, are going to verify that the equipment is installed safely.

And I did ask the fire marshal if they had any particular concerns. He said, no, as long as the equipment is
installed appropriately and safely, he's fine with it.

MR. BONISOAWSKI: As a clarification, so that everybody understands, the entire tower is built completely of structural steel with a core ten structural steel shell around it. There is no combustible material associated with that construction.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Do I hear any other comments? Motion?

MR. IBE: In Case No. PZ13-0019, 27145 Karevich and 27155 Karevich, PI Distribution and Genji. I move that the applicant's application be granted for the following reasons, that the request is based on circumstances or features that are exceptional and unique to the property, and do not result from conditions that exist generally in the city or that are self-created because you have to look at -- based on the presentation given here this evening, the layout of the building itself, it's something that is very unique.

The fact that there are two businesses, and the businesses are actually owned by one common ownership, so that presents a that very unique interest there. And currently there are really no signs, based on if you are driving along
the road to know what actually exists in this particular facility, and that by itself, creates an exceptional and unique -- it makes it exceptional and unique to this property.

Secondly, the failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more than a mere convenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return.

The grant of relief will not result in a use of a structure that is incompatible with or unreasonably interferes with adjacent and surrounding properties. This, obviously, by granting these, I think justice will be done to the applicant as well as the surrounding properties in the area, and I believe that this will be consistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

Moreover, finally, the --

In addition, the area where this building is located, the fact that there is a name change is something that is also very important to note. It used to be called Sheraton Drive, and now it's called Karevich. Obviously when there was a hotel there, I mean, the hotel is still there, it was very difficult to even find the hotel, let alone,
having a new business, and with a new name change.

All of this together, all of this presents an exceptional and unique circumstance that warrants the grant of the applicant's request, therefore, I move that the applicant's request be granted as requested. Thank you.

One final statement. Is it okay that we condition that this variance we granted based on as long as there is a common ownership of the parcel?

MS. SAARELA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And for this tenant?

MS. SAARELA: And for this tenant only.

MR. IBE: Very well. Thank you.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ms. Pawlowski, can you please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to zero.
MR. QUINN: Thank you very much.
Have a good evening.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Case No. PZ13-0021, for La-Z-Boy on 27754 Novi Road.
Present your request.
MR. VENGLARCIL: Good evening.
My name is John Venglarcik. I’m with Harmon Sign. And we both are going to be speaking, so do you want to swear us both in?
MS. STARKEY: Hi, good evening.
My name is Nicole Starkey, last name is S-t-a-r-k-e-y.
MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0021, do you swear to tell the truth tonight?
MR. VENGLARCIL: I do.
MS. STARKEY: I do.
MR. VENGLARCIL: We are here representing La-Z-Boy.
They are in the process of updating that particular property, putting, you know, new signage, redoing the facia on that building.
And we are here to kind of go over some of the hardships that that
particular property does have.
I'm sure you're all familiar
with it. We are asking for an additional
sign, an additional square footage of which
there was, at one point in time, granted two
additional signs to this property, with
additional square footage that is actually a
little bit less than what we are asking for.
The property sits, if you --
one of the issues with it is the elevation of
this property. The elevation is, if you see
here is 954, at the road here, these
intersections, you see the elevation down
here is 920.
So we have a significant drop,
when you drive by there, you can see that the
elevation is significantly lower, which makes
it, you know, hard to see that building as
you are driving down, you know, Novi Road and
coming off of 96.
One of the other -- when we
talk about frontages, and I would -- I don't
know how you would interpret it, but I'm not
sure how many frontages this property
actually has. You could consider 96 as a
frontage, Novi Road as a possible frontage,
this access road as a frontage and Ring Road
as a frontage.
So I wasn't -- I don't know if
any of you board members were here when the
last variance was granted for this property, but I would think that that was part of the argument is the -- were any of you here for that last variance by chance?

