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CHAIRMAN IBE: Good evening and welcome to the January 8, 2013 City of Novi Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Please all rise for the Pledge of
Allegiance. Member Krieger, can you please lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you.

For those of you who are interested in the agenda for today's meeting, it can be found in the back of the room.

And just so you understand, the -- today we do have a member that is not here, however, we do have a quorum, so all the decisions that are made today will be fine.

If anyone would like to have a full board present, they may have the discretion to have their case tabled for another time.

However, any decision today will be final.

Ms. Pawlowski, please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gerblick is absent, excused.

Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Ibe?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Present.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Here.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Sanghvi is absent.

Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: Here.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Here.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you. Now, when you're called up for presentation of your case, please remember to state your full name, spell your last name, and if you are not an attorney, raise your hand to be sworn. Now, the applicants are allowed five minutes to make a presentation. And at the discretion of the chair, you will be given additional time to make a presentation.

Do we have any changes to the agenda for today?

MS. PAWLOWSKI: No.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, can I get a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. GHANNAM: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. SKELCY: Second.

CHAIRMAN IBE: All those in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IBE: All opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, the agenda is hereby adopted.
We will now open the public remarks section. Is there anyone who would like to make a comment? A comment is anything that's unrelated to any specific case before the board this evening, but any comments at all.

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, we will close that and we will move onto our first case for today.

That would be Case No. PZ-12-0053, for 40623 Nine Mile Road.

Seeing that the applicant is already there. Sir, you are not an attorney, raise your right hand, to be sworn.

MR. MARTIN: Louis Anthony Martin, 22327 Sunrise Boulevard, Novi 48375.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0053, do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Thank, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to speak with you tonight and Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Our case before you tonight is we are requesting a variance to allow the installation of a second subdivision entrance sign at the Whispering Meadows subdivision.

We have approximately 350 homes in our subdivision. We're the second oldest...
The reason I tell you that is because as our subdivision became built out, the need for a secondary sign became apparent. That took the course of many years. We have a main sign coming into the subdivision off of Sunrise Boulevard. Our secondary entrance on Mill Road does not have a sign, although, our subdivision grew that way, on the south portion of Novi along Nine Mile heading westerly.

So what we are looking to do is put a small sign off of Nine Mile, on Mill. That is the application that you see before you. Thank you.

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to make a comment regarding this particular case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none -- I'm sorry? Were you going to say something?

MR. MARTIN: No.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, I will ask Madam Secretary to read into the record any correspondence that was received.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No.
PZ-12-0053, 35 were mailed, one returned, one approval, zero objections.

The approval is "In an effort to make this subdivision more attractive and comparable to other subdivisions along Nine Mile Road from Haggerty to Beck Road, I am in favor of placement of this sign, as long as it doesn't interfere with site distance and the landscaping around the sign, it completed to match the east entrance." That's from Matt Parks.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will now turn to the city for any comment they may have?

MR. BOULARD: Mr. Chairman, happy to stand by for questions.

The staff comments did note that as a suggested condition, for consideration that, if the sign ever needs to be removed, for expansion of the road in the neighborhood, and so, they should be responsible for that.

And also that the location within the right-of-way be approved by the Department of Public Services. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Mr. Boulard.

City attorney have any comments?

MS. SAARELA: Nothing to add to Page 7
CHAIRMAN IBE: Very well. We will now open it up to the board for discussion.

Yes, Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: I don't think that -- wow, this is really loud.

I don't think that you have explained well enough for me, why you feel you need a second sign.

I know you said that it became apparent, but it's not so apparent to me. Could you go into more detail, please.

MR. MARTIN: I think there is several things that our residents feel strongly about in that area.

There are kind of two ways to approach it.

First, the residents in Mill Court east and west subdivisions of Whispering Meadows, have always felt that since the beginning of the subdivision, there was a promise from the board for an identification of a subdivision entrance at their entrance, to demark it, to make it easier for them to in the evening be able to let people know that, hey, you're turning at the second sign, when you see the first Whispering Meadows sign.

So there was an expectation to
the residents at that point in time.
When I took over the board six, seven years ago, we heard strongly from the residents that that's what they would want in our annual meetings.
Secondly, I think there is -- conformity is much too strong of a word, but many of our residents also feel there are several subdivisions that do have signs at each entrance, which would make it equal to some of the other subdivisions.
So really from the perspective of our community, those are the two things that resonate with us the most.

MS. SKELCY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes?
MS. SAARELA: Before I guess we go forward and ask any further questions, I just would want to clarify that the actual variance is because the sign is in the public right-of-way not because it's a second sign. The issue of the second sign is really not relevant to the question.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, city attorney for having to clarify that issue.
Do we have any additional comments from members? Yes, Member Ghannam?
MR. GHANNAM: Yes, I have no problem with it. I know my subdivision has two signs. I live down the street in Chase
Farms. I drive up and down Nine Mile all the time. I understand the need.

Here we are only worried about the right-of-way as long as the Department of Public Services has no problem and the subdivision agrees to remove it, if necessary, for road or other improvements. I have got no problem with that.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I know as a board we would absolutely acquiesce to the stipulation that we would remove or relocate the sign should there be sidewalks or roads -- I'd like to say for the record, if there were a sidewalk, we would be overjoyed. But happy to remove that.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you. Any additional comments or questions?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing no additional questions or comments, I will entertain a motion.

