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CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Call to order the Tuesday, June 10, regular scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Gronachan, can you lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Everybody please rise.
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(Pledge recited.)

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

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ibe is absent, excused.

MS. KRIEGER: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: This is a public hearing and the format, Rules of Conduct are in the back, if you would like to get a copy of that.

I would ask that if you have any cell phones that you silence them now. Also on behalf of myself and the board members, I'd like to apologize to the people, the petitioners that were here last month, that meeting was canceled.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Approval of the agenda?

Is there any additions or deletions?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Yes, Case No. PZ14-0011 at 1292 East Lake Drive has been asked to be tabled to the July 8 meeting.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other additions?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: No.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: All in favor for the approval say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, we have an agenda.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Approval of the minutes from January 14, 2014.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any changes to that?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, all in favor?

MR. SANGHVI: So moved.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: We have a motion and second. All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: That's
22             passed. Approval of the February 11,
23 2014 minutes.
24 MR. SANGHVI: I believe there is
25 a correction on page 80, line 16 and 17.
26 Change the motion passes six to one,
27 actually, all seven were here for it.
28 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other
29 changes?
30 (No audible responses.)
31 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Hear a
32 motion.
33 MR. GHANNAM: I will move to
34 approve as amended.
35 MS. GRONACHAN: Second.
36 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion
37 and a second, all in favor say aye.
38 THE BOARD: Aye.
39 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any
40 opposed?
41 (No audible responses.)
42 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
43 none.
44 Okay. Approval of April 8th,
45 2014 minutes, any changes to that?
46 MS. GRONACHAN: None.
47 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
48 none.
49 MR. GHANNAM: I'll move to
50 approve those minutes as presented.
51 MS. KRIEGER: Second.
52 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion
53 and a second, all in favor say aye.
54 THE BOARD: Aye.
55 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any
56 opposed?
57 (No audible responses.)
58 THE BOARD: Seeing none.
59 Approval of May 13th, 2014
60 minutes.
61 Any changes to that?
62 MR. IBE: That was the longest
63 meeting in the history of Novi. No changes.
64 I move that we approve the
65 minutes as they are.
66 MR. SANGHVI: Make a motion to
67 approve the minutes as presented.
68 MS. GRONACHAN: Second.
69 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Motion and
70 second, all in favor say aye.
71 THE BOARD: Aye.
72 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any
73 opposed?
74 (No audible responses.)
75 CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
76 none, approve.
77 Okay. Onto public remarks.
78 If anybody has anything that they would like
79 to discuss about any cases that are not being
80 seen this evening, may come forward now.
Seeing none, takes us to our first case, PZ14-0008, 42355 Grand River Avenue, Feldman Automotive.

Please come forward, raise your right hand, be sworn in if you are not an attorney and spell your first and last name for the court reporter.

MR. YBARRA: Ricky Ybarra, first name R-i-c-k-y, last name Y-b-a-r-r-a.

MR. GHANNAM: Sir, do you swear or affirm you will tell the truth in this case?

MR. YBARRA: I do.

Good evening. Here tonight with Marla Feldman, Feldman Automotive and Ed Phillips from Phillips Signs. Our hardship is the continued use of a permitted ground sign at our facility.

The sign shown was originally approved identifying our Hertz rental car operation at the facility, which we no longer have or are a featured Hertz rental. We don't have the organization here. So per our handout the new faces are Quick Lube and Tire Center that we are providing now, and we would like to hire another 15 employees to operate that center, that we never had before.

And we wanted to make sure that the public and the community know that we are to provide that service. We are not asking for any additional signage, only the continuation of use of existing sign.

As shown on our drawing, sign dimensions are 30 by 73 totaling 15 square foot sign in size. This simple face change accomplishes a lot for our company. It's something that we work hard at Feldman Automotive to make a new brand, the logo it's all new. And all of our dealerships use it. It's kind of a brand for our company. So it's very important to have that logo out there. We don't have the logo anywhere on the property. So we'd like to have that at the entrance.

There is really not much other than we really need some help. We are looking to market this to all makes and models. We do have a lot of other marketing that we are bringing in to try and bring more tire sales there, again more employees to operate the facility. And we feel our request is modest and in good taste and your approval would be much appreciated.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience that has any questions or comments?
18             that would like to come forward now?
19                            (No audible responses.)
20                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  Seeing
21             none, City have anything to add?
22                         MR. WALSH:  No comments.
23                         MS. SAARELA:  No comments.
24                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  Open it up
25             to the board.

0011
1                         MR. GHANNAM:  I've got to read.
2                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  I'm sorry.
3                         MR. GHANNAM:  That's okay. In
4             this case, there is 19 mailed notices, one
5             return mail, zero approvals, zero objections.
6                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  Now open it
7             up to the board.
8                         MR. GHANNAM:  I've got a comment.
9             Sir, I have no problem with the request. I
10             do remember a while ago when we gave you the
11             Hertz, it was a separate business there. You
12             have a sign.
13                            I believe you have covered it
14             up in the meantime, have you not? If you can
15             come to the podium.
16                         MR. YBARRA:  Yes, sir.
17                         MR. GHANNAM:  Last time you were
18             here, I guess there was an issue with having
19             that sign up. You have covered it up,
20             correct?
21                         MR. YBARRA:  Correct.
22                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  And ground
23             sign is already there. It only makes sense
24             that you put something else up as opposed to
25             nothing.

0012
1                         If Hertz is gone, I have no
2             problem with this, so I will be in support of
3             it.
4                         MR. YBARRA:  Thank you.
5             Appreciate it.
6                         CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:  Anybody
7             else?
8                         MR. GERBLICK:  Where the Hertz
9             facility is now vacant, is this Quick Lube
10             going in the same location within your
11             facility?
12                         MR. YBARRA:  No. We put an
13             addition onto the dealership about two years
14             ago, and we were doing just some mechanical
15             repairs out of there, but we needed to change
16             the actual business philosophy for quicker
17             business and more vehicles, all makes and
18             models and tires and 24 hour emergency
19             services.
20                         MR. GERBLICK:  Thank you.
21                         MS. KRIEGER:  Just to clarify,
22             for the Chair. This is a separate business,
23             like the Hertz business on this sign?
24                         MR. YBARRA:  Well, on our
25             financial statement, it is a separate entity
on the financial statement, yes, treated as a
separate business. It's in the same company. I don't exactly know how to explain that.

MS. KRIEGER: I guess then to the city, for the question, what goes on a sign, is it having the sign or what goes on the sign, like for other signs that we have done, Michigan craft -- Dave's burgers and said underneath now serving breakfast, they switched it to craft beer. That was where my question was coming from.

MS. SAARELA: I'm not sure I understand what the question is.

MS. KRIEGER: This is a separate business entity, what they put on this sign versus they're having a separate sign? Like what goes on the sign, is that relevant to what --

MS. SAARELA: I don't think the content is relevant, no.

MR. WALSH: I don't believe so.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other discussion?

MS. GRONACHAN: I have a problem with the two signs next to each other. One says service, one says quick service, and it's both for the same company.

MR. YBARRA: Actually the new one, the revised says quick lube, not quick service. We wanted to make it that way so that it didn't confuse people. Our service sign is for GM. It's required for franchise and it's a certified service sign that all GM dealers, whether they're Chevy or Buick, is a certified service that we provide our customers.

The quick lube and tire center is something that's not branded to the franchise. That's why we can do all makes and models, which we have already started. We have done quite a bit of non-GM vehicles at a very competitive price, with tires as well. Actually we price match Belle and a lot of other companies and customers are loving it. Our tire sales have been huge.

Again, you know, we are trying to bring more students in and more jobs.

MS. GRONACHAN: What does the sign say today out there?

MR. YBARRA: Open Saturdays, I believe.

MR. PHILLIPS: Feldman logo says open Saturdays.

MS. GRONACHAN: Respectfully, this sign wasn't covered.

You mentioned to my board
member that it was covered up the last couple
of months.

MR. YBARRA: It was covered for a
little while, yes. I don't know if it is
today. I was in Lansing, but we try to keep
it covered for the most part. And I know
when they were doing the landscape around
there, the sprinklers, they uncovered it. We
will make sure it's covered until we get
approval, that's for sure. I will guarantee
you that.

MS. GRONACHAN: Has the
building -- can I direct a question to the
building department:
Has the building department
been out there? Have there been any issues
with -- since their last visit to the Zoning
Board?