I'm not sure what the argument was, but you could tell me if I'm right, that the frontages were probably part of argument that was made, as we do border three to four properties, three roads and could be considered four.

There are other properties in the vicinity that have multiple signs. Nicole could maybe speak to those when she speaks.

Another concern that you guys might have when looking at the signage that we have proposed, which, this is the -- this is the La-Z-Boy logo here. But the La-Z-Boy logo and also the home furnishings and decor is specific to this property.

It is not just a La-Z-Boy, it is La-Z-Boy Home Furnishings and Decor. So that is a corporate logo. We cannot modify that.

So, you know, the argument could be made, you know, why don't we just call it La-Z-Boy, because they brand their properties differently, removing the home furnishings and decor, to reduce our square footage is really not an option.
It's been a while since I have been in front of the board, probably, five years, and the last one I was here for was Hagopian, and actually I haven't driven by that building for sometime. So I do know that, you know, that building has some similar type of hardships. You know, it was when I was in here with that property, you know, it -- you know, it sits on -- you know, it borders, you know, multiple things and has multiple signs on it.

I think the square footage that we are asking for here today is definitely smaller than what's on that Hagopian building and Nicole could mention some other buildings in the area as well.

One of the other things that is kind of unique to the La-Z-Boy logo, and I'm going to let her speak here in just a second, is the size of the logo. And so I will let Nicole kind of speak to the logo itself and how -- how we sized it.

MS. STARKEY: Again, this is a corporate logo, so it is branded. We cannot stray from it or vary from it. But you will see that there is significant dead space or clear space. I think it lends to a very clean logo, very visible, easy to read. But
with that there is significant spacing, so we lose a lot of square footage when that sign, those letters are spaced out in the way they are.

So if you were to actually box off the letters and the logo individually, you would find that we are actually within the allowable square footage. That was one thing to note.

And then here is our second elevation, the rear elevation, so very similar, it is smaller, and we would be well under the permitted square footage, based on the previously approved variance for this building. If we were to look at boxing off the letters and logos individually, just something to note.

As far as other tenants, we did notice that there are multiple tenants that have two wall signs. We do feel that as you are exiting, as you're exiting 96, coming onto Novi Road, there is no visibility coming off of the highway and there would be no visibility along Novi Road, or as you're entering the property, if we were not to have this rear elevation, this rear sign here.

So with that said we really, really feel that this additional sign is needed.

MR. VENGLARCIK: The only thing I
would add is it is an extremely large building, you know, so it renders itself to additional signage, as a result of just the mere magnitude of the building itself. So if you have any questions for us --

MS. STARKEY: I do have one other visual aid here. This is just a shot as you're looking from the west side of Novi Road, looking onto the property or the building itself. You will see that it actually does sit behind Dennys, another tenant, again, it is lower. So you will see that the frontage itself is set roughly 14-foot below grade.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you very much. Is there anyone in the public -- if there is anybody in the public that has a remark regarding this case.

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, does the city have any questions, comments?

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.

MS. SAARELA: I have nothing to add.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Our secretary, Mr. Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0021,
there were 11 notices mailed, zero returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Open it up to the board, questions, comments? Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. If my memory serves me right, La-Z-Boy used to be at the same location many, many years ago?

MS. STARKEY: Right.

MR. SANGHVI: You have very similar signs at that time. Looking at your current request, it doesn't seem to be any different than what you used to have there, when you were at the same location in the past.

So I have no difficulty in supporting your application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Mr. Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes, I would echo that I have no problem with that. I remember when we handled this case a few years back. And it was exactly for the reasons the applicant stated, they basically have frontage on four roads, and very distant.

There is a significant distance and elevation drop from the main Novi Road.

And I think the point about the amount of light space or dead space on the sign between the lettering is compelling.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Mr. Boulard?
MR. BOULARD: I just wanted to clarify, if I could. The previous variance from when La-Z-Boy occupied the store before or this building before, is still in place. These signs are larger, that's why they're back before you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

MR. VENGLARCIK: I did the math on it. I think we were at 196 and now we are 224, if we box it completely.

