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CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: At this time I would like to call the September 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order. Would you please all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence afterwards. (Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Please be seated.

Monica, could you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Here.

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER: Here.

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Present.

At this time, I would like to bring to the attention of everyone in the audience that there are there -- there is a list in the back with the agenda for public rules and conduct.

I would ask everyone to please shut off their cellphones at this time.

And then I'll turn it over to the board to ask if there were any changes to the agenda at this point?

(No audible responses.)

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

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The agenda is approved.
The minutes of July 9, due
to technical issues with Ipads and the
inability to have access to them, we are
asking to postpone the July 9th minutes vote
until the October meeting. All those in
favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Any
opposed? So moved, the minutes until October
of 2016.

At this point, if there is
anyone in the audience that wishes to make
comment to the board in other matters
regarding anything that is not on the agenda,
can so come to the podium right now and speak
their peace.

If there aren't any remarks
at this time, I will move forward right into
our caseload.

(No audible responses.)
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing
none, we will be calling our first case
PZ16-0027, Jiffy Signs.

Is the petitioner present.

Come on down.
Board members will remember that this applicant was present last month and is requesting a variance from the City of Novi ordinance to allow construction of a monument sign. Under the current ordinance a 6-foot sign is allowed.

This is a continuation, and I understand that the petitioner has new information to add this evening.

Sir, you were already sworn in last month, would you please state your name again for our recording secretary.

MR. POTRYKUS: Steven Potrykus.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

MR. POTRYKUS: Per our tabled meeting last month, we took in the board's recommendations as far as moving the sign north of the driveway.

It's approximately 60 feet now, which clearly made it pedestrian interference with the sidewalk, and we changed the height of the sign, the recommendation by the board was to make it higher and shorter, to get it more visible.
off that grade.

We made both of those changes per the recommendations of last month's meeting.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you have a picture?

MR. POTRYKUS: Yes, it's up there. There you go. That was the full size mockup, we stuck up there, right where it would be located at.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Anything else you would like to add?

MR. POTRYKUS: That was it. From last month, no. Everything else was the same. The square footage of the sign did say the same. We weren't trying to change that, that we requested for the first variance.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else?

MR. POTRYKUS: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Seeing none, building department.

MR. BUTLER: I did discuss that
with the landscaping architect, and he said that the trees could be -- if they were in the way of the sign, it could be trimmed up to the 10 feet, but they are not in the right-of-way or anything, so those are pretty much private owner trees. It looks like they have done a good job with that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is there correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 32 letters mailed, two letters returned, zero approvals, and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Board members? Members Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I want to commend you for accepting the recommendations, everything looks good to me.

MR. POTRYKUS: It did make a big change.

MR. SANGHVI: I think it's better than before. I have no problem in supporting your application now. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else? I concur with the previous member. I was pretty shocked. When I was driving down
Novi Road, I forgot the mockup was going to be there, I really wasn't looking for it. What a difference.

MR. POTRYKUS: Stands out a little bit more.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think that the tenants should be pleased that they have now have better identification, which is what the challenge was.

So it's not usual that -- you know, we try to give guidance to the petitioner, but I'm glad that at this time, you worked with the city, I understand you spoke with Mr. Boulard, he said that you went and took our advice and talked to the tree people as Larry mentioned, and so with -- this is a long time business at that corner and I know it faces many challenges, we will do whatever we can to help you and it looks like you're on the right track. Good luck.

MR. POTRYKUS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Having said that, is there a motion to be made?

MS. KRIEGER: Question. Sorry.

The pole sign that's there then will be
removed?

MR. POTRYKUS: Yes. They didn't want that one there.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: I'm prepared to make motion, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0027, sought by the Jiffy Signs, Incorporated, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty to use the property as zoned.

The layout of the property is unique and also the location hindering the visibility of the tenants on the north side of the unit.

The petitioner did not create the conditions as mentioned as they are preexisting. And the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties as the sign is designed to -- in accordance with how the retail unit is being redesigned or being rebuilt by the current owner and fits in
nicely esthetically and is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

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

MS. KRIEGER: Second.

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

Monica, would you please call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes seven to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Congratulations. Your variance has been granted and best of luck to you all.

Moving right along. Next case is Hunter Pasteur Homes and Dunhill Park, PZ16-0032. Is the petitioner here. Come on down.