MR. WALSH: There has been no
outstanding issues besides the existing sign
that they originally came in for the last
request being still up, but as far as any
other code violations, no.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you. I'm
struggling with this. I will have to listen
to my other members before I can really -- at
this point I can't support it.

And the reason I can't support
it is that I don't see the purpose of the two
signs side-by-side being that one is -- even
if it's corporate generated, it's still the
same company. I'm having a problem wrapping
my head around as to why there should be two
signs side-by-side. And I live in that area,
drive by it every day. And it has not been
covered up.

And so I have an issue with
following the rules based on our last
collection with Feldman, that they didn't
follow the procedure as the board requested.
So I will wait to hear from
other members. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other
questions or discussion?

MR. GHANNA: I will make a
motion.

In Case PZ14-0008, for 42355
Grand River Avenue, I move that we approve
the petition as requested for the following
reasons.

The request is based upon
circumstances or features that are
exceptional and unique to this property and
do not result from conditions that exist
generally in the city.

This is a large facility with
multiple sources of revenue. Even though
it's technically not a separate business
entity, it basically and effectively acts
like one.
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 the use of the structure that is incompatible or unreasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties. It will result in substantial justice being done to the applicant as well as surrounding property, and it is not inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing a motion and second, Ms. Pawlowski, will you call the roll?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: No.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes five to one.

MR. YBARRA: Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Case PZ14-0009, Novi Corporate Park Parcel 5022-09-451-028.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Matthew Quinn appearing on behalf of Amsom Dembs Company, the owner of Novi Corporation Park.

This is a request to extend the time to allow a sales trailer to be on site.

We have been operating under a two-year permit from the building official. The site is not yet developed. It's two large parcels of industrial zoned property. Things look like it's picking up, and therefore, the need for this trailer, at least for another two years, is anticipated.

If it's not going to be used as a sales trailer, and actual activity occurs on site, then it will be converted to a construction trailer.

If any of you have been out there, you will see how it's been upgraded, it's brick. It looks good. It's just not a typical, you know, mobile home sales office situation.
sitting out there.
So in order to help market
this property, and to allow it to develop, we
would request an additional two years.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

ANYBODY from the audience have any comments
they would like to make at this time?
(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Read
correspondence from the secretary.

MR. GHANNAM: There were 16
mailed notices that went out, one return
mail, zero approvals, and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anything

from the City?

MR. WALSH: I will just want to

add, if the board is inclined to consider the
extension, staff suggests limiting it to two
years.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

MR. QUINN: Great minds think alike.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I open it
up to the board for further discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: One question,
Mr. Quinn, what else are they doing for
finding some customers for these places,
other than keeping the trailer up there?

MR. QUINN: Well, you know part
of it is hoping from some spill-over from the
Beck Road north industrial developments.
You know, working together
with people that come to look at that. We
also have another site to show them. So
that's the other marketing technique that's
being done.

MR. SANGHVI: I think the sign
has been -- the trailer has been there quite
a while.

MR. QUINN: Yes, the client has
owned the property five to six years, but as

you can see, we went through a downturn when
there really wasn't a great demand for
industrial property anywhere in this region.
It looks like it's picking up a little bit.
That's why it's time to keep this temporary
building at the site.

MR. SANGHVI: You are looking for
a further extension of two more years?

MR. QUINN: Correct.

MR. SANGHVI: I have no problem

with it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anybody
else? Hear a motion?

MR. GERBLICK: I'll make a
motion. In Case No. PZ14-0009, Novi
Corporate Park, I move that we grant the
variance as requested.
The variance is based on
unique circumstances or physical conditions
of the property, so much as its shape and
The need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty. The need is not self-created and strict compliance with regulations governing area setback, frontage, height, bulk, density and other dimensional requirements will require -- will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose and 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 other property owners in the district, and 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.

I would add that the variance would be limited to two years for the temporary structure.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion and a second, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. QUINN: Thank you very much.

I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Takes us to Case No. PZ14-0010, Beck North Lot 56, Parcels Nos. 5022-04-151-028, 031, 032, and part of 016.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, once again, Matthew Quinn on behalf of Amsom Dembs, Beck North Corporate Park. A little bit handicapped, I see because the overhead isn't working tonight. I know you have a package for this requested variance in your packet. We are requesting two variances for this light industrial property. The first I know you have a
6. This is a 75,800 speculative industrial building that will be constructed on this particular lot. This particular lot is on the north end on Cartier Drive where Hudson drive ends.

The two variances that we need, and I must say they are recommended by the planning staff, both of them, because of the uniqueness of this project, is first of all, the building height is in an industrial zone, when it's adjacent to residential, you're allowed a 25-foot high building. The way modern industrial office buildings are constructed that height really doesn't get it. It's just not what's an acceptable norm anymore.

And with the rooftop appurtenances that puts us up to requesting a variance of 10.6 inches for the height of the building.

The second variance is the overhead doors and truck loading area facing residential.

In your packet I know you have this map, that shows two main things. Number one, the back of this building is over 800 feet from the closest residential property. The City of Novi has a 50-foot easement all around Beck North Corporate Park. Then there is a required 50-foot setback for any construction from that easement. Then there is 700 feet to the apartment that lie to the north where Wellington Drive is located so, in effect, we have 800 feet and mostly all wooded between that residential use and this particular building.

And on top of that, one of the other exhibits you will see in the drawings is, within the buffer, it's two on the property, that's adjacent to the 60-foot buffer, it's heavily planted with trees. So there will be a screening effect of really this entire building from those apartments that are over 800 feet away.

And the planning staff noted that, that it was something that can't be avoided, and in order to have the quality of building that is required in this market and that actually goes along with the quality of the other buildings in Beck North Corporate Park, this is something that is necessary. It will have absolutely no effect on the surrounding property.

Certainly, we own the sides of our properties and the adjacent residential will hardly not even know the building is there nor the corporate park itself. And therefore, we are asking your affirmative vote for these two.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Anybody in the audience have any questions or comments they would like to come forward now and ask?

(NO audible responses.)

Seeing none, I will have the secretary read any correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: There were ten notices mailed, one return mail, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Ask the city if they have any additional comments.

MR. WALSH: No comments.

MS. SAARELA: I have nothing.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was just looking for those departments, I couldn't see them on the property line. I don't think that would make much difference, so I have no problem supporting your request. Thank you.

MS. KRIEGER: Mr. Quinn, the deliveries be in the daytime?

MR. QUINN: Most of them, yes. Most of the industrial businesses are typical normal building business hours. Perhaps a little extended, but there is no anticipation you will end up with an owner of the building or tenant that's going to be operating any time at night.

MS. KRIEGER: I also am in favor of this.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Entertain a motion.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ14-0010, Beck Road Lot Five, Parcel Nos. 5022-04-151, 028, 031, 032, and part of 016, I move to approve the request and two -- the height request for 10.6 inches and the overhead doors facing into the buffer zone, and that there are unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property, such as the narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, topography, the nature of this site, the buffer of the trees between the apartments and the building itself that's going to be constructed will protect and buffer each other.

The similar physical -- or similar physical conditions and the need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty.

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. By putting the -- constructing it as they have requested, it complies with their neighbors in this office park. The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to the property owners. 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. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion from the board? Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?
MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?
MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

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

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. QUINN: Thank you very much. Have a good evening.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Case No. 5, PZ14-0012, 44050 Twelve Mile Road, Stone Ridge Office Park. Please come forward.

MS. KRIEGER: Put them at the end?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Do we do a motion for that or just put them to the end?

MS. SAARELA: You don't need a motion. You just check back and see if they're here.

Moving onto Case No. 6, PZ14-0013, 301 Duana Avenue.

MR. HEARN: My name is Robert Hearn, R-o-b-e-r-t, last name H-e-a-r-n. Please raise your right hand be sworn by the secretary.

MR. GHANNAM: Do you swear or affirm you will tell the truth in Case PZ14-0013?

MR. HEARN: I do.
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and Teresa Hearn. They would have been here, they lost a friend this weekend, they're at the funeral tonight. So I'm a little not as prepared as I could be. We are looking to get a variance under a back deck. They purchased the house a year ago, the back deck has no stairs down. The house has a front door, and a side door into the garage. The only way out of the garage is through a garage door, that if a power failure happened, it wouldn't be useful. So in an emergency there would be front door exit only.

What we are looking for is to get a variance, if possible get an extra four feet of width with a stair going down away from the easement side towards their backyard. And the type of property, if you have the drawing there, it's an unusual shape property. There is -- it shouldn't impact the neighbor on their left side and the neighbor on the right side it shouldn't either because the stairs should come down in front of the deck itself.