So I think we are -- the old variance was 196 square feet. If you take it the way we have shown now, a lot of it might be because of the tagline at the bottom that's probably making the difference.

But the dead space is what -- you know, if we can take that into consideration, calculate it a little bit differently, we would be within that, what was allowed in that 196 real easy.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Can you explain to me the M3 and M4.

MS. STARKEY: That has been approved. That is a monument sign and it's just a face change here. It's existing. It's been in place, the existing tenant does have the signage there, so we are just changing the faces out. This has been already been approved.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. GEDEON: I'd like to make a motion in this case.

In Case PZ13-0021, La-Z-Boy, I move to approve the variance as requested.

The request is based on circumstances or features that are exceptional or unique to the property and do not result in conditions that exist generally in the city or that are self-created.

Specifically as was explained earlier, the property is a significant distance away from the main Novi Road, there is an elevation drop from Novi Road, there is a parcel in between the applicant's parcel and Novi Road. And there are also -- there is essentially four road frontages surrounding the entire parcel.

The failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more than a mere inconvenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return.

The grant of relief will not result in a use of structure that is incompatible with or unreasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties, and will result in substantial justice being done to both the applicant and adjacent or surrounding properties and is not
inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

I would further limit one of the considerations for this -- granting this variance is the amount of white space or the dead space in the proposed sign, so I would specifically limit this variance to the particular tenant as well as the particular sign that's before us in the proposal.

MR. IBE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ms. Pawlowski, please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. VENGLARCIK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

Next we have PZ13-0022, for Galway Drive.

MR. KENT: Hello members of the
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you could state your name and spell it.

MR. KENT: Thomas Kent, K-e-n-t, residing on 43769 Galway.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?

MR. KENT: No.

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

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0022, do you swear to tell the truth tonight?

MR. KENT: Yes.

I'm looking for a variance for a covered porch on our existing home. There is a current porch now that is approximately eight foot across and approximately five foot out.

We are looking to go eight feet total out now and going approximately 21 feet across. I have some pictures of it. I wasn't the actual contractor that was going to be here, his son got sick, and couldn't find anybody to come. So I have picture on my phone. I didn't print anything, because I had my kids today.

If it works on this, I don't know if it does or not. If you can see it.
It's not going to work well. But a lot of the houses that are on Galway Drive have covered porches currently on them. It kind of works. You can't really see it.

Again, there will be one entrance into the front of it, using the existing. We are not going to the street or anything. We will be using the existing walkway. This is another view of the coming straight on, just a side view of it as well.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it?

MR. KENT: Yes. I have the existing survey of the house which is going to be really hard to see on that, which is showing that existing porch on there, pretty much the porch that we are putting on is approximately three feet from where we are at now, from -- to the actual street line, to the sidewalk.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Any public remarks regarding this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, to the city, Mr. Boulard or counsel?

MS. SAARELA: I have nothing.

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Gedeon, if you could read the --

MR. GEDEON: In Case No.
PZ13-0022, there were 17 notices mailed, zero
returns, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Now I will
open it up to the board for questions or
comments.

Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Good evening. I
was right in front of your property
yesterday, looking at your request. You have
a pretty good looking entranceway at present.

MR. KENT: Thank you.

MR. SANGHVI: You are going to
enlarge on that?

MR. KENT: A little bit. We have
a lot of -- we have lived here for 11 years,
we were going to actually sell the house. I
have three girls. We made the house, kind of
what we wanted, from back -- I think we are
the second owner from '69, and so getting to
know our neighbors, getting to know everybody
around us, we plan to say there for the rest
of our lives, so we end up with a lot of
neighbors that hang out in the front, watch
the kids. Galway is kind of a cut-thru, so
keeping an eye on the kids, in my eyes,
traffic.