47700 Eight Mile Road, north of Eight Mile and west of Beck. The applicant is requesting a variance for two subdivision business signs to allow increased visibility.

If you would please state your name, spell it for our recording secretary, then be sworn in.

MR. HERKOWITZ: My name is Seth Herkowitz, H-e-r-k-o-w-i-t-z.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand and be sworn in.

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

MR. HERKOWITZ: Yes.

MR. MONTVILLE: Thank you.

MR. HERKOWITZ: Good evening. My name is Seth Herkowitz, as I mentioned. I'm a partner in Hunter Pasteur Homes. I appreciate the opportunity to petition in front of this board this evening.

As I mentioned, we are here to seek a variance from the City of Novi code of ordinances, specifically Section 28-6. Our current development, Dunhill Park, is a 31 unit single family home neighborhood, prices will range from 800,000 to $1.3 million.

Dunhill Park is located on the northwest corner of Beck and Eight Mile Road and thus has dual frontages, approximately 900 lineal feet along Eight Mile Road and 850 lineal feet along Beck Road.

Per ordinance, we are permitted a single sign of 64 square feet. We are respectfully requesting a second 64 square foot sign, thus we would locate one
site marketing sign along each frontage.

Please note we understand and respect the policy behind the ordinance, but would not be asking for a variance if we only had one frontage.

Here, however, in an effort to increase awareness and visibility for development, we are seeking two site marketing signs. Drive by traffic is typically one of the largest lead source generators. Our goal is to build a beautiful community for our residents, our neighbors and the cities and townships in which we build.

Greater visibility will result in increased sales and a quicker development timeline, subsequently decreasing the construction impact on the residents, the area and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Moreover, our circumstance is not self-created, rather we believe our request to be a practical approach based on the location of the land. The sign itself meets all required zoning requirements, its finish and design in a tasteful manner, and
is appropriate in terms of scale.

Further, the sign is not incompatible nor unreasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties.

Finally we believe a second site marketing sign, along a second frontage is not inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

I appreciate your consideration and hope you support this request on the merits.

I'm willing to answer any questions you may have on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to make comment on this case?

Seeing none, I will do it reverse this time. Is there any correspondence?

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

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Building department, do you have anything to offer?
MR. BUTLER: Nothing to offer at this time. Standing by for questions.

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

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Couple of questions. How soon are you planning to try building -- are you going to build if they are sold or they are going to keep (unintelligible) and sold?

MR. HERKOWITZ: Great questions. The first answer is that we are currently putting in the underground utilities there. Our goal is to be paved by the end of October, early November. Once our master documents are recorded and we have addresses, we will be submitting for building permits.

We are in the process of just starting sales. Typically, we build based on sales, not on spec. Typically we might have one or two specs per community.

So at this time, we would be building based on sales to answer your question.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I have no problem supporting your application for a
period of two years. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Anyone else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I'd just like to add to that. It's a unique situation with the dual frontage, high traffic areas.

I think that is clearly unique, when the ordinance was written, thinking every site like that would be dual frontage. So I think it is unique and I can support it as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I am very well familiar with that corner. And I think that the lay of the land, also not just the frontage, but there is a big hill in there.

So visibility is not the greatest, and if you -- when you're driving down Beck Road, trust me, you're not really looking around that stuff.

So maybe if you're at a site, the advantage of having the two signs I think would give you visibility to that lot because it really -- when you're driving around and looking at it, it's not very
visible.

I know that sounds crazy, but when I came back down Beck Road, then I went back down Eight Mile and the lay of that lot is just not -- it's tough to see what it's going to be. So I am in support of your request.

I think that you did an excellent job on your presentation. I thank you for that.

MR. HERKOWITZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Makes our job a lot easier.

Is there a motion or any further discussion? Would anyone like to make a motion. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: In Case PZ16-0032, sought by the applicant Hunter Pasteur Homes, I move that we grant the variance request for an additional marketing sign as the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty using the lot getting proper visibility for the residential aspect of the lot.

The property is unique as
mentioned previously in conversation due to
the wide and large dual frontage of the lot.
For that same reason, it's a pretty -- the
petitioner did not create that condition, the
relief will not unreasonably interfere with
any adjacent or surrounding properties and
the variance being requested is consistent
with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

I move that we grant the variance as requested.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

MS. KRIEGER: I have an addition
to the motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Friendly amendment.

MS. KRIEGER: For two years.

