REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY OF NOVI

October 11, 2016

Proceedings taken in the matter of the ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Tuesday, October 11, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS

Cindy Gronachan, Chairperson

Jonathan Montville, Secretary

David Byrwa

Brent Ferrell
Joe Peddiboyina

ALSO PRESENT: Lawrence Butler, Building Official

Beth Saarela, City Attorney

Coordinator: Monica Dreslinski, Recording Secretary

Carol Chaput, Recording Secretary

REPORTED BY: Jennifer L. Wall, Certified Shorthand Reporter

10/11/2016

1		
		Page 2
1		
2	INDEX	
3	Case No. Page	
4	PZ16-0039 5	
5	PZ16-0040 15	
6	PZ16-0042 23	
7	PZ16-0044 32	
8	PZ16-0045 47	
9	PZ16-0046 66	
10	PZ16-0047 74	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

	Page 3
1	Novi, Michigan.
2	Tuesday, October 11, 2016
3	7:00 p.m.
4	** **
5	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good
6	evening. I would like to call the October 11
7	2016 Zoning Board of Appeals people meeting to
8	order.
9	I will ask Member Byrwa to
10	lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Please
11	rise.
12	(Pledge recited.)
13	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica,
14	can you please call the roll.
15	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
16	MR. FERRELL: Here.
17	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
18	MR. BYRWA: Here.
19	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger is
20	absent, excused.
21	Member Montville?
22	MR. MONTVILLE: Here.
23	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Page 4 1 Peddiboyina? 2 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Here. 3 MR. FERRELL: Member Sanghvi is 4 absent, excused. 5 And Chairperson Gronachan? 6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Here. 7 Thank you. This evening we 8 will run the meeting following our normal 9 rules and conduct, and I'm asking everyone to 10 please shut off your cellphones at this time. 11 The cases will be called to 12 the podium. At that point, you will represent the information to the board. 13 14 After the petitioner gives 15 all the information, it will be at that time, 16 we will ask if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on that 17 18 particular case. 19 Are there any changes in the 2.0 agenda this evening? 21 The first MS. DRESLINSKI: Yes. 22 case, Case PZ16-0034, has been postponed to 23 the November 15 meeting.

	Page 5
1	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do we need
2	to make a motion for that or
3	MS. SAARELA: You don't need to
4	since they called in ahead of time.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
6	We have minutes from July and
7	August. Board members, are there any changes
8	or additions to the minutes after review?
9	All those in favor of the minutes as they
10	are, say aye.
11	THE BOARD: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: None
13	opposed. The minutes for July 2016 and
14	August 2016 have been approved.
15	Is there anyone in the
16	audience at this time that wishes to make a
17	public remark regarding anything other than
18	what's before us this evening?
19	Seeing none, we will move
20	into our first case, which is Case No.
21	PZ16-0039, Phillips Sign and Lighting, Inc
22	Is the petitioner here. Come
23	on down. The applicant is requesting a

Page 6 1 variance from the City of Novi to allow 2 installation of one additional wall sign of 65 square feet on the north elevation of the 3 4 building. Sir, if you would -- if you 5 6 are both going to testify, please state your 7 names, spell it for our recording secretary, 8 and then raise your right hand to be sworn 9 in. 10 MR. SIEWERT: Bill Seward, 50617 11 Fossett Drive, Macomb. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you 13 spell your last name for us, please. 14 MR. SIEWERT: S-i-e-w-e-r-t. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Are you 16 the only one giving testimony this evening? 17 MR. SIEWERT: Jessica. 18 MS. HUTTENSTINE: Jessica 19 Huttenstine, H-u-t-t-e-n-s-t-i-n-e. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you 21 both raise your right hands. 22 MR. MONTVILLE: Would you both 23 raise your right hands. Do you swear to tell

Page 7 1 the truth in the testimony you are about to 2 give? MR. SIEWERT: Yes. 3 4 MS. HUTTENSTINE: Yes. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may 6 proceed. 7 MR. SIEWERT: Good evening. have a medical establishment that we have 8 9 clients that have appointments that are 10 critical to keeping a timely agenda for the 11 clients here, people need to get there on time 12 and be able to get out of there on time to 13 keep the flow. 14 And that's the hardship that 15 we are proposing for a sign on the exterior 16 of the building so that people can have ample 17 time to find the single drive that is into 18 the establishment so that they can keep their 19 appointments. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 21 Anything else that you would like to add? 22 MS. HUTTENSTINE: There is so much 23 I could say, but --