So what we are asking for is the variance for the width and stairs.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you. Anyone in the audience have any comments at this time? (No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, open it up to the secretary to read any correspondence.

MR. GHANAM: We had 24 notices that were mailed, three returned mail, zero approvals and one objection.

The objection we have of record is from Sharon James of looks like 16570 Owosso Road, Fowlerville, Michigan. It says, "we do not agree with this. She has already cut down one of our trees without asking. It sounds as if her money can buy anything she wants. We would not have allowed her to cut our tree either. We never heard from her. As for the variance, absolutely, no". Dated April 29, 2014.

MR. HEARN: Well, that doesn't apply to this property because --

MR. GHANAM: You can't ask questions, sir, at this time.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Up to the city, any comments?

MR. WALSH: No, comments.

MS. SAARELA: No.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for any discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: You were supposed to have six different buildings there, how...
MR. SANGHVI: If you look at the previous minutes here, that is what we had talked about. Six different units at this property.

MR. HEARN: I'm just talking about a deck extension on a single user house.

MR. SANGHVI: You don't know about it?

MR. HEARN: No.

MS. GRONACHAN: Secretary, could you clarify the letter that we got from that residence? Did she clarify where -- does she own a piece of property next to it? I understand that there is an address in Fowlerville, but did she indicate what property she owns, or where she resides, or is there any clarification?

MR. GHANNAM: I'm looking at it right now. I'm looking at the form that was sent in in terms of requesting comment and they're just general forms. They're not addressed to anybody.

But it is regarding this case.

I'm not sure why.

MS. GRONACHAN: Is there a neighbor that they're having any problems with or a tree in question that was --

MR. HEARN: No. I know for sure that in the year that they lived there they have never cut down a tree.

I can't even picture a tree that would have been cut down or how it could be. Because on the side of the house is the public easement, and the other part is a neighbor who is right up with the fence. There couldn't have been a tree there.

Like I said, I'm not even sure what that's all about.

MR. GHANNAM: Just in terms of my comments, I have looked at the request, even though it does increase non-conformity, I still have no problem with it.

I think the request for a variance is reasonable under the circumstances. I know this house was built, I think back in '97, does that make sense?

MR. HEARN: Yes.

MR. GHANNAM: It's to the rear of the property. I don't think it effects any of the neighbors, so I have no problem with it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Is that a motion?

MR. GHANNAM: If there is no other comments, I do have a motion.
In Case PZ14-0013, for 301 Duana Avenue, I move that we approve the petition as requested for a number of reasons. There are unique circumstances or physical conditions of this property, such as the narrowness, shape and so forth. And the need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty. The need is certainly not self-created because of the unusual nature of the lot. Strict compliance with the regulations governing the area setback and so forth will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose. The requested variance is the minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant, and the requested variance will not cause adverse impact on surrounding properties. In fact, I think it would enhance surrounding properties.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion and a second. Any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MR. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motions passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Moves us to Case No. PZ14-0014, 42990 Grand River, Discount Tire. Please come forward, state your name, spell it and be sworn in by the secretary.

MR. LEWIS: My name is Tom Lewis. I'm with Walton Signage out of San Antonio, Texas. I am the program director for Discount Tire.

MR. GHANNAM: We have to swear you in.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Spell your name first.

MR. LEWIS: Lewis, L-e-w-i-s, Thomas, T-h-o-m-a-s.

MR. GHANNAM: Raise your right hand.
hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm in
Case PZ14-0014 you will tell the truth?
MR. LEWIS: Yes.
MR. GHANNAM: Please proceed.
MR. LEWIS: I am here with both
Ken Cane, who is from the regional office for
Discount Tire and Jeff Hamilton, the store
manager for the location.
Also with me is John Carol, who is our partner in signage with Walton on
the project.
My understanding of the
variance is that in visiting with them also
is that Discount Tire has been before the
board on occasions to get additional signage
approved with no success.
I think they're kind of coming
back to the board again because they're
looking at a number of their close
businesses, Tony's Pizza, Steve and Rockys.
I also kind of walked the
entire site, you know, Pei Wei, the Big
Salad, number of locations that have more
than one sign on their building.
The Discount Tire is set back,
it's rather hidden. There is numerous trees.
The monument provides them a certain amount
of visibility, but, you know, with nothing on
the building it really looks like an empty
space.
In walking the property, I
noticed that they had put up some temporary
banners. I can tell you in conversation with
them, they have helped sales. Banners were
not installed by our company.
They face a certain amount of
competition in the area. Firestone across
the street has multiple signs.
So what they're really looking
to do is put a professional image on the
front of their building, make it look more
like the surrounding tenants, get the
advertising value they feel is necessary for
the success of the business.
With the Wal-mart behind them,
there is quite a bit of traffic flowing down
the back side of that property, being able to
identify their business on that side does
help it.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Is that it?
MR. LEWIS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anybody in
the audience have any comments?
(No audible responses.)
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Mr.
Secretary, can you read any correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: Yes. We have 18
mailed notices, two return mail, zero
approvals, zero objections.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Mr. Walsh,
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anything to add?
MR. WALSH: Nothing to add.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for any discussion.
MR. GHANNAM: My problem with this one, you want two additional signs in addition to your ground sign, correct?
MR. LEWIS: Yes.
MR. GHANNAM: First of all, number one, I do understand the request. We have handled a number of these in this area, this Grand River, Novi Road area.
These buildings are situated a little bit differently because you have got a strip center behind you, major strip center and other retail. And you do have a narrow lot with one little sign -- or I shouldn't say little, but one sign at the front.
I wouldn't be in favor of two signs though. I mean, you do have the one ground sign you're entitled to as of right.
I wouldn't be in favor of two additional signs. I would be in favor of one additional sign.
And although I don't want to necessarily tell you where to put it, my thinking would be to be the traffic behind you, coming from that parking lot area. I guess if you wanted it in a different spot, I mean, that's your choice.
I don't want to micro manage those issues, in but terms in two additional signs, keep in mind our job is not to give you as many signs as you can so it increases your business.
That's not part of the standards that we go by.
If you heard some of the previous motions where we did approve, we have various standards that we have to meet and I don't think -- I think you meet them for one sign, but not for multiple signs.
MR. LEWIS: Question, in the case of Steve and Rockys --
MR. GHANNAM: That's all my comments.
I'm not necessarily fielding questions, but that's what my comments are on this particular motion.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anybody else?
MR. SANGHVI: Quite honestly, I don't see any hardship or practical difficulty. It's a pretty well mapped place. Discount Tire, it's not hard to find. But I see Mr. Ghannam's point, and yes maybe you need one sign coming from the other side, but although there is a lot of traffic on the other sign at the moment.
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So if you would like to have one on the north side, I can understand that, but two signs I think are one too many. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you. Anybody else?

MR. GERBLICK: Question for the applicant. Can you explain your need for the two signs as opposed to the one sign that is --

MR. LEWIS: With the setback of the building, once you come up that driveway, you really -- without the sign on the front of the building, you get no reference from, I turned into the driveway, where is the Discount Tire? Is it on the left, it is on the -- you know, is that the building in front of me. Because without a sign there, it's really just a blank facade. The rear signage, yes, there is a lot of traffic that moves across the back. It's a much more open area.

MR. GERBLICK: So is the ground sign not directing any traffic towards the building?

MR. LEWIS: It brings people in off the street because of how far the building is set back. Once you come onto the drive, when you are coming down the street, what you see is the long driveway, you see a lot of trees and through the trees you see the front of the building, but it is obscured.

MR. GERBLICK: I would have to agree with my board members here. In fact, that I have driven Grand River numerous times. Once you see that Discount Tire sign, you turn into that drive, the building is right in front of you essentially. So from an identification of the building and directionally for traffic on Grand River there, I can't see a need for an additional sign there. Again, a sign elsewhere in the building, even if you choose to put it on the front of the building, I think another sign on the property for the 360 degrees around the property where traffic can come from makes sense, given the area and the other businesses in that area that also have multiple signs.

MR. LEWIS: Question, I guess, in the case of Steve and Rockys, who has two wall signs, and a monument sign and multiple directional signs, what makes them different from a business like Discount Tire? It seems as I walked the
property, that if you're a restaurant, you
get extra signs. If you're a business, you
don't.