Yes?

MR. GHANNAM: I'll go ahead and make a motion in item number one, Case No. PZ-12-0053 for 40263 Nine Mile Road.

I move that we grant the motion -- or strike that.

I move that we grant the petition as requested, with the condition that if the sign needs to be moved as a result of any
conflict of future road or pathway improvements, it would borne at the expense of the subdivision.

Number one, the circumstances are unique and the physical conditions of the property, such as the narrowness, shape and so forth, this isn't to necessitate in the variance. The need is not self-created. Strict compliance with the regulations governing the area setback and so forth will render the conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome.

The requested variance is the minimum variance requested necessary to do substantial justice and it will not cause adverse impact of surrounding properties.

MS. KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing that a motion has been made and seconded, do we have any further discussion regarding the motion? Seeing none, I will ask the recording secretary to please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDeon: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Ibe?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Skelcy?
MS. SKELCY: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Congratulations.
MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much for your time, we appreciate it. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IBE: That will bring us to our second case for today. Case No. PZ-12-0054, 23925 East Lebost.

Will the applicant please come to the podium. Please and state and spell your name for the record.

If you are not an attorney, please raise your right hand and you will be sworn. Thank you.

MS. RESSEGUIE: Karen Resseguie, R-e-s-s-e-g-u-i-e.
MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0054, do you swear or firm to tell the truth?

MS. RESSEGUIE: I do.
MS. KRIEGER: Are you all going to speak?
MS. RESSEGUIE: They will.
MS. KRIEGER: If you could also
add your names and spell them, please, please.

MR. VICKSTROM: Kenneth Vickstrom, V, as in Victor, i-c-k-s-t-r-o-m.
MR. LEE: Kevin Lee, L-e-e.
MS. KRIEGER: Thank you. In Case No. PZ-12-0054, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?
MR. VICKSTROM: I do.
MR. LEE: I do.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Please go ahead.
MS. RESSEGUIE: The reason for our meeting today is to approve a variance for the carport that I have put up.
CHAIRMAN IBE: I'm sorry? Are you done?
MS. RESSEGUIE: Well, we are here to ask for the variance of the existing carport. I got the structure. I have got the builder here. I have got photographs supporting that the old carport was very dangerous. It's a rental property. It supports that it was ready to fall down.
The house was built in 1953, and at the time when the home was built, they actually put the gas line through the roof of the carport and on the outside structure.
Due to the carport being in so -- in bad shape, I have a family in there of five with three young children, it's a hazard.
that it was going to fall down, if it did
fall down, it could have did damage to the
gas line, it could have caused an explosion,
so we are asking today to be able to move
forward and --

MR. LEE: Is there a way we could
put these pictures up on the projector?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes.

MR. LEE: Is there a focus on
this, or are we doing something wrong?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Could be both.

MR. LEE: Does anybody know how
to work this?

(A pause was had in the proceedings.)

MR. LEE: Let me start with this picture here.

At the beginning of what we had
come across. Initially it had a flat roof on
it, you can see all the water damage on the
roof. It was pretty much just about ready to
fall in.

At that point, the homeowners
decided they wanted to take it off, and
something put back in its same place.

This picture here shows the gas
meter in the location right next to a support
pole.

We took some steps to get that
gas meter moved, and that's now in the back
of the house in a better location.
And this main gas line was running through the soffit of the carport, so if that structure had fallen in, that would have taken that gas line with it and caused some serious problems.

So we decided -- or the homeowners decided they wanted to go ahead and remove that carport, put one back in its place, and take the necessary steps to move the gas meter.

So what we had done -- or I had done, was when I had put a carport on it, in its exact location, I think it's 16 inches longer than the original one, but for the most part, it's the same width, the same length, and it carries the same roof line as the old home.

Since the home was approved for a two car garage six years ago, the homeowners felt we could just go ahead and take the old one off, put a new one on there.

It was quite evident that if this one held up through the next snow load or any snow load at all, so we went ahead and took it off, and put this one on.

That's where we are at. There is a picture of the gable end. That's basically the same size as the old one.

So we are asking for approval of the variance, so that we can continue on and
get this thing finished.

MS. RESSEGUIE: I also would like
to point out the home was up for sale, and I
actually lost the sale of the home due to the
inspection.

I have documentations supporting
from my realtor, as well as the other
purchasing buyer at the time, indicating that
the reason that they were forfeiting on the
sale was due to the carport, as it was very
hazardous, it was ready to fall down, and
therefore, they were declining my sale.

At that time, I did go ahead and
move forward with it becoming a rental
property.

So I have supporting
documentation that says that it was
dangerous, and like I said, I'm going to
reiterate, that there was a family of five in
there, they have three young children, if
that would have fallen down, I can't even
imagine the horribleness that I would feel,
any anyone else.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you. Do you
have any additional comments?

MS. RESSEGUIE: No. We have
photos that support that a gas line has been
moved into the back of house where it's
supposed to be, because it didn't meet code.

I also have photographs
supporting that because of the age of the subdivision, there are other homes in there that do have this same situation that I do, where the actual gas line runs through the roof line of the carport, so if they were to move or it was to fall down, they're going to run across the same situation that I was in.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to make a remark regarding this particular case?