In fact, there was somebody
pulled over in front of my front my house
this morning because of someone blowing that
stop sign constantly. So I like to be out,
the kids want to play outside, so I like to sit, so at least I can put -- with the covered porch, I can sit out there. I can bring my laptop work out there, keep an eye on things a little bit better than what it is now.

Now it's more of just an entryway coming in and out. It doesn't give me a lot of room to have anywhere to sit, anywhere to have -- you know, for friends to come over and neighbors. Also gives me something a little bit larger that I will be able to keep my eye on things. I sit out there right now a lot on the steps, but --

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I appreciate your hardship and I have no difficulty in granting your request myself. Thank you.

MR. KENT: Great. I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Nothing to add? No other questions?

MR. SANGHVI: I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Motion?

MR. SANGHVI: If somebody would make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Somebody like to make a motion?

MR. FERRELL: I move to approve
Case No. PZ13-0022, variance be granted.

There is a unique circumstance or physical condition of the property, such as narrowness, shallowness, water, topography, and similar physical conditions. The need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty, other than making the house look more esthetically pleasing.

The need is not self-created.

Strict compliance with the regulations governing area setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or will render conformity with the regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

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

The requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or zoning district.

MR. GEDEON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you can call the roll, Ms. Pawlowski.
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MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?
MR. Gedeon: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?
MR. IBE: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Most passes five to zero.
MR. KENT: Thank you. Have a good evening.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Now we are at Case No. PZ13-0023, for 2012 West Lake Drive.
MR. SZYMANSKI: I am ready to be sworn.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you could state your name and spell your last name for our reporter.
MR. SZYMANSKI: Gary Szymanski, G-a-r-y, S-z-y-m-a-n-s-k-i.
MR. Gedeon: In Case No. PZ13-0023, do you swear to tell the truth?
MR. SZYMANSKI: I do. My wife and I are the new owners of the property on 2012 West Lake Drive.
We received variances for the construction of the house originally last year before the board. The property itself is extremely narrow. It's actually 29 feet, seven inches, so the setbacks were given variances in order that the house could be constructed. Originally we were in error. We thought that the setbacks for the variances received initially would also be applied to the deck.

But through some different discussions with the city, it was decided that, no, we would have to bring this issue up with the board again, to build a deck on the back of the property.

But the fact remains still that it's -- the property is 29 feet seven inches. The house is 20 feet, and the deck that we are proposing is actually slightly narrower than the house, 19 feet, seven inches, I believe.

So it's well within the confines of the dimensions of the house, but it still does encroach on what would be normal variances for that property, the normal easement.

So we have come to the board to have you look at that.
I think -- do each of you have plans of it -- okay. I don't need to present that.

The plan is well-approved with our fellow neighbors. It would probably most impact our neighbor to the north, Carol Ames, as we are extremely close to her house. And she's well aware of the plan and is in agreement with that plan.

To our south, we have -- the property directly next to us, the house is setback towards the road considerably from the lake. So it really wouldn't impact him much, but he was in agreement when we talked with him earlier.

The next house south, actually, their deck that's presently in place is also -- would go into those setbacks quite a bit, and actually gets much closer to the lake than if I put it --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Face up.

MR. SZYMANSKI: It's kind of dark. I'm not sure if you will see it well. It probably -- it goes the full width of the house, and then extends down to the lake, maybe 10 feet from the lake. Whereas our deck would only be extending 15 feet, nine inches from the house, well back of the lake.

I guess the issue for us was...
that it does require a variance to be that close to our neighbors, but that's well within the sides of the house. It's already been approved for variances.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it?

MR. SZYMANSKI: Would you like to have any discussion about the deck itself? I'm not sure. It will be a wood construction.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Do you have dimensions?

MR. SZYMANSKI: The dimensions should be on the drawing there.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Do you have one on paper that you can put on the overhead?