MR. MONTVILLE: I have no problem
with that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
It's been moved, second, friendly amended.
Is there any further discussion?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, Monica, will you call please call the
roll.
9/13/2016

MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:  Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI:  Motion passes seven to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:  Your variance has been granted for two years.
Okay.  Good luck.  We hope you build out before then.  I'm sure you do, too.
Okay.  Our next case is Case No. PZ16-0033, Casa Loma Homeowners
Association, which is north of Eight Mile and west of Beck. A lot of traveling up and down Beck this week.

Is the petitioner here.
Would you please state your name, spell it for our recording secretary and then be sworn in.

MR. COMPO: My name is David Compo. I'm the sole owner and developer of Casa Loma as well as currently the head of the homeowners association. That's C-o-m-p-o.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right hand and be sworn in, please.

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

MR. COMPO: I do. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. COMPO: We had already been approved for the signs that are on the other side. I'm not sure if any of you were able to get out for the grand opening with the
mayor or not. But we always had intended to have a coat of arms in the small section of stonewall between the boulevard entry. And my fabricator has created a laser cut, small Casa Loma name in that shield and it never really crossed our mind that that became a sign at that point because the name in the coat of arms, it's a shield about this wide, about three feet tall, it's mounted on the stonewall. And so I request that this be allowed as really a unique aspect to the community as Casa Loma -- actually the gates go on next week and we can look for -- right now we have three other homes in design and two lots sold, including the one that's currently under construction. There are ten lots total. This is definitely in the spirit of Bellagio and the higher end community and it's going to be quite beautiful. We are trying to put in as much money into that entryway and the entire facade that we have done, you know, to really set it apart as much as we could do based on only ten lot sales, including the entire
boulevard, which makes it unique because the entire community is a boulevard.

So I just ask that you allow this coat of arms, just similar to kind of what Bellagio did next-door. They have a limestone center, just didn't put their name it in it. It's similar in that, in the spirit of creating a set -- portion of a boulevard, which is what we did. Unique to itself.

Casa Loma was originally named for the castle in Toronto meaning castle on land, which is I think appropriate for Novi as a great community, which is really why we want to build it there. So any questions, please, I would be happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment.

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 26 letters mailed, five letters returned, one approval,
from David Compo, the applicant and he notes his approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Building department.

MR. BUTLER: They did a really good job. The sign looks good. It enhances the appeal of the sign, does not degrade or anything. But it's nice that they should -- for the community, too. Looks good. They did a good job.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And I have a question for you. It's not visible from outside of the subdivision, correct?

MR. COMPO: No, it's not.

MR. BUTLER: If it was, it's strictly decorative, too. It's a more decorative coat of arms, as you would say.


MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Actually I quite like your sign there. It look quite regal out there. Very esthetically, very beautiful looking thing. I have no problem. Thank you.
MR. COMPO: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: This is for the city attorney, if I could, or the building department.

Is there anything with it not being visible from the street, that differentiates from the other two signs because it's being roped in as a three sign deal. I feel like it's more decor than a sign. It's really not related to the other two signs that were already approved.

Does that make sense?

MS. SAARELA: Is there an exception, is that what you are asking?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. SAARELA: It still needs to have a variance. It's still technically a sign because of the wording on it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?

I know that they are starting the whole thing that the word is -- that the name is being put on the sign, and
we have to justify the grounds for the variance.

I agree it's absolutely breath taking, the whole area out there. When I looked at it, I thought how cool. Then I had to go back, instead of being a resident, I had to go back and be a ZBA member. So that's what the struggle and the silence is of the board right now.

So I think that under the circumstances I would be in support of this based on the following criteria. That it's a unique situation, and that due to the high value -- let me reword that.

Due to the esthetics and layout of the subdivision, okay, that this is -- really rules as a decorative piece, more as a sign of serving for identification purposes, and that an exception should be made, for us to grant the variance based on that.

It wasn't the intent for business identification. It's not intended to degrade anything around it or take away from anything around it.
And also the fact that inside the subdivision and it can't be seen by the other areas that are being built up in there, that's how I would probably show my support for this sign.

MR. MONTVILLE: If I could add one thing, too. It is a little unique the way the lot is, and when you push back on the lot, this sign being pushed back as well as the other two, that is another unique factor. I would open it up the conversation, but I am in support of this sign as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: I agree with Member Montville as well. I think if it was visible from the street, I wouldn't be in support of it.