Please, sir, come to the podium, when you do, state your first and last name and spell your last name.

If you're not an attorney, please raise your right hand to be sworn in.

MR. STOTLER: My name is Tim Stotler, S-t-o-t-l-e-r.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0054, do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. STOTLER: Yes.

I come as a resident. I live right down the street, a little bit farther south of this home, on East Lebost.

The work that they have already done, it looks good. I like the fact that they carried the roof line equal with the roof instead of going with a flat roof.
The investment in their home here is an investment in our entire Willowbrook subdivision as a whole, and not only is this investment an investment in their property, but also brings up the property values of the rest of the homes in our residence -- in our subdivision.

So as a resident, I ask that you guys would consider passing or approving their request for the variance because I think it brings value to all of our homes. Not only that, but I drive by it just about every day. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, sir. I will ask our secretary to read into the record any correspondence received.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0054, 68 were mailed, zero returned, zero approvals, zero objections. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will now turn to the city for any comments.

MR. BOULARD: I would just like to clarify one point.

The new carport is larger than the existing -- or the previously existing carport by a certain width. I think it's about 16 or 18.

MR. LEE: Yes, I stated it was
MR. BOULARD: I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Mr. Boulard. Does the city attorney have any comments?
MS. SAARELA: No.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, I will open it up to the board for discussion. Yes, Member Ghannam.
MR. GHANNAM: I just had a question for the city. The original carport, was that allowed when it was originally built?
MR. BOULARD: The original -- the home was constructed in what would be the current front setback, it was existing non-conforming.
I could not find a previous variance or a permit for that carport, so I'm not sure when it was built.
MR. GHANNAM: Was that the non-conformity that was referenced in our paperwork?
MR. BOULARD: Well, that and the fact that the entire house and the old carport are in the front setback.
So the previous carport was my understanding actually extended further into the front setback than the current
replacement was.

MR. GHANNAM: Okay.

My comments to you are just generally, what you're requesting, ma'am, makes complete sense.

My only criticism is that you did it without, you know, permits and approvals from the city first, as well as coming to the zoning board.

I know you may not have believed you needed it or thought of it, but that is what is required.

Now you built it, now the question becomes, you know, trying to get approval for what you have already done.

That's my only criticism.

But what you are requesting makes sense. I mean, I agree with it personally. So I mean, although it was done after -- you know, or prior to coming to here, I still would be willing to support it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Member Ghannam.

Any additional comments or questions?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, I will entertain a motion.

MS. SKELCY: I move in the Case of PZ-12-0054, located at 23925 East Lebost,
that we grant the variance as requested, which is to allow construction of an attached carport with a reduced front setback of 25 feet and an aggregate side setback of 19.5 feet, such that there is a 5.5-foot variance being requested for the aggregate side setback.

I make the motion based upon the fact that there are unique circumstances and physical conditions of the property, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, topography and other similar conditions.

The need is not self-created. There is strict compliance with regulations governing the area setback, frontage, height, bulk, density and other dimensional requirements 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 as well as to other property owners in the district.

In fact, we had a neighbor come forward and explain that he believes that there is an increased property value based on the fact that the carport had been added.

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

MR. GEDEON: Second.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing that a motion has been made and seconded, is there any further reason to --

MS. KRIEGER: Don't forget permits. Thanks.

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you. Please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Ibe?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Congratulations.

MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN IBE: We'll now turn our
third case for tonight. That's Case No. PZ-12-0055, 39595 Ten Mile Road.
Will the applicant please come to the podium, please state your first and last and spell your last name.
And if you are not an attorney, please raise your right hand to be sworn.
MS. ZAID: I'm Eden Zaid, E-d-e-n, Z-a-i-d.
MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0055, do you swear to tell the truth in this case?
MS. ZAID: I do.
MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.
MS. LEIGHTON: Jeff Leighton, L-e-i-g-h-t-o-n.
MS. KRIEGER: In same case number, Case No. PZ-12-0055, do you swear to tell the truth in this case?
MR. LEIGHTON: Yes.
MS. ZAID: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
My husband and I are the owners of the Holly Hill professional village on West Ten Mile Road. And we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you tonight. Jeffrey Leighton is the CFO of National Diagnostics, one of our major tenants in the complex.
We are requesting a variance
which will allow the mobile heart monitor trailer to remain on our property for up to 48 hours.

It has been doing so since 2004 and there was a variance granted previously, however, the prior owner let it lapse and did not renew it, and so we are trying to recoup what's already been granted.

Since he already received the application and permit information, I won't go through too much detail unless you have questions.

This variance was granted in 2004. When we purchased the three buildings this last summer, there was only 60 percent occupancy, and we have a great need for remodeling and repairs and we can't really afford to lose one our major tenants.

Mr. Kaslick (phonetic), the owner of National Diagnostics, was going to be here, but something came up at the last minute, and Jeff Leighton was kind enough to come in his place.

He incurred a great deal of expense installing the concrete pad, the underground electrical wiring and plumbing and conduits and everything needed for this trailer and worked very closely with the City of Novi and met all the requirements and has been a model tenant, not just for the short
time we have been there, but through the records over the last eight years, ten years.