MR. SZYMANSKI: No. I have also a drawing similar to yours, that has the dimensions on there. It would be a wood construction deck, with the treks, synthetic, wood decking, which it actually looks a lot nicer than the actual wood, low maintenance and yet adds a lot of value to the house.

I think it will be quite a nice addition to the house and add value to the house. In addition to the fact that we have so small an area for entertaining or other activities, the deck will be very nice for those activities, too, I think.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

Is there anyone in the public that would like to speak regarding this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, I'd like to open it up to the city, any questions or comments?

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.

MS. SAARELA: I have nothing to add.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Mr. Gedeon, correspondence?

MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0023, there were 35 notices mailed, four returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I'll open it up to the board for questions or comments. Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: I was at your property yesterday and looked around. This area, all the lots are like narrow strips of land, and there is no room to do anything without variances.

I can understand his comment for doing a deck, and I have no problem granting you a variance. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any other comments or a motion? Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: If there is no other comments, I will go ahead to make a motion to...
approve the variance in Case No. PZ13-0023.
There are unique circumstances or physical
conditions of the property such as
narrowness, shallowness, shape, water,
topography or similar physical conditions and
the need for the variance is not due to the
applicant's personal or economic difficulty.
Specifically these are the Walled Lake lots
which are extremely narrow.
The need is not self-created.
Strict compliance with regulations governing
area setback, frontage, height, bulk, density
or other dimensional requirements will
unreasonably prevent the property owner from
using the property for a permitted purpose or
will render conformity with those regulations
unnecessarily burdensome.
The requested variance is the
minimum variance necessary to do substantial
justice to the applicant as well as to other
property owners in the district.
The variance will not cause
any adverse impact on surrounding properties,
property values or the use and enjoyment of
the property in the neighboring or zoning
district.

I would also note that there were
no official objections, and the applicant
indicated in his presentation that his
neighbors approved of this proposal.
MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ms. Pawlowski, if you could call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. SZYMANSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Last, but not least Case No. PZ13-0006 for Eleven Mile Road.

MR. CHALOU: Good evening. My name is Mark Chalou, and the last name is spelled C-h-a-l-o-u. I'm not an attorney. I'm representing Chalou Designs for Running Fit athletic store.

MR. GEDEON: In Case No. PZ13-0006, do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. CHALOU: Yes, sir. Thank you.
for taking the time this evening to allow me
to meet with you.

The case is, the way that I
see it, is a simple hardship case allowing
for an additional sign, for the Running Fit
store.

The sign currently is facing
Grand River, which you can barely see it
because it has such a setback from Grand
River south and the additional sign that we
are asking for a variance for is facing due
south.

You cannot see it from any
thoroughfare. You can only see it from the
Wal-mart area. Basically we'd like to have
it as an additional revenue generator for
Running Fit.

I can show you an existing --
where Running Fit is at this time. Right
here where the darkened area is, this is the
existing Running Fit.

There is a sign that faces,
obviously, Grand River here on the one
elevation.

What we are requesting is an
additional sign that faces Wal-mart in this
parking lot for a revenue generator.

I have a picture from Wal-mart
looking towards where we are going to -- we
would like to propose the new sign. There is
nothing on this side of the building. And the issue is that people don't -- there is an entrance for bringing goods in for the other stores, a back entrance.

What we are proposing to put in additional sign for, just to attract attention to people in the parking lot and from Wal-mart, so they can differentiate us, from looking like there is nothing there whatsoever.

There is no signage on the back. There is a banner that was put there for the committee to review. I don't know if anyone had an opportunity to go by and look at it, but this is a pretty simple hardship request that we're looking to get a variance for.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That's it?

MR. CHALOU: That's pretty much what I have.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anybody in the public that has remarks regarding this case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing none, to the city, any comments or questions?

MS. SAARELA: No.