The fact that you can't see it from the street, I think that's something I would support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anyone else?
(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Silence is golden. Okay. Is there a motion?

MS. KRIEGER: I can make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0033 for Casa Loma, that the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to the use of the property because it is part of the esthetics of this neighborhood.

The property is unique. The position of the -- and the circumstance is unique that the third sign really is more of an esthetic shield that is inside the subdivision, and won't necessarily be used as a sign.

And IT is not self-created because of the positioning of the sign being inside the lot. It can be misconstrued as a third sign that -- it is a third sign, but under the circumstances it is within the
subdivision and can't be seen from the road.

The relief will not
unreasonably interfere with adjacent or
surrounding properties, will increase the
esthetics and it is consistent with the
spirit and intent of the ordinance.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

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

(No audible responses.)

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?
MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Moton passes seven to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted. Congratulations. Good luck to you. And next time there is an open house, include the Zoning Board. I'm just kidding.

Good luck to you.

Our next case is the Grant Promenade, LLC 48975 Grand River, it's Case PZ16-0034. This applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi to allow construction of a second monument sign at the business.

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

MR. PASCARIS: George Pascaris, P-a-s-c-a-r-i-s.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Raise
your right hand, please.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to provide the truth in the testimony you're about to give?

MR. PASCARIS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. PASCARIS: Good evening. We are respectfully requesting a variance to allow a monument sign in front of a new development there on Grand River.

We have got a lot of traffic and a lot of interest in our new development there. One of the first questions that the perspective tenants ask for, will there be a sign on the road.

And we would love to put one there, so they can answer that question for them and allow them to identify the development.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case?
(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing none, is there any correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 29 letters mailed, four letters returned, one approval from Dan D. Valentine at 48750 Grand River, Novi, Michigan. And he notes his approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Building department?

MR. BUTLER: Nothing at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members? Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: So, if we won't grant the sign that's in front, the sign that's on that drive, that -- is there a sign there?

MR. PASCARIS: Yes. There is a sign on the drive, that signifies the development behind us by the Target and the Sam's Club.

MR. FERRELL: I don't think there is any room left on that sign, is there, to put --

MR. PASCARIS: No, there is not.
MR. FERRELL: Only issue I have, I don't know if I would be in support of this. The other board members, see what they talk about. The fact that you can see every business from the road anyway. I don't know if you really need a sign right by the road to see the business. It's not like it's pushed back so far where it's not visible. So I would be a little bit reluctant to approve that. Like I said, I want to hear what some of the other board members say.

MR. PASCARIS: Getting into it, I don't think we realized that Novi promenade sign was on the tail end of the property, which wouldn't allow us to put a second one technically according to the zoning. I think the big thing there would be identifying it with the address on the road, allowing it much easier for, you know, patrons and to be able to see instead of trying to find it, you know, up against the building.

MR. FERRELL: I agree, but my argument with that would be, somebody is looking for a business, they Googled it on
their phone, it's going to point to that
direction, as soon as you get close enough,
you're going to see the signs on --

MR. PASCARIS: No doubt, but you
could say that about every business on
every --

MR. FERRELL: Exactly. Every
business wants to have so many signs. We are
a little stricter with our sign placement in
Novi.

MR. PASCARIS: That's why I was
staying with our 30 square feet and the
placement of it, and what we was thought
appropriate.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you, Member Ferrell. Anyone else? Member
Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Yes, I came and saw
your current sign and it's really close to
the Target sign at the moment. Maybe you can
move it out from there -- otherwise all the
businesses are very, very visible.

MR. PASCARIS: Are you saying
move it farther to the east?
MR. SANGHVI: I'm still a little reluctant to have a second sign moving the one to a more visible location.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes, more to the east. I don't think Member Sanghvi heard your question, but I'm going to answer that for him.

MR. PASCARIS: I don't think we have a problem moving it farther to the east. I think on the original design, it was just showing in the middle of the property. And that's where we had left it. No problem moving it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Board members. Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: With the unique aspect of the lot, behind the original development of Sam's Club and Target behind there, that's where the initial sign went, I understand you want to limit signs as much as you can, but at the same time these businesses -- let me rephrase.

The landlord and the developer for the business, the way it's zoned, is a retail unit and retail tenants
demand signage, you know, say it's a new day
and age, but at the same time it's not.