Mr. Kaslick will have no choice but to relocate his business outside of Novi, where it won't be a problem for his trailer to be operable and easily accessible for his business. His trailer is essential to his business.

He's also valuable to our other tenants, who are mostly physicians, and uses the services that he provides, which are MRIs, CAT scans, heart monitoring, wellness, all kinds of services in the medical field of which are -- buildings are medical buildings, so most of the professionals network with each other.

Plans are underway to remodel the outside of the building, replace the current parking lot, and we hope to start this spring.

We are doing everything possible to improve the curb appeal, to attract additional tenants to the complex to bring pride to the City of Novi.

It's a great location by the Jaguar dealership, Ten Mile and Novi, but the building is over 30 years old and has never been upgraded, maintained and taken care of.

It's in pretty bad shape.

We are going to -- we are working
with the city right now with plans to make it
go upwards higher, improve, redo the parking
lot, it's in very bad shape, the landscaping.

But we are basically taking the
money out of the complex, putting it back
into the complex and National Diagnostics are
a great tenant. We really hate to lose them.
I don't think that Novi would probably like
to lose them either.

We are all here to do what's in
the best interest of the City of Novi, its
residents and the businesses that make Novi
the dynamic and prospering city that it is
today.

Denying this variance will be a
hardship in the following ways: Loss of
income that would be used to upgrade and
improve the property. Loss of revenue to the
City of Novi, loss of services to tenants in
the already struggling complex. Relocation
of a business that is doing well, providing
valuable services to the residents of Novi
and loss of jobs.

I want to thank you for allowing
me to say this, and also that I worked for
City of Novi about 35 years ago, when you
were a two-story bi-level building over on
Paul Bunyan, by Twelve Oaks, when they were
building Twelve Oaks, and coming here the
last few months has been amazing, with the
building, the people, the growth, and it's phenomenal. I'm really proud to be part of Novi in some way, be a business, or otherwise, but we do want our complex to succeed and we need your help to keep our tenants so that we don't get demoralized. The tenants -- we already have some empty parking lots, some of the buildings are half empty.

We want cars to drive by and see lots of cars, hustle and bustle, people in and out and by keeping National Diagnostics with us and not forcing them out, because of this variance, that would be so helpful and appreciated.

That's all I have to say.

MR. LEIGHTON: Just to give you a little bit of information on National Diagnostics.

We are a diagnostic mobile medical service company. We specialize in early detection cardiovascular disease. We're probably one of the largest, if not the largest, mobile diagnostic service in Michigan, and we are glad to be housed here in Novi.

We have up to about 75 employees.

I just kind of want to reiterate what Eden said. It is very important for us to get
this variance for a couple reasons, so we can continue to have lower rates for the medical services, when we can bring the community members to us, instead of having them go to the hospital and incur the abundance of cost there. And also for the local physicians. And usually it's about one to two days every other week while we are there.

MS. ZAID: Yes, the 48 hours is totally the maximum. They're usually there one day a week. They want the 48 hours because sometimes weather prevents them from hauling out as quick as they like and so on. But at the present time, they are only using them one day a week. We don't want to be in violation. We want to always be in compliance, so the two days will make sure we are always in compliance.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you.

MS. ZAID: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment regarding this particular case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Well, seeing none, I will ask Madam Secretary to read into the record any correspondence.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0055, 41 were mailed, four returned, one approval, zero objections.
The approval is "National Diagnostics provides needed services to a large patient population. Their presence in our complex adds value to our practice and increases flow to our building. We would appreciate any ordinances that aide them in remaining a tenant in our complex. Two days a week is not a long time." From Prime Care of Novi, Theodore -- I can't make out his name either. Shiley (phonetic).

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will now turn to the city for any comment they have.

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add.

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you, Mr. Boulard.

City attorney?

MS. SAARELA: Nothing other than

if you are considering granting the variance, to look at the scope of limiting it to the tenant, the term and the number of days per week.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you. I will now open it up to the board for discussion.

Yes, Member Ghannam.

MR. GHANNAM: Actually, that's what I had on my mind.

How long is your lease for?

MS. ZAID: It's the end of 2014.
MR. GHANNAM: And with what counsel was just indicating, is that what do you have a problem limiting it with your tenancy, whether it be currently, or if you extended the lease or signed a new lease, limiting it to that?

MS. LEIGHTON: That would be a portion of it, yes. The mobile diagnostic trailer coming there is a big part of our business, especially in support for the other doctors, especially that it's housed in a certain area there and in the same complex.

MR. GHANNAM: And I presume that these are the types of tests that you can't inside of the building?

MS. LEIGHTON: No, all the equipment is inside affixed in the mobile, the CT scans.

MR. GHANNAM: When did the other temporary use permit -- when did that expire?

MS. ZAID: Mr. Ghannam, I don't believe it was a temporary one. It did expire, but I think it was a permanent one.

MR. GHANNAM: That's the nature of temporary, it can expire. That's what I'm thinking.

MR. BOULARD: I believe it was 2004.

MR. GHANNAM: 2004, okay.

And although you requested 48
hours in a particular calendar week, are there specific days that you would be there --

MS. LEIGHTON: It could be two weeks in a row, it could be two days, or it could be every other week.