Even to the case of -- there
is an exercise building in the -- within the
property, a fitness center, and they have two
signs.

So we are kind of -- I guess
it's a little bit of semantics of two signs
or three signs. I mean, would a smaller sign
on the front make you feel better that we are
bringing people in off -- you know, we are
directing them from the monument to the --
you know, if the monument sign sat right
where the building was right up by it, it
would be less of an issue.

I have seen a number of
properties where that's possible.
But with the way this property
is set, and the way the building is set so
far back off the road, and the tree canopy
across the front, it really does leave you to
wonder is that the building.

And I get where people come
from, everybody should know where the
Discount Tire is because it's only local
people that are coming there.

But they have evidence that
they put two banners up and their sales
increased.

I think that's what we are
really talking about, is the success of
business inside that development. If it
helps some and it makes more successful, I
think that's what we are looking to do.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: If the
board was inclined to grant one sign, would
you be in favor of that motion?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, I'd rather have
two. I would allow, if we could do a smaller
sign in front.

I mean, if you are unhappy
with the 72 square feet, you're right, the
rear sign is read from a much greater
distance.

But it would be nice to -- it
would be nice to mark the front of the
building with something more than, you know,
pencil and cardboard in the windows that
says, Discount Tire.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I have a
question. On the front picture on sheet four
of five, is that a final sign that you have
on the front window? It says, Discount Tire.

MR. LEWIS: I believe that was a
picture taken, yes, this winter. That was
some sort of temporary sign that was placed
in the window.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Is that
still there?

MR. LEWIS: Yes.
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CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I have a question for the city. Are they allowed to have that sign? Is that considered a sign, having it in the window?

MR. WALSH: It's considered a sign.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Okay. So that would have to be removed if they --

MR. WALSH: That's correct.

MR. GHANNAM: I just have another quick question for the city. If we grant the sign, is -- or let me -- strike that. If he was entitled to one

MR. WALSH: 35 square feet.

MR. GHANNAM: This would be more than double what would be required. Or what he would be entitled to?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Sir? Did you hear the question?

MR. LEWIS: Yes. Well, as I understand the -- how we closed out the sign, it's a total of 45 square foot sign roughly, unless you -- depending on how the city -- we mapped it out as one box around Discount, one box around Tire.

MR. GHANNAM: I don't think that's the way they measured it.

MR. LEWIS: You penalized them for empty space, but yes, I understand that there are different ways of doing it.

MR. GHANNAM: Well, the city has ordinances as to how it's calculated.

But my question is, if the board were to grant one sign, would you rather have the north or the south elevation?

MR. LEWIS: I would have to kind of ask them that question. I would have to get with the ownership of Discount and ask them that.

Now, question --

MR. GHANNAM: Do we have to select an elevation?

MS. SAARELA: You don't. You could grant one sign, leave it up to them, if the north or the south.

MR. GHANNAM: My only question -- or my only problem, I should say is if it's in the front. I mean, to me 72.5 square feet seems to be a lot. If it's in the back, I kind of understand because there's tons of space back there. People will be driving and it makes more sense to have a larger sign in the back. I have no other comments.
MR. LEWIS: What if you wanted --

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Hold on a second.

Mr. Walsh, was he approved for the Discount Tire sign in the window?

MR. WALSH: He was approved for temporary signage. The one in the window, it's hard to tell from the photograph, if that is actually the temporary signage.

I have to -- I misspoke, 24 square feet, not 35.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: When was that supposed to expire, that temporary sign?

MR. WALSH: I'm sorry. I don't have that information.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Do you know when that was supposed to expire?

MR. LEWIS: No, I do not. Like I said, we didn't put it up.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: How long has it been there, would you say?

MR. LEWIS: Do you know how long your temporary sign has been up?

UNIDENTIFIED: They're actually stickers.

MR. LEWIS: Do you know how long they have been there?

UNIDENTIFIED: Couple years.

MR. LEWIS: Question. Would the board grant us 72 square feet and let us decide how to best apply the signage to the building, not putting a requirement on the number of signs, but limiting it to three?

MS. KRIEGER: We would have to re-advertise all of that, change numbers and that.

MS. SAARELA: Or you can grant a lesser variance without re-advertising. So if he's asking for a lesser variance, if you're considering a lesser variance, you can also grant it without them saying this is what I want. So if you feel it's appropriate to do two smaller signs, you can grant two smaller signs if you feel you don't have to get --

MR. GHANNAM: I think what he wanted was multiple, like three signs, but that equated to what he's asking.

MS. SAARELA: Or did he mean the existing monument and the two wall signs?

MR. LEWIS: No, 72 square feet of additional signage, but no restrictions.

What I would like to be able to do is go back to Discount Tire, and probably put a smaller sign up front and see how that manages the back sign. Ultimately if it's their choice to do one sign, per the drawing, then
they will come back with just the 72 square foot sign. I'm trying to give them some freedom to make some decisions --

MS. SAARELA: You could table it and you want to meet with them and discuss the proposal.

MR. LEWIS: I have traveled a long way. I'd like to kind of be done. I'm sure you guys would, too.

MR. GHANNAM: We are struggling, as you can see. My theory is I would grant one, and if it was in the front, I don't know that I would grant it at 72 and a half square feet. If it was in the back, I would consider it.

That's my take on it.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I concur with my fellow board member. I think that more homework needs to be done. Nobody wants to leave here with an unhappy business person.

Novi stands on supporting their businesses, and I can appreciate that you're from a different area, but each city does things differently.

This building has been there a while. There obviously is a sign in the window that has been there for a while and it's supposed to be temporary. So I think that this presentation needs to be neatened up a little bit and brought back to the board. I apologize for the inconvenience.

But I think that you could do better if a little more homework was done. Let me tell you that I would recommend a smaller sign in the front. And do your homework on the sign in the back. Then come back in front of the board and ask if they can support it.

I will give you kudos on your presentation when you indicated that people can't identify the building. I would use that in terms of your presentation. I would also do my homework a little further and bring some proof of that. You could be creative with however way you want.

I would love to help this business. But there is not enough here for me to make a decision tonight. I can't support any of this without further research. I cannot support 72 square feet in the front window. That temporary window sticker, sticker or not, would have to be removed.

And then I would like to support the back, but I can't support both 72.

So I just feel that, and being...
on this board before, and served for a few
years, I just feel if you did a little more
work, a little more homework and came back
with a little cleaner presentation, and took
those stickers off the window, you might see
a better result.

MR. LEWIS: Okay.

MS. GRONACHAN: That's all I have
to say.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Any other discussion?

MS. KRIEGER: Motion to table.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

MS. KRIEGER: For the July
meeting?

MS. GRONACHAN: Is that enough
time for you to come back in July?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, definitely.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: We have a
date of the July meeting?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: The 8th.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Motion and
a second.

Any other discussion on this?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Ms.

Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson

Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MR. GHANNAM: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six
to zero.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Takes us to
Case No. 8, PZ14-00015, 1361 East Lake Drive.

Please come forward and state
and spell your name for the reporter then be
sworn in by the secretary.

MR. METTE: My name is name is

Bruce Mette, M-e-t-t-e.

MR. GHANNAM: In Case PZ14-0015,
do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. METTE: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

MR. METTE: My wife and I

purchased the home at 1361 East Lake Drive
seven years ago when our older son was single
at the time and looking for a place to live.

It was small, but fine for a
single guy. He lived there for three years
when he was transferred to California for his job.

Our youngest son and his fiancée have recently both graduated from college and got married two years ago and moved into the home on East Lake. It is the perfect location because both of them work in Novi.

Our son is a senior manager at Ryder at M5 and Thirteen Mile Road, and his wife is the store manager the Old Navy in Novi.

After living in the house for two years, they have found the house, which is only 750 square feet, very cramped. It's too small, since the house is only -- only has one bedroom and one closet in the bedroom, a bathroom and a small kitchen in the living room.

There is no other storage space in the house or even a second bedroom for a child if they want to start a family.

With the addition, we are looking to add a bedroom, closet, bathroom and a coat closet.

That is why we are requesting a variance to add an additional 336 square feet, a 16 by 21 foot room on the house. The rooms would be built by a licensed building contractor, and will be built over a crawl space and will conform with the City of Novi codes.

It will be built -- it will be built onto the existing house, with the same exterior siding, color, and some additional landscaping.

It is our hope that we can build this room so that we will -- it will be a little more liveable and hopefully a grandchild in the future.

We have had conversations with our neighbors, and they all seem to be on board with the addition of the house.