It's still a retail store
front. Grand River, that's a high speed
area, I believe it's 50 through there, it
might be 45 or 50. It's a high speed, high
traffic area, and the sign is not egregious
in any way. It's not oversized. It's within
the size requirements and it sounds like the
applicant is willing to move it a little
farther east, so it's not right next -- it's
not right next to the Target sign either, I
believe there is a significant amount of
distance. But if he's willing to move it
farther east as well, I have no problem
supporting it at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I also support
the same thing moving to the east side.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you. Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: For Grand
Promenade, the Target sign, is that separate
property?
MR. PASCARIS: We thought it was separate properties because of the curb cut there, entrance to the Novi Promenade, but it does fall on the edge of our lot.

MS. KRIEGER: So from a different way that if this Grand Promenade center had been there first and then Target was moving in behind, it's just a matter of timing, who has their sign what and where.

I was thinking more if the Grand Promenade, like the Pine Ridge before, you have Pine Ridge in a corner, then you have a list of the sign on that monument sign, although the speed is 50 miles an hour.

So if you did want to -- if that is a second sign, then move it a little bit farther east. I am in agreement with that. And then, I don't know, I guess whatever you put on sign -- we agreed to the size of the sign, is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We are just agreeing to the size.

MS. KRIEGER: That's it right now.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Anyone else? Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: I still just don't see the hardship why we need another sign. You're going to see all the signs on the building. You're going to have -- all the tenants are going to come in and try to get bigger signs for their building as well. So now you're going to have to go with all that. I think it's -- I'm not going to say it's creating more work, it will happen anyway, we can't stop that. I just don't see a hardship of adding a monument sign, when there is no obstructions whatsoever to see the building.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I am on the fence on this one. And the reason I am on the fence is because when you started construction at your site, I lost site of where the Sam's Club sign was, that was where I could focus in and I knew where to turn. I know that -- I always talk like a consumer or a driver.

You know, I have lived here a lot of years. So I looked at stuff as if I'm going someplace where I'm trying to find
something.

I take that as a bad corner. But I think that the existing sign needs to get moved. I think this needs to get reworked, and the reason why I say that is because when we got the packet, as a matter of fact, I called the department today, there wasn't enough in here for me to generally feel one way or the other.

I think that there needs to be a little more homework done on this to present your case as to why you need that information -- why you need that second sign. I think that we should have -- I'm not telling you what to do, this is just a suggestion. I want to be clear on that. What I suggest doesn't necessarily mean that your case will be approved. I want to say that.

But I think there needs to be some more -- there needs to be more meat in this packet.

I don't think there is enough here to make a good decision. I am going to suggest that we postpone it, if
possible, until next month, if you're in
agreement to that, and you add some more
information and I would seriously recommend
maybe more pictures from different angles.
Just one drawing of the sign doesn't paint --
doesn't cover the issues that you're having
with this location.

Does that make sense to you?

MR. PASCARIS: It does.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So it is
not up to the board to come up with reasons.
It is up to the petitioner to show why you
need that sign there, okay.

And so I think that a little
more due diligence would be done on the
petitioner's part. I don't think that the
board would be torn at this point.

So I don't know if you are
open to my suggestion, to table this until
next month and give some us more information
on this case, if the board members would be
in agreement to that, because it seems like
we are split.

I am not seeing any shaking
of heads or otherwise. We are on track.
It's really up to you. If you would look to take that suggestion and add something more to --

MR. PASCARIS: I don't have a problem with that. I think the trouble that we had with it, it's being called a second sign.

The first sign is not our sign for that development, so it doesn't identify our development.

That's the only thing we want to do. And we want to give that to our tenants. Respectfully I understand what you are saying about people being able to drive by and see the signs.

But the fact is, if you drive around, every business has a sign. We are not asking for a double size sign. We are not asking for a taller one, a wider one. We stated the parameters and just want a monument sign that will identify our property, that's all.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Go ahead.

MR. FERRELL: City attorney, building department, that is not their sign,
why would it be considered a second sign for them for that development? Is it because it's on the same property?

MR. BUTLER: It would be considered a second sign because they are identified on the first sign, but it's not their sign. So technically really their first sign. Would you agree with that?

MS. SAARELA: I haven't looked at that section of how this is laid out to see how -- where it is on the property or anything. So it's hard for me to determine how that decision was made --

MR. FERRELL: If we table this, if you provide information to us, than why maybe that is considered a second sign or better understand why it's a second sign, not just their initial sign.