MR. GHANNAM: My question is, if you came in a particular week, would it be always Monday, Tuesday or two particular days or does that vary within the week?

MS. LEIGHTON: That would vary.

MR. GHANNAM: That would vary. So you would have a hard time having us limit it to two particular days of the week?

MS. LEIGHTON: Yes. We are at 1,400 physicians throughout Michigan besides that location.

MR. GHANNAM: This is simply a trailer that sits in the parking lot, I presume?

MS. LEIGHTON: Yes.

MR. GHANNAM: When it sits in the parking lot, when you're there, when you come in, let's say on a Monday, it will be for there for, let's say, a 24 hour period, then it would leave?

MS. LEIGHTON: Yes.

MR. GHANNAM: You don't sit there and bring it back and forth --

MR. LEIGHTON: No, too costly.
MS. ZAID: It's actually not even in the parking lot. It is right next to the building. They built their own concrete pad, and it sits right flush to the building, so it's not even taking up parking space or sticking out in the parking lot causing anyone trouble seeing behind it or getting through it.

MR. GHANNAM: I personally have no problem with it, sir.

I agree -- actually we did grant one of these before. I want to say it was at Meadowbrook at Eleven Mile, that medical building there. I don't know if your company services that building. I remember it was some type of diagnostic testing. It was several years ago.

But I have no problem with it. I do agree that it should be limited to 48 hours within a calendar week. And it would only be good during your company's particular tenancy, as opposed to, for example, if your company left, any new potential tenant that would replace you, would need to come in and seek another variance, if they needed it.

I would be in support of that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes, Member Gedeon?
MR. GEDEON: My question is for the city, for more details about the particular ordinance at issue.

Is the concern that there is a trailer at the -- in the business district where it’s not permitted or what is the actual violation?

MR. BOULARD: The concern in this case is that we’ve got a former site plan that didn’t include this work and now there is a trailer being parked in a fairly prominent location throughout a number of days of the week.

So does that answer your question?

MR. GEDEON: It’s because this is OS-1, but if this was an industrial property, there would be no issue with parking a trailer there?

MR. BOULARD: Yes, if it was an I-2, right, there would not be.

MR. GEDEON: So presumably the ordinance doesn’t go into details what about the trailer is, it would just have your trailer in OS-1 regardless of what type of trailer it is, it’s just not a permitted use?

MR. BOULARD: To essentially have a trailer stored or sitting there for an extended periods of time, would not be
allowed in this district.

MR. GEDEON: What if -- hypothetical here, in like building sites, where there is a temporary office building, you know, like a construction office that gets pulled in, is that -- would that fall under the same definition of a trailer?

MR. BOULARD: It would, and that's the temporary use process that's referred to. They originally did that back in 2002.

The caveat there is those are allowed for the duration of the construction project or for undeveloped sites for a maximum of six months, plus a six month extension. Beyond that, it's in the purview of the ZBA to extend that. That's why they came to the ZBA in '03, the former owners, and that's why they're back here now.

MR. GEDEON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: I have a further follow-up question.

So is the term extended defined in the ordinance, and are you reading it to say extended like because it's one or two days every week over a period of years?

MR. BOULARD: The ordinance allows the six months, plus the six month -- excuse me. I misspoke.
One year plus a one year extension for developed parcels. I apologize.

Beyond that, essentially what the ZBA would be doing would be granting a variance from that limitation on the temporary use.

MS. SKELCY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Quick comment. I have no problem with your application as well.

And I understand that this service that is being provided is an essential one. And also you are truly (unintelligible) money for the local businesses and many of the doctors in the area, as well as the patients. So this really is a win-win situation.

This is not a nuisance, concerning the fact it's only there for 24 to 48 a week. And so I have no problem supporting your application.

Do we have any additional questions or comments?

Yes, Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: On the application, it says two days and two nights, so -- and you indicated, Ms. Zaid, that you're going to -- like if it's there on a Monday, it will stay overnight on Monday night, and then if
it was bad weather, it would leave, sometime Tuesday, but possibly be there Tuesday night, too?
Because I can understand the two days, but I didn't understand why you need two nights.

MS. ZAID: Maybe we didn't think that through too much. It was the 48 hours that they asked me for.

So 24 hours, then if it stayed -- well, also, if they were to use it two days, just to not have to come back in six months, if their business grows or they get busier, but as of now, as of the last ten years, they have never used it for more than that.

But up to 48 hours will always keep us in compliance, not in violation.

Although they felt safe enough to say they won't use it 48 hours, but I want the protection, they probably would have went with a day and a half, but I want to make sure of that, you know, that we are covered for 48 hours.

MS. SKELCY: Do they have ever park it on a Friday and leave it over the weekend?

MS. ZAID: No, never.

MR. LEIGHTON: It's in use over the weekend.

MS. ZAID: It's always been
Wednesday, Thursday. You know, it might change from Monday, Tuesday, but never on the weekend.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes, Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: This reminds me of the PET scan at Providence and that every Friday it’s there and then it’s gone and doing its other things.

So I don’t have a problem with this because it’s medical, that they’re providing a service, providing jobs, providing help to the city and that it’s until their lease expires 2014, I believe, that -- to allow it until then, and then if it renews, I don’t know if we have to go forward with that, and then to the 48 request they had, and that was it.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Do we have any additional comments?