In fact, our neighbor next door to the north did the same addition, very similar, years ago to make their house a little more liveable as well.

As we all -- we also are not blocking anyone's views on either side of the property or to the rear as that land behind us has been vacated, and the stream that feeds Walled Lake.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter, as we love the family environment, school and parks that Novi has to offer.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Are you finished?

MR. METTE: I am.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anybody in the audience have any comments?
Chairperson Ferrell: Seeing none, Mr. Secretary can you read the correspondence.

Mr. Ghannam: Yes. We have 15 mailed notices, three return mail and one approval. Approval is from Anthony Hopeck, H-o-p-e-c-k, 1354 East Lake, Novi, dated 5/24/14 and it indicates, "they have my full approval", with this signature.

Chairperson Ferrell: Anything from the city?

Mr. Walsh: No comments.

Chairperson Ferrell: Open it up to the board for discussion.

Mr. Ghannam: Firstly, sir, I have no problem with the request. I mean, I have looked at it. It seems like you're trying to do the best under the circumstances.

We have dealt with a number of lots along East Lake Drive. They are old lots, they're not consistent with the current lots if land was to be split up, so you're dealing with a tight space and certainly you need to make these homes liveable.

We have had requests for garages and outdoor storage and so forth. So I understand the need for the request, I have no problem with it.

Mr. Sanghvi: Like Mr. Ghannam said, there is nothing else you can do that isn't already a variance. I have no problem supporting your application.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Gerblick: I'd like to make a motion.

In Case No. PZ14-0015, 1361 East Lake Drive, I move that we grant the variance as requested, given there are unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property, such as the narrowness of the lot and shape of the existing structure and lot. That the need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty. The need is not self-created and strict compliance with regulations governing area, setback, frontage would unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome, given the size of the existing home on the lot.

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

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

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: We have a
motion and a second. Any further discussion?
(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six
to zero.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL:
Congratulations. Good luck on
your grandchild.

MR. METTE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Brings us
to Case No. 9, PZ14-0016, Glens of
Northville. Come forward, state and spell
your name for the reporter and raise your
right hand to be sworn in by the secretary.

MR. BARBAS: Hello. My name is
Andrew Barb as.

MR. GHANNAM: Are you an
attorney, sir?

MR. BARBAS: Yes.

MR. GHANNAM: You don't need to
be sworn.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Please
spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. BARBAS: B-a-r-b-a-s. I am
not here as an attorney.

I am manager of -- as a
managing member of the Glens of Northville.

We are, as a company, an
established long-term apartment community
owner and operator, as some of you may recall
three years ago, we acquired another
apartment community in Novi. It's currently
known as the Heights of Novi. We made a
significant investment and are repairing and
renovating the community.

We are proud of the results we
achieved and I hope you're pleased with our
efforts.

Last December we acquired
another apartment community in Novi, that
once again, we are repairing and renovating.
As you know, this community is known as Woodland Glens Apartments. Since it will become relevant to my remarks, let me first explain why the community has remained and why it is now called the Glens of Northville rather than Woodland Glens Apartments, the Glens of Novi Apartments, or some other name. Like our previous acquisition, the Glens is a property that had been foreclosed by the lender, in this case, Fannie Mae. There had been multiple management companies involved over the past several years, none of which had an economic interest in the community. As a result, the physical condition and operations of the property were significantly inadequate. When we acquired the community, it did not have a great reputation. In addition, the former name of the community was dated. In changing the perception of the community, we are renovating it and adding value, we have found that changing the name is very helpful. It conveys in our marketing that something new and better is coming. Because the community had Northville rather than a Novi mailing address, we concluded that Glens of Northville would be more appropriate because Glens of Novi would have been very confusing. As with the Heights of Novi, we have been making significant improvements for the conditions and appearance of the exterior portions of the property, as well as the apartment homes themselves. We have been somewhat delayed in the process because of the wonderful weather we have had this past winter, but we are now working diligently to do this extensive work. I was going to give -- you, I understand, the monitor is not working. I was going to give you an overview of the front landscape design. You do have one in your packets and the signage that we are requesting tonight.

Basically what we are requesting, that the sign be 36 square feet as opposed to 24 square feet, and that the height of the sign be six foot three rather than five feet. As you're aware, the sign ordinance sets forth several purposes for standards established. As the ordinance states, the standards are designed to promote
the public health, safety and welfare of persons within the community, including the promotion of traffic safety and esthetics and to aid in the development, promotion of business and industry by providing sign regulations that encourage creativity, effectiveness and flexibility and design and use of such devises without creating a detriment to the general public.

The standards for, as you know, a variance from the sign, have three -- the sign ordinance have three requirements.

The first is that the request be based upon circumstances or features that are exceptional and unique to the property and do not result from conditions that generally exist in the city or are self-created. The reason for our variance request is that because of the topography and the width of Eight Mile Road, it is important to create a more noticeable sign than a current sign, which is very difficult to see and read from the road.

Because of the setback and landscaping of the front of the community, it is very difficult to realize that the property is an apartment community, and unlike the residential community immediately east of the Glens, or the apartment community across Eight Mile Road, there is only one entrance. They have multiple entrances. More over, and more importantly, Eight Mile Road slopes down from the property in both directions, which makes it difficult to see the property until you are at the entrance.

The circumstances are also unique because Eight Mile Road is a five lane road, which generally only occurs in Novi, I believe on parts of Haggerty Road and around the Twelve Oaks Mall.

The second standard established for granting a variance is that 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 change or to attain a higher economic or financial return. As I have already described, the failure to grant our request is more than a mere inconvenience. When looked at in light of the extent of the request we are making, the failure to grant the request we feel will unreasonably limit the use of the property. And the final standard established for granting the variance is that the grant of relief will not result in the use of a structure that is incompatible with,
or unreasonably interferes with adjacent or
surrounding properties and will result in
substantial justice being done to both the
applicants and adjacent or surrounding
properties, and is not inconsistent with the
spirit and intent of the ordinance.

The sign we are requesting you
approve is compatible with the adjacent
properties. It does not create any injustice
to the surrounding properties.

As I noted in my introductory
remarks, this request certainly is consistent
with the spirit and intent of the sign
ordinance.

For these reasons, I would
respectfully request that the board grant our
request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Excellent.
Thank you. Anybody in the audience have any
comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
none, Mr. Secretary, can you read in the
correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: Yes. We have 36
mailed notices, two return mail, zero
approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anything
from the city?

MR. WALSH: No.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up
to the board for discussion.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.
Excellent presentation. Everything that you
said is true. And I moved back here to
Michigan two years ago.

I was going down Eight Mile
and drove right past that complex and ended
up renting someplace else.

MR. BARBAS: So did we, including
our landscape designer.

MS. GRONACHAN: I do agree with
this and so as the petitioner made reference
to the difficulty of the lay of the land, so
to speak, Eight Mile being it's challenges,
it definitely does need a bigger sign.

Visibility is very difficult
in that area. And I would like to duly note
for the record that everything that you
presented would be the reasonable why I would
support this request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Anybody else?

MS. KRIEGER: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I agree as
well. Ready for a motion.

MR. GERBLICK: In Case No.
PZ14-0016, Glens of Northville, I move that
we grant the variances as requested.

As the request is based on
circumstances or features that are
exceptional and unique to the property and do not result in conditions that exist generally in city and that are not self-created, specifically the topography of where this complex is located, the width of Eight Mile Road, the setback of the community from the road, as well as the fact that this is the only entrance to the property along a busy Eight Mile Road.

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.

Again, the visibility from Eight Mile Road is difficult with both sides sloping down from the property, visibility of the sign is difficult.

The grant of relief not will result in a use of the 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 and surrounding properties and is not inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

MS. KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Having a motion and a second, any further discussion?
(No audible responses.)
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll?
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?
MR. GERBLICK: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?
MR. GHANNAM: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.
MR. BARBAS: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Brings us to Case No. PZ14-0017, 23940 Forest Park Drive.
Come forward, state and spell your name for the reporter, then raise your right hand to be sworn in by our secretary.
MR. ROSE: Good evening. My name is Stacy, S-t-a-c-y, last name, Rose,
for the file. I don't appear to have this file.

(MR. ROSE: If it's helpful, I provided a plot of the lot and then a two page summary. It's just only three pages.)

(MR. ROSE: Have you been able to see my packet?)

(MR. GHANNAM: We have your packet. We just didn't have the city file.)