MR. PASCARIS: It is on the inside of the walkway closest to the drive. And what we thought is maybe it was allowed or put there when they put that drive in the development. And we couldn't find anywhere where it was an easement or something that allowed for it. And that's why we didn't
even think of it as, you know, consider it a second sign.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Having said all that, are you in agreement to having the case tabled until next month?

MR. PASCARIS: Yes. I have no problem with that. I mean, we are very finish line.

We have tenants that are getting ready to start their construction. We would like to wrap it up, so if we have to wait another month, then --

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, can I have the date for next month, please.

MS. DRESLINSKI: October 11.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So what I would like to do is move that the Case No. PZ16-0034, be moved until October 11 to answer some of the questions presented by the board members tonight as to why this is a second sign and how it is tied into the other business.

Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: I just wanted to suggest that maybe at the same time they
should consider moving the current sign and
modifying or they need a second sign all
together.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Point taken. All those in favor of tabling
until next month say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will
see you next month. If you have any
questions, please contact the building
department for any guidance.

Our next case is Curtis
Builders, PZ16-0037, at 41882 Ridge Road
East, south of Grand River west of
Meadowbrook. Good evening.

If you are both going to
give testimony, I need both of you to please
state your names, spell them for the
secretary and then raise your right hand to
be sworn in, please.

MS. KOVAL: Deborah Koval,
D-e-b-o-r-a-h, K-o-v, as in Victor, a-l.

MR. CURTIS: Carl Curtis,
C-a-r-l, C-u-r-t-i-s.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
please raise your right hand to be sworn in.

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

MS. KOVAL: I do.

MR. CURTIS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MS. KOVAL: As I said, I'm Deborah Koval. I'm the homeowner that is applying for this variance in my backyard. I would like to do an addition on the rear of my home. Unfortunately, my yard is very narrow. The yard is very small. If you want to try to stay within 35 feet of that lot line, it's not going to happen. So I'm looking for a reduce of that rear setback from 35 to 32.6 feet, so I can put a nice sunroom on the back of my house.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything else?

MR. CURTIS: Again, just want to reiterate that, you know, the size of -- the depth of the rear yard is basically not conducive to adding onto the house. This is
not a large addition, it's 10 by 12. So just
really no other way to add on at this point.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Thank you. Anything else?

MS. KOVAL: No.

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

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: 58 letters
mailed, zero letters returned, two approvals,
first from Jack Bentley at 41874 Ridge Road
East, he approves the request.

And the second one is from
Stephanie Bentley at the same address, also
noting her approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Thank you. Building department?

MR. BUTLER: No comments at this
time.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you. Board members?

MR. SANGHVI: I came and visited
your home on Sunday, actually, looked at the
area. You have a corner, you have a pie
shaped lot and there isn't room anywhere else
and you are asking for a minimal variance. I
have no problem with it.

MS. KOVAL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All
right. Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: I just want to
confirm it's 11 by 12 feet?

MS. KOVAL: Yes, 11 by 12 feet.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone
else? Okay.

I have no problem. If there
is any definition of what's unique, it's that
lot. You fit all the criteria, quite
frankly. The uniqueness, the inability to
stay within the standards because of lot size
and the shape.

So I have no problem. I
will be offering my support, if anyone would
like to make a motion, if there is no further
discussion.

Member Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: I move that we
grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0037 at
41882 Ridge Road East, that the applicant,
petitioner has shown practical difficulty, just looking at the map of the property, is pie shaped, every which way is going to be requiring some kind of assistance.

The petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited from using it because of that, and it is unique because of its pie shape.

And they didn't create this situation and it will unreasonably -- not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. The addition will enhance property values, and is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

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

(No audible responses.)

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?

MR. BYRWA: Yes.

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes seven to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted. Congratulations. I'm sure you'll be in touch with the building department.

Our final case of the evening is PZ16-0038, Conlon Installations at 40800 West Thirteen Mile Road.

This applicant is requesting a variance from the ordinance to allow construction of a 57.5 square foot monument sign, under current ordinance. Board members
you will recall that 30 square feet area.

Good evening, are you all giving testimony this evening?

MR. VERES: Good evening. My name is Chuck Veres, V, as in Victor, e-r-e-s.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You are, sir?

MR. FRECHETTE: My name is Norman Frechette. I'm the administrator pastor at the church, F-r-e-c-h-e-t-t-e.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And you are?