MS. ZAILD: I just have a question for Ms. Krieger.

I thought Mr. Ghannam said tenancy. I interpreted that, if I’m correct, as long as they’re tenants need, if they renew their lease in 2014, which they plan to, then it will extend as long as they are tenants or is it just until this lease
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MS. KRIEGER: Either one.

MS. ZAID: Good.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Is that what you meant? Clarification --

MR. GHANNA: That was my suggestion regardless of how long this particular tenant stays, that would be my suggestion, in terms of making a limitation.

CHAIRMAN IBE: In the absence of any further discussion, I will entertain a motion.

Yes, Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: I move to approve the Case No. PZ-12-0055, at 39595 Ten Mile Road for the variance. The property cannot be reasonably used for any other uses permitted by right to special land use in the zoning district in which it is located.

That the need for the requested variance is due to the unique circumstances or physical condition of the property involved, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, topography and similar physical conditions. And is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, and that the need of the requested variance...
is not the result of actions of the property
owner or previous property owners and it is
not self-created.

Also with the term of 2014 or
until when the tenant decides to terminate
the lease, for no more than 48 hours in a one
week period.

Was that it? I don't know if
there is something else.

MS. SKELCY: That it should be
limited to the tenant.

MR. FERRELL: Limited to this
tenant that's occupying it now.

MR. GHANNAM: Your time
limitation, 2014 or whenever their tenancy is
terminated, whichever is later?

MR. FERRELL: Right, whichever is
later.

MR. GHANNAM: I will second that.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing that a
motion has been made and seconded, is there
any need for further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, will
the Recording Secretary please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Ibe?
CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Congratulations.

MS. ZAID: Thank you all very much.

CHAIRMAN IBE: That will bring us to our final case for today. Case No. PZ-12-0051, 25875 Novi Road, Panera Bread. I see that our good friend is an attorney, he need not be sworn.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, everyone. Matthew Quinn appearing on behalf of both the owners of City Center Plaza and Panera Bread. It's Happy New Year to you, first time of the year, I look forward to being here many more times here this year, I hope. This is the last step in a process that City Center and Panera started with the city over a year ago. Originally drive-thrus were not allowed in the Town Center district. And Panera came to City Center Plaza and said,
our lease is up, our new format is to have drive-thrus, with the new Paneras, and we would like you, City Center, to approach the city to see if we could amend the ordinance allow drive-thrus, and if not, we will probably have to go to another location.

The City Center, through my offices, came to the city and started the process, and the city ended up amending the ordinance to allow drive-thru restaurants in the Town Center district, but with very specific limitations, and I think those limitations are good.

They basically -- the drive-thru restaurant, like Panera, cannot have a similar drive-thru or a competing business with a drive-thru within a certain number of linear feet down the roadways or within the same system.

So you're not going to have a plethora of drive-thru restaurants in the Town Center district because it's still primarily a pedestrian-orientated district.

We have been through the process after the ordinance was changed. We applied for the special land use that was required by the ordinance, we've received approvals, a recommendation by the planning commission, approval by the city council, subject to the variances that we are asking for.
also the site plan was recommended by the planning commission and again approved by the city council, again, subject to the two variances that we are looking for.

Tonight, I have with me, Mike Califan, the engineer, who can assist with any of the questions concerning the plans, if necessary.

Now, we are here requesting two variances.

Number one is a greenbelt variance along Novi Road, where the parking will be expanded. It requires 20 feet and we are providing 10 feet.

I will point that out on the map here shortly.

The second variance that we are requesting deals with the bypass lane for the drive-thru.

The ordinance requires that whenever you have a drive-thru, the stacking lane has to have a parallel 18-foot wide bypass lane.

Now, let me move over here and I will do some demonstrating on the site.

All right, to get orientated, Novi Road is at the top here, the bridge
would be at this -- I'm sorry -- the bridge going south would be this area (indicating).

This is Flint Street coming along behind the area of the City Center Plaza that contains Panera Bread.

This green shaded area is our greenbelt.

The problem with the 10-foot variance that we are requesting is that Oakland County, who has jurisdiction over Novi Road, when they built the bridge, widened their right-of-way and took additional right-of-way from the property. Had they not done that, we wouldn't be here asking for this 10-foot variance for our parking because we would have the 10-foot that previously existed.

But even with that 10-foot variance, we still have plenty of green space that will exist, and it will look the same pretty much as it does today.

In fact, the other portions of City Center Plaza only has a 3-foot greenbelt between the parking and the road.

So the area where Panera is still has plenty of green and will not really be effected whatsoever.

The second variance, of course,
is for the stacking lane.

Now, the drive-thru is going to be at the south end of Panera, as you can see, from your site plans that you have in front of you.

The cars will come in off of the Flint Street driveway, get into the chain and drive through all the way up to the front to the drive-thru.

Now, the main purpose of having the bypass lane is for vehicles in the drive-thru, so that they have the ability to get out if they don't want to complete the entire drive-thru.

Well, just by happenstance, what's happened here is that as you get into the drive-thru, we already have a wide drive area before you get to the actual building that would allow the cars to escape.