(MR. ROSE: Great. Okay. Well, I did provide a detailed explanation of my variance request, and I will give you a quick overview of it.)

Basically, I set out to build a garage and I did it based upon the City of Novi summary sheet for accessory building. And I should have looked at the ordinance because what I missed was the minimum lot size exception to the allowed garage sizes. But anyway, the proposed garage was well in compliance with all other aspects of the city code. I couldn't find any other negatives. So I decided to pursue a variance based on my need for the garage. And I guess I'm ready to answer any questions you may have.

(MR. GHANNAM: In this matter 16 mailed notices, zero return mail, two approvals, zero objections.)

The first approval is from Dan and Janet Bennett, 23883 Forest Park Drive East dated 6/9/2014. It indicates, "this is a nice plan for a better land area."

The second one is from Gerald Harris, 23918 Forest Park Drive East, dated 5/28/14, and it indicates, "I believe this request meets the spirit of the prevailing ordinances and that this Novi citizen has been very diligent in communicating with his neighbors and the City of Novi entities needed to make the request a reality. I am in full support of granting this request." It's signed by Gerald Harris and it says immediate neighbor.

(MR. GHANNAM: The rest of the correspondence is blank.)
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anything from the city?

MR. WALSH: No additional comments.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: I have a couple questions. Who owns the open field behind your property?

MR. ROSE: It's Dr. Michael Balan. He's the house behind me to the right where Dr. Balan lives.

MR. SANGHVI: I was there this afternoon. I noted a sign for a rezoning same area.

MR. ROSE: He still owns it. I believe there is a purchase agreement. I believe there is probably another purchase agreement for somebody to purchase that purchase agreement if the zoning goes. It's complicated. The developers are definitely chasing that land. That's one of the few remaining open areas in Novi.

MR. SANGHVI: I have a question for the city. What kind of rezoning are we talking about in that area?

MR. WALSH: I'm not sure. I don't have that information in front of me.

MR. SANGHVI: It's a huge sign east of this subdivision saying rezoning requested.

MR. ROSE: I could answer that for you.

MR. SANGHVI: This is just east of the backyard.

MR. ROSE: They're trying to rezone it from R3 to R1.

MR. SANGHVI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you. Anybody else?

MR. GHANNAM: Sir in general, I don't have any problem with this request myself. I noticed, which is I mean I appreciate the various approvals from your neighbors, which you have attached and given to the board. It's somewhat helpful. It's also seems to be signed by your subdivision board.

MR. ROSE: That was necessary for city approval before I could get a permit.

MR. GHANNAM: That is also constructive. But in terms of your request, I think it's reasonable under the circumstances, so I have no problem this it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Motion?

MR. GHANNAM: I will make a motion, if no one has any comments.

In Case PZ14-0017, I move that we approve the petition as requested. There are unique circumstances and physical conditions of the property. And the need for
the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty.

The request for -- the need is not self-created. Strict compliance with government regulations regarding setbacks, frontage, height, bulk density and so forth will reasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose.

The requested variance is a minimum variance necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to the other property owners in the district and it will not cause an adverse effect on the surrounding properties. In fact, I think it will enhance them.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion and a second, any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. ROSE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Brings us to Case No. 11, PZ14-0018, Sky Zone, 46890 Magellan Drive. Please state and spell your name and raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

MS. DAGOSTINI: My name is Maria, M-a-r-i-a Dagostini, D-a-g-o-s-t-i-n-i.

MR. GHANNAM: Are you an attorney?

MS. DAGOSTINI: I am.

MR. GHANNAM: See, I can pick them out. You don't need to be sworn.

MS. DAGOSTINI: I'm not here in an official capacity.

MR. GHANNAM: It doesn't matter, you took your oath after the bar exam, you're fine.

MS. DAGOSTINI: Good evening. I'm here representing Dagostini Land Company, who is the landlord of the proposed 80,000 square foot building located off Magellan
Dagostini Land Company is requesting a variance from Section 2505 to allow for a reduction in parking to -- for the proposed site plan. The building that's proposed is a multi- -- it's a two-unit industrial building. Sky Zone would be occupying 25,600 square feet approximately. The remaining space is speculative building. There has not been a user identified for the remaining 48,000 square feet. That 48,000 square feet is comprised of approximately 80,000 square feet of office, which is two floors, two floors.

When going through the plan review and building review process, the building department initially determined that the Sky Zone portion of the building, based on its unique -- Sky Zone is an indoor trampoline park, in case you didn't know. Sky Zone's unique assembly use, they determined that it would require -- the site would require in its entirety 290 spaces. However, included in your packet, Sky Zone submitted a study concluded that only three spaces for every 1,000 square feet of space would be necessary, and contractually they only required us to provide them 100 spaces for their portion. One hundred and ten spaces were provided for the Sky Zone portion. If you look on -- at the bottom of the site plan that was also included in your packet, there is a little parking lot breakdown on page two of the site plan. It's towards the bottom middle portion.

So with that said, 110 spaces were provided for the Sky Zone portion. With respect to the speculative portion of the building, parking was calculated for ordinance, which for the shop warehouse is 700 -- the space divided by 700 square feet, which yields 57 spaces for the industrial warehouse shop portion, and based off the ordinance, 38 spaces for the office.

So with the -- considering the study, along with the ordinance calculations, 205 spaces were required for the site, 230 spaces were provided in our proposed site plan. So we're asking or we're respectfully requesting a reduction to those 230 spaces.
indicated in its plan review reports that they would support a variance for same, so we respectfully ask that a variance be granted.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

Anybody in the audience have any comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Mr. Secretary, can you read any correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: We have eight mailed notices, zero returns, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Mr. Walsh, anything from the city?

MR. WALSH: No comments at this time.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: I just had one question or a comment. How can you extrapolate all your findings from California to Michigan?

MS. DAGOSTINI: That is a good question. Sky Zone has indicated to us that all their users, they have the same hours, same -- their model for their business has been proven.

She, Colleen Fitzgerald, who unfortunately isn't here tonight, she uses this formula for all her locations in southeastern Michigan and in -- she has space or facilities in New York, and they have proven to work for her. Sky Zone stands by their requirements and that's what they ask for, that's what we --

MR. SANGHVI: Are you from here, this area?

MS. DAGOSTINI: Yes, I'm from southeastern Michigan.

MR. SANGHVI: Then you know what happens in the winter here, as opposed to what happens in the winter in Sacramento or some such place like that.

MS. DAGOSTINI: Sure, no. It definitely gets cold and it snows. But keep in mind that his site has 230 spaces proposed.

The adjacent user will likely, very likely have hours that don't coincide with the Sky Zone's use. Sky Zone, their busiest time is on the weekends. And they have indicated in that study that the majority of their patrons come in groups, whether they be, you know, school buses, or just carpools. They don't have a lot of cars that frequent the facility, so --

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Welcome to Novi.

MS. DAGOSTINI: Thank you.

MR. GHANNAM: I have reviewed
City of Novi - Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting 6_10_14 - Vol I.txt

everything. I have no problem with the
request. I think it was very well put
together and presented. Also I do know that the plan
review also recommended final approval of
your site plan, assuming you get the variance
from the zoning board.
So with that in mind, I have
no problem with it and I will be supporting
it.

MS. DAGOSTINI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Entertain a
motion?

MR. GERBLICK: In Case No.
PZ14-0018, Sky Zone, I move that we grant the
variance as requested for 230 spaces on the
property, as there is unique circumstances or
physical conditions of the property such as
the shape and unique occupant of the
building, that the need of the variance is
not due to the applicant's personal and
economic difficulty.
The need is not self-created
and strict compliance with regulations
governing area setback, frontage, height,
built, density and 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 other
property owners in the district.
And 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 and zoning district.

MR. GHANNAM: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Motion and
a second, any further discussion?
(NO audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing
none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairperson
Ferrell?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick?

MR. GERBLICK: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?

MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVII: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six
to zero.

MS. DAGOSTINI: Thank you.
Brings us to Case No. PZ14-0019, 44725 Grand River, Suite 204 Croskey Lanni.

You are welcome. Brings us to Case No. PZ14-0019, 44725 Grand River, Suite 204 Croskey Lanni. Come forward and state your name and spell it for the court reporter and then be sworn in by the secretary.

MR. SCHAFER: Maurice Schaefer, S-c-h-a-f-e-r.

MR. GHANNAM: Do you swear to tell the truth in Case PZ14-0019?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes, I do.

MR. GHANNAM: Please proceed.