MR. JONNA: Gary Jonna. Chairman of the Brightmoor Church building committee.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Gentlemen, will you please raise your right hand to be sworn in.

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

MR. FRECHETTE: I do.

MR. JONNA: I do.

MR. VERES: I do.

We have a fairly unique
property that we are looking at, somewhat
unique in its configuration. In that it's a
40 acre parcel with about 175,000 square foot
under roof.

What brings us here tonight
is that there are three distinct ministries
within this facility. The minimum size that
we are proposing for the sign that's before
you tonight is required to identify properly
the three distinct ministries to motorists so
they can safely enter the property.

A good portion of this is
because when you're coming from the east,
traveling west, we were required to increase
the size of our turning lane or our -- the
cut-in for the turn to 225 linear feet, which
is much greater than it was before.

So the opportunity and
necessity to get in that lane is much earlier
than it was prior to the expansion of the
facility.

As far as the separation of
the faces of the sign, that's the second
variance we are seeking this evening, our
opinion is that this separation is totally in
keeping with the spirit of the ordinance.

I have been in the sign business probably 32 years now, and my understanding of the reason for the separation of the faces wanting to be minimal was so that you could not have a sign basically two signs facing at odd angles at an intersection, thereby giving somebody two single face signs.

This sign will be visible exactly the same from east or westbound traffic, which is what it would be seen from, and the reason we want the elliptical shape is number one, is beautification, if you will, it's going to be a planter area, that this sign will be actually installed on, and this elliptical detail is something that travels through the entire facility, on the outside and the inside.

If you look at the packet we submitted, we showed some of the way finding signage, too. Just to show you that that elliptical theme is carried throughout. And it's very important to the design and the architect's design intent to have that
carried through and it does not increase
visibility at all on the sign itself, it's
strictly a beatification attempt.

Other than that, we do have
letters of support from the immediate
neighbors and we put the address on the front
of the sign to also assist with the public
safety so people could clearly identify the
address of the property.

Other than that, I'm here to
just answer your questions and help wherever
I can.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you. Gentlemen, would you like to add
anything?

MR. FRECHETTE: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: 64 letters
mailed, four letters returned, one approval,
four objections. First objection is from
Katherine Default (ph) at 40827 Lennox Park
Drive. She believes that the current signage
size is sufficient.

The second objection is
Albert Buchanan, 40721 Lennox, and they believe the current ordinance is fair, should be respected.

Third is from Louise Pascolo (ph), 40792 Lennox Park, and she notes that -- she believes large billboards cheapen the area in Novi.

The last approval is from Dave and Deborah Olcowski, 40788 Lennox Park Drive -- excuse me, objection. And they note that the variance request is twice the size of the current ordinance as written.

Then the approval from Michael McCormick. He notes on behalf of the Fox Run retirement community, they express their support. They note their partnership with their neighbor and to reiterate their support for the variance request.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department.

MR. BUTLER: Just a follow-up with what he just read.

I had quite a few members out in the community actually come in to see me because they actually thought it was a
billboard sign. They did not see the elliptical design. When I showed it to them, explained to them, I got several, oh, that's what it is, we don't mind that. A lot of them, they didn't realize, they thought it was just a billboard sign. That kind of interfered with their good just opinion of it. It's a nice design.

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

MR. SANGHVI: I think I came and visited your property a fourth time or fifth time. I don't know how often you have been here for different things to the ZBA, over the years. And I really admire the way your whole campus, I'd like to call has expanded and developed.

I really want to commend you for that kind of development on the corner there. And I realize the need for the identification of the three ministries and all that you mentioned.

And I am also aware of the fact that M5 is a fast moving place and once you turn, there is no place to go before you
get into your entranceway, and so you need a really easy identifiable sign.

So I have no problem supporting your sign, which is also, as I might mention, esthetically beautiful and very pleasing sign. Thank you.

MR. VERES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else. Member Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I say the same thing, what he said. We need a big sign for the M5 to enter into that. I support that.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right, thank you. Anyone else? Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Is it going to be pre-lit in the middle or is that just going to have planting area there or each side will have lit for day or night?

MR. VERES: It would just be some exterior illumination. No internal illumination.

MR. JONNA: Our current monument sign has ground lighting up into the sign. We intend to light the new sign the same way.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member

Ferrell?

MR. FERRELL: What's the height

of the current sign, do you know?