So you only have a very few cars that would be stacked up in the drive-thru, and they wouldn't be able to get out until they get there.

Now, why can't we put the bypass lane in? Deals with the site. We have a narrow site at this end. We have Novi Road that's been expanded by the right-of-way for Oakland County, and we have a natural feature which lies right behind, which is the Rouge River.
Now, if that wasn't there adjacent to our site, we could, of course, move things through. So this is site specific for this particular purpose, and that is why this site can't be adjusted to build that drive-thru.

Now, the city staff planning department is supporting in writing the greenbelt variance of 10 feet. We have received no negative comments from the fire department whatsoever in any packet stating that they have any adverse comments on not having the bypass lane.

So those are the two variances we are looking for.

And by allowing these two variances to go through, this year plus effort on behalf of Panera and City Center will come to fruition.

They will begin to start construction, they're going to sign a new 10 year lease when this is approved, and we will all benefit by being able to get our sandwiches and our coffee very quickly on our way to work, other than you are retired and probably welcome the wait.

That's the purpose and reasoning behind the two variances. I will be more than happy to answer any questions, or as I said, to have the owner's representative or...
the shopping center's engineer respond.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Mr. Quinn, as always.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment regarding this particular case?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, I will ask our secretary to read into the record any correspondence received.

MS. KRIEGER: For Case No. PZ-12-0051, 41 were mailed, nine returned, zero approvals, zero objections.

MR. GHANNAM: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will now turn to the city for any further comments, if any.

MS. SAARELA: I don't have any.

MR. BOULARD: I have nothing to add. I'd be happy to standby for questions.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Very well, Mr. Boulard.

I will now open it up to the board for discussion.

Yes, Member Gedeon.

MR. GEDEON: Question regarding the site plan. There is a couple of areas marked -- one is referred to as the new preview board and the other as the new menu board.
And I'm curious specifically where in the ordering lane or stacking lane that the vehicles would place their order? How deep are you in, you know, if you change your mind.

MR. QUINN: Patrick Keast, I guess, will have to be sworn in.

MR. KEAST: Patrick Keast, K-e-a-s-t.

MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ-12-0051, do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. KEAST: Yes.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

MR. KEAST: To answer your question, on the site plan, the menu board, the preview board -- your question is how many cars deep are you into the --

MR. GEDEON: Well, right. I'm concerned with the bypass lane is that if you change your mind, you know, you have a way of getting out, but presumably, somebody wouldn't change their mind after they placed their order.

So I'm wondering, you know, how far along would the cars be before they actually placed their order in this lane?

MR. KEAST: Well, they would be -- once they place their order, there is about two cars that they would have to wait before they have a way to get out.
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If they made their order, they decided to leave, they could still do that, and go park and go inside, or if they -- or I guess they could just leave without paying, or without getting their order.

MR. GEDEON: So specifically, though, the box labeled new menu board, is that where cars are placing their order?

MR. KEAST: Yes, that's right.

MR. GEDEON: Thank you. I guess my other -- no, that's all for now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: That you, Member Gedeon.

Yes, Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: On the drawing that you have, is the -- are the cars to scale; in other words, I see that there is one, two, three, four, five cars before you get to the new menu board, then by the time you get to the window, you have got a stack of ten cars in there. Is that accurate?

MR. KEAST: Yes. Actually this was reviewed by the city's traffic engineer and our own traffic engineer. These cars are shown, are more typical size cars, but they had us do an analysis that included an ASHTO (phonetic), vehicle, basically the largest type of vehicle, and to determine how many
vehicles could be stacked and also with the turning radiiuses here and exiting, turning left or right, and also the entering, turning radiiuses of those vehicles. Which as you can see, there is a gap between these vehicles, and when they did the analysis, that gap was a little smaller and the cars were a little bit bigger.

But the amount and the number of cars is the same.

MS. SKELCY: You know, Mr. Quinn, I have been to that facility many times. That parking lot though is always packed. Has that been addressed at all? I mean, that is a very popular location.

MR. QUINN: Oh, absolutely, yes. That was the point of the special land use proceedings in front of the planning commission and the city council.

There was discussion regarding pedestrians from those parked cars crossing and going into the building. That was satisfied to the agreement of city council and planning commissioners.

So, yes, their concerns were your concerns. They have approved that. The parking in this area is, as you see, moved forward a little bit into the greenbelt area, that's the reason for it.
yes, there will be some congestion. But with the drive-thru and the way the vehicles are going in and out, it's designed as best can be for this particular site.

Is it perfect, no. Is it good, yes. Is it going to be safe for pedestrians, yes.

MS. SKELCY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Mr. Boulard?

MR. BOULARD: If I can just make a couple of points, Mr. Chairman.

There is a requirement in the section of the zoning ordinance that applies to drive-thrus, that specifically requires sufficient stacking to keep those cars from blocking the parking lot.