MR. SCHAFER: We are requesting a sign up for the front of the building for reading Croskey Lanni and Company, PC. They are -- originally they are right now in Rochester, and they're expanding out here and they would like to have a nice presence on their building to grow their company out in the west area. We are asking for a 36.66 square foot of signage. This type of signage would be the reverse channel or a halo-lit sign, which is more of an architectural look, where the light comes out of the sign and reflects onto the wall behind it. There is no face lighting on the sign at all, and this is with LED lighting. We're just trying to get a presence on the building for visibility, you know, for this tenant that would be coming in, or that is in there now. They would like to build business in this area. I have one of the owners here, if you would like to hear from her.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Your presentation is done?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you. Anybody from the audience have any comments or questions?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Mr. Secretary can you read any correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: Yes. There were 14 mailed notices, three returns, zero approvals, zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Mr. Walsh, anything from the city?

MR. WALSH: No comments.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for discussion.

MR. SANGHVI: I just have one question. Who is or what is Croskey Lanni?

MS. JONES: May I speak?
MR. GHANNAM: You want to speak, just come to the podium, state your name and spell it, please.

MS. JONES: Carolyn Jones, C-a-r-o-l-y-n, J-o-n-e-s.

MR. GHANNAM: Can you raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm you will tell the truth in this case?

MS. JONES: I do.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MS. JONES: We are a CPA firm, been in the Rochester area for 25 years. We have a prominent client base in the west side of town and we are anxious to exert our present here in town.

MR. SANGHVI: Welcome to Novi.

MS. KRIEGER: Will you be occupying all of the building?

MS. JONES: We are occupying the majority of the second floor and right where the sign is located.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Anybody else? Entertain a motion?

MS. GRONACHAN: I have a question for the building department, Mr. Walsh.

What is the minimum sign that they would be allowed?

MR. WALSH: One sign by right, 24 square feet.

MS. GRONACHAN: That could be a ground sign or a building sign, correct?

MR. WALSH: That's correct.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: But there is going to be multiple tenants in this building?

MR. WALSH: My understanding, yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: So I need clarity in terms of what if the other tenant on the first floor wants a sign as well? So that's my -- that's where I'm having a problem with this. You're saying 24?

MR. WALSH: Twenty-four square feet.

MS. GRONACHAN: Back to what was the reasoning for the size of the lettering that you chose, for that size?

MR. SCHAFER: Well, we tried to keep it down, we are trying to get it down into the 24 square foot, but it's such a long name, and they're only 15-inch high letters. So they are small. That's one reason why, too, we are using the reverse channel and the halo light so that it's not pushing out at the light. It's suddenly against the wall. So that's kind of halo lighting around each letter.

It's more architectural for this type of a building, than what you would use at a party store or any other, you know,
commercial restaurant, stuff like that. They all have face lit letters, where this is an architectural design so it comes out to the back.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

MR. GHANNAM: Can't you get rid of one of the partners to put this name, or something? Actually, I don't have a problem necessarily with the size.

The problem, as I recall on this one, remind me, don't you have a ground sign?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes, we do.

MR. GHANNAM: You have names of tenants on that ground sign?

MS. ROSINSKI: Correct.

MR. GHANNAM: That faces Grand River, if I recall?

MS. ROSINSKI: Yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: I understand this is going to be -- well, let me ask you this. What percentage of the space of this tenant is occupying relative to the entire building?

MR. SCHAFER: I'm not sure. I think what they're trying to do -- it's not -- they're not, you know, the whole place, they're not the largest, but they're going to grow.

MR. GHANNAM: We can assume that.

Our problem is, I mean, I understand everybody wants signs. A lot of cities including Novi have restrictive sign ordinances. My question becomes what makes this property unique. It's not supposed to be for economic return. It's supposed to be for other reasons that you have been hearing us, you know, repeat all night. Because if you have other tenants, whether it be larger or even smaller ones, as the other board member says, what's to prevent them from coming and saying, I want my sign, too. That becomes very oppressive at that point, you follow?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes. The owner of the building itself is approving of this, to bring more business in for that tenant.

MR. SCHAFER: Right now they're occupying 15 percent of the building. But there is a lot of other tenants in there. And most of them are identified on the small ground sign also.

MR. GHANNAM: So it's relatively a small percentage of the building?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes, but there is
quite a few tenants in the building also.

MS. GRONACHAN: I understand that. Do you have larger tenants than this one?

UNIDENTIFIED: I believe there is one. There is one.

MR. SCHAFER: They're not looking for added identification. They have been here a while. This tenant, they're just trying to get known more out in this area because they're mainly in Rochester.

MR. GHANNAM: I understand that. I understand all of that, to be honest. Once we grant -- if the board grants a wall sign, it runs with the land and it's good indefinitely. Do you know what the term of this lease, of this particular tenant approximately?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Ma'am, state your name and spell it for the reporter.

MS. TRUPIANO: My name is Sue, S-u-e, Trupiano, T-r-u-p-i-a-n-o.

MS. GRONACHAN: Raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MS. TRUPIANO: Yes, I do.

MS. GRONACHAN: Give me an idea --

MS. TRUPIANO: I actually work for the owner of the building and basically we would be happy to take their name off the billboard sign that's in the front, the monument sign, to have them on the building. Basically they have a big presence over on the east side, and they have a clientele base here currently which there -- because we're -- where our building is placed, we are kind of like in the industrial part of Grand River and we are an office building that's sitting in there, so people just have to pass us right by. They're not looking for an office building to be where we are.

So when they came on board, you guys have a ten year lease with three five-year options. And basically, what they're looking to do is they're looking to establish a presence on the east side.

MS. GRONACHAN: I understand all of that. My reservation is you have got a relatively small tenant in this larger building. You have larger tenants and you're entitled to one ground sign. I understand that.

And the question becomes if we grant a variance, then that is good for this particular property indefinitely is my understanding.
We are not supposed to grant them simply for economic gain and to draw in business. The question is the uniqueness, other factors that we look at. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

MS. TRUPIANO: They have come into the building basically looking to take more space, but in order for them to do that, they need to create a bigger client base on this side, the west side, so --

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other discussion?

MS. KRIEGER: For the city, for the Croskey Lanni, can we grant the 26 by 15, and if they at some point in time, they decide that they're not going to be in this area, that some other business can fit their lettering into that area?

MS. SAARELA: I don't believe the request is specifically relating to size, it's for an additional sign. So what we are granting is an additional sign.

I don't think the size is what's -- the relevant issue here. You are able to limit it to this tenant for signage purposes.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I thought the sign -- the maximum size was 24 square feet, they're asking for 32 square feet, it would be a bigger sign, correct?

MS. GRONACHAN: Is the variance -- they are asking for a variance in the size as well, and for an additional sign.

MS. SAARELA: So I mean, you can reduce the size. I mean, it's not something that has to be agreed to by the applicant.

So if you felt the 24 was appropriate, you just want to grant the variance for the additional sign, that would be something that you could do without getting an approval.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I have one question. The size of the sign -- of the address on the building, how much difference is it with the lettering that you're -- pretty similar with the same size? Are they letters with the bigger --

MR. SCHAFER: The address is smaller in height-wise than what the letters are, yes.

MS. GRONACHAN: My recommendation to the board would be this. Something for the petitioner to ponder or to consider, if you will. My recommendation would be to have the sign removed, have your name removed off the ground sign, and add your name onto the building for the 24 square feet, based on
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your presentation before us this evening,

stating that you're trying for

identification. I understand that this is an

office building in an industrial area, and if

you're trying to bring people into it,

unidentifying the building for the business,

I get that. What I can't support is for

the economic reason.

I can support identification,

the uniqueness of the building. I can

support a reduced signage, if you remove it

off the ground sign, to the 24 square feet.

And that's what I would recommend to my

fellow board members.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.

I agree with removing the sign from the

monument sign.

The size of the lettering, I

mean, you want to name the building, then you

can be stuck with that on it. I guess that

is up to you guys, it's your building. The

size might be a little too big.

I would be in favor of

reducing it at least a little even down to

four feet, maybe a little bit bigger. I

think esthetically it would look better, if

it was a little bit larger. How large, I'm

not sure.

If you guys would be willing,

I know we can pretty much give off for

something, if you want to approve it. If

there is something, you would be willing to

take a little bit lesser of a size, let us

know, maybe work with that.

MR. SCHAFER: We could probably

work with 30 square foot.

MS. KRIEGER: We have to revise

for that?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: No.