MR. JONNA: I think it meets

the -- the maximum height I think is six feet

is it. That's what --

MR. FERRELL: This one is going
to be six feet tall?

MR. JONNA: Yes.

MR. FERRELL: I got a question

for the city.

So if it's six feet tall, they put plantings in it and that grows
taller, is that considered part of the sign, would that increase the square footage of the
sign because it's part of the sign?

MR. BUTLER: I have never seen

anything in writing that would be part of the
sign. That is actually plants, not part of
the physical structure of the sign, in my
professional opinion.

MR. FERRELL: So the square

footage, just to kind of keep the sign at
certain -- having the ordinance -- I don't
know what the thought process was for making the ordinance for that, but keeping the size to a minimum, if you add plantings to it. So, anybody can add plantings to the sign, that would just enhance the size of it. I just -- I don't know.

MS. SAARELA: I don't know that there has been a formal interpretation done of that before, that might be a new question. You know, it's just an interpretation.

Larry is saying he didn't interpret it at this point as not being part of the sign.

MS. KRIEGER: If you drive by, you look at Fox Run, the whole area is plantings.

MR. FERRELL: Just saying.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?

MR. VERES: Just one point of clarification. You do not have a letter of support of Lennox Park in the file? You didn't mention it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If it was part of the packet, it's already part of the
record. So the correspondence we read is what we receive after the notification goes out.

MR. VERES: That one was sent in with the packet.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you for bringing that to the board's attention. We appreciate that.

I think that given the size of this campus, and for lack of a better word right now, how tastefully it is done throughout the whole campus, I see the need for the size of the sign.

I concur with Member Ferrell, however, that's not going to stop me from supporting this tonight, but I would be cognizant of what the planting were to not take away from that identification.

So when we had other cases where, you know, they did something then something grows in front of it, it's, you know, blocked -- I wouldn't want to see that for the vegetation, so I would just keep that in mind.

But given the size of your
campus, given the visibility hinderance that you have with the type of traffic that you have, also given the fact that you have the three separate businesses that need to be properly identified, you don't have a lot of time to figure out the identity, I have no problem with your request. Therefore I will be supporting it.

MR. VERES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there any further discussion? Would someone like to make a motion. Member Ferrell. Sorry. Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: In Case No. PZ16-0038, sought by Conlon Installation, I move that we grant the variances -- the two variances as requested as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty presenting -- getting the proper visibility of their development, to the traffic flow.

Without the variance the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented from getting the visibility out properly, given the large land side 40 acreage lot parcel, thus the necessary additional size of
the sign.

And additionally, from a safety concern for westbound traffic coming down Thirteen Mile, and the expansion of the entranceway into the property, the necessary proper visibility so the (unintelligible) can properly identify the development and enter that lane in a safe manner. The petitioner did not create these individual conditions, as mentioned, through the large size, and the safety concerns and the relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, again, due to the esthetic improvement of the sign or increase property values.

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

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

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been moved and second by Member Ferrell.

Is there any further discussion?

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

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

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

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

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

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

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes seven to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variance has been granted.

MR. FRECHETTE: We are very grateful for your support. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank
you.

Are there any other matters to discuss?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I have a suggestion to the board members that in light of fact that the last couple of months we have been having some technical issues with our Ipads.

I did have a conversation with Mr. Boulard and I'm going to suggest that we have a small meeting, a training session, if you will.

I don't know that we need to know how to operate an Ipad, but I think we all agree that we are having struggles with it. Maybe meeting with IT people, if we sit down for a half an hour. And I know we are all busy.

MR. SANGHVI: I haven't used the Ipad for a long time because of the problems I have had. And I just use my own laptop and download everything from the city site.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: However, not all of us have that ability to do that.
I mean, I have more computers than I need.
This Ipad is my saving Grace right now.

Given the challenges that we all faced, over the last couple of months, I am going to ask Monica if she would please get together with the powers that be and maybe schedule a half an hour or an hour and then let us know when that would be convenient. Is everybody okay with that?

THE BOARD: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is evening better than a Saturday morning for a quick bit, or evening better for everybody?

THE BOARD: Evening.

MR. BUTLER: Is there a certain evening of the week that's more feasible than another?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Not Mondays.

MR. FERRELL: Or the second Tuesday of every month.

MS. DRESLINSKI: I have to get with IT. I will email you guys a couple of days.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If there
a motion to adjourn?

MR. FERRELL: So moved.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meeting adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)
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