So that's one of the reasons that they have provided as much stacking as they have, so that the cars that are in the drive-thru lane don't block the parking lot, and be that -- the other thing is, in terms of the time that a customer is in the parking lot, if they go to park and then go inside the store and wait in line, come back out as opposed to the time that's in the -- that they're in drive-thru line, the intent is they would actually speed that up, and they will able to hopefully alleviate some of the congestion while still serving more.
11 customers, right, because that's what all
12 businesses want, so -- thank you.
13
14 CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you,
15 Mr. Boulard.
16
17 Yes, Mr. Ghannam?
18
19 MR. GHANNAM: Just a couple
20 questions.
21
22 First, when the cars exit from
23 the stacking lane, pick up their orders and
24 so forth, their natural exit would be to the
25 left, correct, where that -- to Novi Road?
26 That would be the only way they could exit
27 this parking lot, am I right?
28
29 MR. KEAST: No, they could go
30 left or to the right. If they went to the
31
32 right, they to go Flint Street --
33
34 MR. GHANNAM: Back to Flint
35 Street.
36
37 MR. KEAST: And Novi Road.
38
39 MR. GHANNAM: So someone can
40 enter this stacking lane either from the
41 parking lot or from Flint Street?
42
43 MR. KEAST: That's correct.
44
45 MR. GHANNAM: I follow you now.
46 I assume there is no way to reroute them,
47 middle Rouge River to exit -- I'm just
48 kidding.
49
50 I think, you certainly all did a
51 nice job and a very nice presentation by your
52 attorney. I would be in support of it.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes, Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: On the building itself, like at other drive-thrus, they pay first, then go up the next window to get their order, so that provides maybe some more room for getting people through?

MR. KEAST: On this particular one, it's just one window where you pay and also get your meal.

MS. KRIEGER: Also because it's so popular and it's good revenue for the city and good for Panera and the center, I'm also in agreement with it.

But going up and down Flint Street, I got my truck all dirty, I find it a shame that you're paying so much money on a house on a lake, and then you have got the river that where somebody could sit have a chair, that there is no way to access that in the future somehow, but that remains to be seen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you, Member Krieger.

It appears that everyone has made a comment.

Do we have any additional comments?

Yes, Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: I got one for the
city. In the pass lane, there was no issues
with fire safety, not being able to get
out --

MR. BOULARD: No. Certainly
people can get out of the vehicles, the fire
derpartment did not have any concerns.
And the stacking is separated,
for the most part, away from the building.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you.
I will entertain a motion if any
member would be willing to take that on.
MR. GHANNAM: I will give it a
try.
CHAIRMAN IBE: Go ahead.
MR. GHANNAM: I move in item
number four, which is Case No. 12-0051, for
25875 Novi Road, Panera Road, that we approve
the petition as requested.
Taking into consideration of the
site, the proposed use, there certainly will
be no detrimental impact on existing
thoroughfares.
The proposed site will not cause
any detrimental impact on the capabilities of
public service, facilities, including water,
sanitary and so forth.
The proposed use is compatible
with the natural features and characteristics
of the land. The proposed site is compatible
with adjacent uses of land in terms of
The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the city's master plan and land use, and the proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner.

The proposed use is listed among the provisions -- provision of uses requiring special land use review, as set forth in the various zoning districts and is in harmony with the proposed purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it's located.

MS. SKELCY: Second.

MS. SAARELA: Actually, the standards we should be looking at that are usual non-use variance standards that we look at. That was for the planning commission.

MR. GHANNAM: Why didn't you tell me -- interrupted me.

MS. SAARELA: It's basically the same, the need is not self-created, strict compliance would cause unnecessary hardship, those standards listed.

MR. GHANNAM: I gotcha. Want me to read them all?

MS. SAARELA: You should go
Then I will amend my motion to include that there are unique circumstances or physical conditions of the property, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water, topography or similar physical conditions. The need for the variance is not due to the applicant's personal or economic difficult. The need is not self-created. Strict compliance with regulations governing area setback, frontage, height and so forth will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose. The requested variance is the minimum variance requested to do substantial justice and will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding property values. Is that it?

MS. SAARELA: Yes. You might just mention some of the facts that you mentioned as far as the unique characteristics of the property, including the 10 feet taken by the Road Commission, the location, that type of thing.

MR. GHANNAM: It is true. Of course, it is based on the applicant's presentation.

And what did convince me partly
is what they were mentioning about the Oakland County Road Commission recently, actually, just condemning some of the land in front of it, necessitating the variance, as well as the unique nature of this particular parcel, because it is narrowly shaped and unusually shaped and it's not typical.

MS. SKELCY: Second.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing a motion has been made and seconded, Recording Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Gedeon?

MR. GEDEON: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ghannam?

MR. GHANNAM: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Chairman Ibe?

CHAIRMAN IBE: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Skelcy?

MS. SKELCY: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. PAWLOWSKI: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. QUINN: Thank you all. Have a good evening. See you at Panera.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Well, that concludes the cases before the board this evening.
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Do we have any other matters we need to take up at this time?

MR. BOULARD: If I might, just wanted to remind folks, you should have gotten an email about the joint planning commission ZBA training that we have got scheduled for February 5th in the second floor of the library.

We will have sandwiches and a we will get more information about that. I want to make sure that you've got that on your calendar and thank you for those of you who responded already. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Thank you. Any additional business?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: In the absence of that, I will entertain a motion for us to adjourn.

MR. GHANNAM: So moved.

MS. SKELCY: Second.

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing that motion has been made and seconded, all in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IBE: All opposed?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRMAN IBE: Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.)
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