MS. JONES: Could I offer, we are

known as Croskey Lanni, PC. If we took the

company off, could we take the same height

and then bring it down, so it's less

obtrusive.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Say it

again, I'm sorry.

MS. JONES: We are known as

Croskey Lanni PC. If we had to leave the

company off to have that increased size, and,

you know, we wouldn't be as obtrusive, maybe

our lettering could be the same size, but it

wouldn't cover such as a large --

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: The picture

I have here doesn't have the PC part on it.

That's what you're talking about?

MS. JONES: It should. And

company.

MR. SCHAFER: What she would like
to do is take and company off, which would
reduce it down well below --
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I don't
have a copy of the picture you're looking at.
MS. TRUPIANO: Can I say
something. It is just Croskey Lanni. It's
not Croskey Lanni --
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Is that it,
just 32 square feet?
MS. TRUPIANO: See, this is
just --
MS. GRONACHAN: If you could hold
on one second. Whoever put these packets
together, they just -- in the upper left it's
titled option B. What was given to us in
our packets says option C. And the one that
gave us, just handed to us now, it says
29-foot by 4 inches by 15 inches, versus 26
that came with our packets.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: So option B
is bigger, but I don't know how many square
foot that is.
MR. WALSH: Option C is what they
submitted.
MR. GHANNAM: That references the
32.5?
MR. WALSH: That's correct.
MR. GERBLICK: That's what you
guys wanted was --
MS. JONES: Yes.
MR. GERBLICK: Just this, okay.
MR. SCHAFER: I'm sure that will
be in the area.
MS. TRUPIANO: This is an
established logo for them on the east side.
You know, it's present on their current
buildings that they have over there.
So that's why we can't it from
this, and obviously, we took like basically a
photo image of what they had on their
building there. And we had cut this down,
and obviously, the original copy they
submitted to us, I sent it back and said, no,
we want to go with exactly what their logo is
on the east side.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: For the
board, I don't know what anybody wants to
discuss. Like what size would be acceptable.
You guys' opinions.
MS. KRIEGER: I'm okay with
Croskey Lanni.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: At 32
square feet?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. GRONACHAN: Well, the
petitioner already said that he would go down
to 30. If that was possible, I would like to
see less, with the petitioner removing their
name off the ground sign, if this is going to
be on the front of the building. He already
agreed to it.
MR. GERBLICK: I agree with the agreement removing the ground sign.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I would be in favor of limiting the sign to this tenant as well for the term of the lease.

Mr. Gerblick: I'm okay with the 30 square feet, it's less, removing the name off the ground sign.

Anybody else? Make a motion?

Mr. Gerblick: It Case No. PZ14-0019, Croskey Lanni, I move that we grant a variance restricted to a 30 square foot wall sign limited to the lease term of this tenant as well as the condition of removing the existing sign off the ground sign for this business.

I move we grant this variance based on circumstances or features that are exceptional and unique to the property and do not result in conditions that exist generally in the city, or that are self-created.

This building is located in an industrial area, as well as on Grand River Road, which has low traffic and difficulty for visibility.

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 economic or financial return.

And the grant of the relief will not result in a use of the 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 and surrounding properties and is not inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance.

Chairperson Ferrell: Did you add it's limited to just this tenant?

Mr. Gerblick: Yes.

Ms. Gronachan: Second.

Chairperson Ferrell: Motion and a second, any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

Chairperson Ferrell: Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski can you call the roll.

Ms. Saarelä: Was there someone that stated ground sign versus wall sign?

Mr. Gerblick: For this business, removal of the ground sign to limit the business to one sign.

Ms. Pawlowski: Chairperson Ferrell?

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Ms. Pawlowski: Member Gerblick?

Mr. Gerblick: Yes.

Ms. Pawlowski: Member Ghannam?
MR. GHANNAM: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gronachan?
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?
MR. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.
MR. SCHAFER: One sign 30 square feet?
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Yes.
MR. SCHAFER: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: And removal of the ground sign lettering is okay?
MS. TRUPIANO: The 15-inch is okay?
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: As long as it's within the square footage, 30 square feet.
MR. SCHAFER: Thank you for working with us.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: No problem. Have a good night.

Moves us to Case No. 13, PZ14-0020, 1171 East Lake Drive. State your name and spell it for the reporter. Then be sworn in by the secretary.
MR. KWAPIS: My name is Eric Kwapis, Kwapis, K-w-a-p-i-s.
MR. GHANNAM: Sir, in Case PZ14-0020, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?
MR. KWAPIS: Yes.
MR. GHANNAM: Please proceed.
MR. KWAPIS: I am the architect representing McDonalds. We came before the board a couple months ago and had approval of keeping and doing an addition to this existing house. At the time, we are advised as part of our written statement that if there was an issue with the foundation, we would have to come back before the board. In further exploration of the existing foundation, we are trying to accommodate the expansion with the use of existing foundation, but we found that it was going to be difficult, expensive -- well, anyhow at least difficult for that use. And if you're going to construct and spend all of this money and time, to redo this whole house, we thought it would better to have a better foundation for the construction purposes of the house. So that's why we are back here before the board at this time.
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Thank you.
Anybody in the audience have any comments?
(No audible responses.)
CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Seeing none, Mr. Secretary, can you read in the correspondence.

MR. GHANNAM: Yes. We have 15 mailed notices, zero return mail, two approvals, and zero objections.

The approvals are from the following. The first one is from Mike Milazzo, M-i-l-a-z-z-o, 1175 East Lake Drive, dated 6/6/14. "I, Michael Milazzo approve of Anne Marie and Chris McDonald's construction of a new single family home on 1171 East Lake Drive. Understanding that they will be using the existing footprint, I have no objections and have reviewed the plans with Anne Marie and Chris, the homeowners". Signed.

The second one is from Carol Kernan, K-e-r-n-a-n, 1167 East Lake Drive, dated 6/10/2014. It indicates, "I, Carol Kernan, have reviewed the plans for the construction of a new single family home at 1171 East Lake Drive. I understand that Chris and Anne Marie McDonald will be using the existing footprint and attached the existing garage. I approve the construction of their new home".

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Mr. Walsh, any comments from the city?

MR. WALSH: I just wanted to ask the petitioner to come back to the board due to the -- as you recall, earlier this year, they came in for an addition and the existing foundation wasn't capable to support the new loads, so basically, we are going to have a new house, existing footprint, what's out there today.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Open it up to the board for discussion.

MR. GHANNAM: Yes. I personally have reviewed this. I see no problem with it.

Again, I mentioned to you before, we have had a few on East Lake tonight. But we have had a number in the past and we understand that narrowness of these lots they are old, they don't really comply with the new ordinances, setbacks and so forth, it's impossible to build a new house and comply with the current ordinances. So given what you have presented seems appropriate under the circumstances, so I will be in support. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I am as well, since you're using the same footprint. I have no problem supporting it.

Anybody else?

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: A motion?
In Case No. PZ14-0020, 1171 East Lake Drive, I move that we grant the variance as requested, and there are unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property such as narrowness and shape, and the need of the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficulty. The need is not self-created and strict compliance with regulations governing area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density and other dimensional requirements will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for its permitted purpose or 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 other property owners in the district and the requested variance will not cause an adverse impact on the surrounding property or property values use and enjoyment of the property.

Second.

Any further discussion?

Chairperson Ferrell: Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Chairperson Ferrell: Seeing none, Ms. Pawlowski, can you call the roll.

Chairperson Ferrell: Chairperson Ferrell?

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Yes.

Chairperson Ferrell: Motion passes six to zero.

Chairperson Ferrell: Thank you. Take us back to Case No. 5, PZ14-0012, for 44050 Stone Ridge Office Park. So we table that --

Chairperson Ferrell: Motion and a second, all in favor say aye.

Chairperson Ferrell: All opposed?

Chairperson Ferrell: Seeing none, it's tabled.
Motion to adjourn?

MS. GRONACHAN: Not yet.

MS. KRIEGER: Other matters.

MR. SANGHVI: I will further suggest to (inaudible) Member Ghannam to be secretary, at the time of the election, and if he wants to discontinue, that is okay with me.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: I think he's doing a fine job.

MS. KRIEGER: Me, too.

MR. GHANNAM: I have no problem serving my city and my country, and state for that matter.

I have no problem. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: Any other matters?

MR. SANGHVI: Motion to adjourn.

MR. GHANNAM: Second.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON FERRELL: We are adjourned.

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