MR. BOULARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Secretary, if you could read in the correspondence.
MR. GEDEON: In Case PZ13-0006, there were 66 notices mailed, four returned mail, one approval, and zero objections.

The approval comes from Ken Banks of Banks Vacuum, 43015 Grand River, and the approval reads as follows. "The applicant's request should be granted. This business is an asset to the community and his customers will be able to find him easier. We are fortunate to have Running Fit as part of the Novi community".

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

I'm going to open it up to the board for questions. Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: I was at your location yesterday. Coming out, I think that the entire configuration of the Town Center has changed, since the (unintelligible) Wal-mart.

The approval of Wal-mart opening (unintelligible) give you a new frontage, so to speak, and yes, there is --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Member Sanghvi. I can't hear you. Can you turn your microphone on.

MR. SANGHVI: I beg your pardon.

You want me to repeat it?

THE REPORTER: Yes, please.

MR. SANGHVI: I was in front of Page 78
your store yesterday and looked around. And the topography and the configuration of the Town Center has completely changed since the arrival of Wal-mart on the property. And now this has opened up and given them a new frontage, and I can understand that they might want to have some exposure on the east side and I have no difficulty in supporting that application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Did they need a letter from Town Center?

MR. BOULARD: Originally the application was submitted sometime ago, there were some back and forth and the Town Center landlord has approved this. They have approved the -- as the property owner of the center, they have approved the variance request.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Do you know offhand if they are having a central map where everybody can get an idea what's where? There are so many different stores --

MR. BOULARD: A directory map?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MR. BOULARD: I know that there is one farther north on the site. I don't know if there is one near this area in particular, but there is a directory, but it is farther north of the site.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So it's
similar but different. I guess it's just a
matter of -- it doesn't matter how you're
driving in there, you're going to end up

seeing -- being on a road and seeing it. So
because it's on the -- you're on a corner
lot?

MR. CHALOU: Yes, we are on an
dec cap, right underneath the -- I guess it
would be right in this area here
(indicating). Right where this truck is,
right in that area, we have an end cap, yes,
we are.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Personally
I go in there now and I get lost.

Any other comments?

MR. IBE: Sir, the proposed area
where you want the sign, is there an entrance
that leads into the building from that?

MR. CHALOU: There is an
entrance. It's kind of like kitty-corner
underneath that, I guess, the arch. There is
an exit -- I mean, entrance for the store,
it's kind of like on an angle, where you -- I
might have a better picture to show you, sir.
If you'd like me to present --

MR. IBE: So you can make ingress
and egress into this building from this door
here, is that correct?

MR. CHALOU: Yes.
MR. IBE: So if someone wanted to see the sign from the point of view, from Wal-mart, you know, they can actually walk into the store from that entrance?

MR. CHALOU: Yes, where the sign would be located, yes, it's through just to the left and lower to the sign, yes, sir.

The issue is because of the, I guess we will call it, the corner being so large that there is a big difference between, if you had just a corner, you got a sign here, a sign here, because of that corner, it's basically 12 feet, 12 feet, 12 feet.

There is a sign on one side, and we are asking for the sign on the other side.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Have you thought of having instead of Running Fit on the end cap, there is another building with the sign, that they just have the single sign on the end corner?

MR. CHALOU: There is another restaurant down at the end and they were granted two signs sometime ago. I think it's coney island. It's at the other end of where -- right around the corner from where we are asking for the sign. They have two signs. But, no, there is no other signs on this particular elevation.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I think
it's the Arcovis (phonetic) that we approved
a sign before, they have got a sign on the
end cap. Have you thought of doing that?

MR. CHALOU: No, we have not.

They won't allow us. They have put some very
strict criteria.

Now, the letters have to be
flush mounted, they have to be a certain
size. They have -- they have changed the
sign criteria in the City of Novi, which we
do have approval, pretty drastically.

So actually it's going to be
more esthetically pleasing with the flush
mount instead of a raceway, the letters would
be adhered right to the facade of the -- the
letters would be attached right directly to
the facade. They will be LEDs instead of
neon, so there is environmental issues of
saving power.

MR. IBE: Madam Chairperson, may
I make a motion, if there is no additional --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MR. IBE: In Case No. PZ13-0006,
43280 Eleven Mile Road, I move that we grant
the request for the following reasons.
One, that the request is based
upon circumstances or features that are
exceptional to the property and do not result
in conditions that exist generally in the
city, or that are self-created.
Specifically, the site (unintelligible) of this particular location, since the redesign of the entire Town Center itself, and the fact that Wal-mart is the anchor of this site, it allows room for huge parking space and creates a situation where other businesses in the area look quite small, and this particular building has dual frontage, I think on the one that faces Wal-mart and actually faces the parking lot, to the left and to the right of it.

And there is also an entrance that leads into this particular structure from the position -- the sign of the place, which means that customers that wish to enter this establishment can see the sign across from Wal-mart and would walk right in. And that by itself makes it quite exceptional and unique.

Second, the failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more than mere inconvenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return.

The grant of relief will not result in a use of structure that is incompatible with or unreasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties, and will result in substantial justice being done.
to both the applicant as well as adjacent surrounding businesses. And this is not inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

And let me add furthermore, that the fact this particular establishment is granted this variance, it will in no way effect other businesses in the area.

I think that the unique location of this particular establishment presents and allows for this variance. Therefore, I ask that the applicant's request be granted. Thank you.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ms. Pawlowski, if you could call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe?

MR. IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: No.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes four to one.

MR. CHALOU: Thank you very much.
Have a good evening everyone.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings us to other matters. Do we have other matters?

We received a letter from Donna Skelcy letter stating that she is going to be relocating to Georgia, and we just previously elected her to president.

So we have to have re-election of officers?

MS. SAARELA: Actually just because it just consists of one vacancy of officers, you don't have to re-elect everyone, just for her position.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you very much, ma'am.

These are very unusual circumstances, and we might have to redo the election all over again, considering last month's situation.

MS. SAARELA: Not necessarily.

Article Four of elections says, "in the event of a vacancy involving an officer of the board, the board shall conduct an election at or before the next regular meeting to fill the vacant officer's position".

So we don't necessarily have
to do anything about the other ones that are already filled, just the one that's vacant.

MR. SANGHVI: If you promote the people up the scale --

MS. SAARELA: There is nothing about promoting. If one vacancy becomes vacant, you just deal with that vacancy under section 4.1.

MR. FERRELL: I think what he's saying if that person was already elected, gets nominated for another seat, his seat will be open.

MS. SAARELA: Okay. Doesn't necessarily mean that everybody has to move up, but --

MR. SANGHVI: That is what I'm talking about.

So, I don't know how we should do it. We should have a slate for all three of them or do you want us to do it individually?

MR. GEDEON: One issue that came up was that Member Ferrell is not a full member currently, but he is seeking appointment for full membership --

MR. SANGHVI: We can make a provision when he becomes a full member.

MS. SAARELA: We can't really elect the alternate for anything under the
rules, so we would have to wait, if that's
the proposal until he actually becomes a full
member to make him an officer.

MR. GEDEON: I'm wondering if
since we have a couple of absences tonight,
I'm wondering if this may be better channelled
next month.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We can
table it to next month?

MR. SANGHVI: There are two
options. Either we have a temporary slate
now or we can table the election until the
next time when the full board is here.

MR. GEDEON: There is no issue
with waiting a month, is there?

MS. SAARELA: No.

MR. GEDEON: I'd rather wait
until next month.

MR. SANGHVI: I think I'll be
more comfortable when the full board is here.

May I make a motion to table the
election to the next meeting of the ZBA?

MR. GEDEON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in
favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any
opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Seeing
Page 87
none, let's move it to the next meeting. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

MR. IBE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.)

** ** **