Page 8 1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Why don't 2 you tell us what type of facility it is. 3 Medical, that would be pretty broad, but 4 specifically --5 MS. HUTTENSTINE: We run a 6 physical therapy clinic and it is hard to see 7 our building from -- I should say, our 8 location from the road, and we have patients 9 that can't find it, they call, they're 30 10 minutes late. 11 We are also open early and 12 late, from six to eight at night. That makes us extremely hard to find. So a lighted sign 13 would help with that. And also when our 14 15 patients are late, it not only jeopardizes 16 their care, but it potentially runs over into 17 jeopardizing the care of others. That's it. 18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good job. 19 MS. HUTTENSTINE: That's most of 2.0 my concern. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there 22 anyone in the audience that wishes to make

comment on this case? Seeing none, building

Page 9 1 department? 2 MR. BUTLER: No questions at this 3 time. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 5 Correspondence? 6 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 26 letters 7 mailed, two returned, zero approvals, one 8 objection from Robert Jeneru (ph) at 39608 9 Bunton Drive, and he notes his opposition to 10 the sign as he feels the light will encroach 11 on his property and potentially affect his 12 property value. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Board members? 14 15 MR. MONTVILLE: Can you spend a 16 quick second on the design of the sign. Looks 17 like you have a professional rendering put 18 together. Second or two on the thought 19 process. 2.0 MS. HUTTENSTINE: Can I ask what 21 their address was? I'm just trying to see how 22 it would affect his property. 23 MR. MONTVILLE: 39608 Bunton,

B-u-n-t-o-n, for the record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

MR. SIEWERT: It's not a type of sign that's going to be -- that's going to beam --

MR. MONTVILLE: I understand. The size and dimensions are necessary so we know that there was a thought process that went into it for the record. I mean, it looks like there was. I'm not trying to beacon you off. I'm just curious.

MR. SIEWERT: Yes, there was. We kept their logo in proportion to the size of the building to, you know, compliment what's out there and not overpower, you know, how many -- the wall, but it has esthetic value.

MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. Ouick comments from my perspective.

Going west on Ten Mile, it's a fast road. We have had issues with that address before, especially with medical facilities and customers and potentially missing the signs. I think it's warranted.

I'm in favor of the sign as applied for.

Page 11 1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. 2 Member Ferrell? 3 MR. FERRELL: So is the lighting 4 like that much brighter than normal signs, is 5 it average lighting, typical sign that would 6 be on a building? 7 MR. SIEWERT: It's LED lighting. 8 MR. FERRELL: Okay. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone 10 else? I will tell you that I did drive, after 11 I saw the letter, because it was part of our 12 packet, and I specifically drove around the 13 entire neighborhood trying to get an idea if 14 there would be a negative impact. I will tell 15 you that I did not see any negative impact. 16 I will, for the record, say 17 that the residents behind the building on 18 Bunton Drive, the property line abuts, but 19 there is no lighting, and this particular 2.0 sign is not on that side of the property, 21 it's on the north side of the building, and I

think that what the objection was maybe

perhaps you thought it was going to be on the

22

south side.

But after looking at it,
there isn't anything that I could see that
would contribute. I don't even see any
spotlights or anything for at night, security
lights or anything. I thought maybe that's
what they were talking about, but that's
not -- this case does not have any of those
issues.

as well. I think that where you are located, the setting of the building, it sets back, as the two previous speakers, we have had other issues with this building, given the speed limit, the traffic flow, and then it's Ten Mile Road in Novi, people that are going for physical therapy, you're not thinking 100 percent to begin with, with all due respect, and when you're driving, the last thing you want to do is miss the driveway and have to turn around at Haggerty or go all the way down. Yes, it's not a good sign.

So whatever we can do to

2.0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

23

Page 13

help. And I think that this sign is within the spirit of the ordinance.

I think that given the frontage of the building, it's a nice fit, and for where it is and when you're driving up west on Ten Mile, you catch it right away.

And the same thing when you're coming east, so yes, it was me driving back and forth all night on Saturday.

So, with that, if there is a motion. Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

In Case No. PZ16-0039 sought by the petitioner, the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the sign. Without the variance, petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, due to the petitioner stating that it's difficult for patients to see the location and has had several complaints from patients trying to find the location.

14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22

Page 14 1 The property is unique due to 2 the location. The petitioner did not create the condition. 3 4 The relief granted will not 5 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or 6 surrounding properties, due to the petitioner 7 stating that the lights are LED and they are 8 standard lighting, it will not cause a 9 negative impact on surrounding properties. 10 The relief is consistent with 11 the spirit and intent of the ordinance. 12 MR. MONTVILLE: Second. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been 13 14 moved and seconded. Any further discussion? 15 Seeing none, Monica, would 16 you please call the roll. 17 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell? 18 MR. FERRELL: Yes. 19 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? 2.0 MR. BYRWA: Yes. 21 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville? 22 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. 23 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

	Page 15
1	Peddiboyina?
2	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
3	MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
4	Gronachan?
5	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
6	MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
7	five to zero.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:
9	Congratulations. Your
10	variance has been granted and I'm sure you
11	will be in touch with the building
12	department. Good luck to you.
13	Our next case is PZ16-0040
14	Metro Detroit Signs for Chipotle, 43345
15	Crescent Boulevard.
16	Is the petitioner here? I
17	think he is going to be taking up residence
18	this evening.
19	The applicant is requesting a
20	variance to allow installation of one
21	additional sign on the west elevation of the
22	property.
23	Your name, please.

MR. DETERS: Good evening. My name is Paul Deters. I'm with Metro Detroit Signs, 11444 Kaltz Avenue.

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

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

MR. DETERS: I do. Thank you for your consideration this evening. Here we have Chipotle. As you can see, they have sort of an unusual circumstance there, that the sign -- we have applied for a sign and received approval for one phase of the parking lot.

The second sign, which is actually the rear of the building, is the sign that traffic would see. And we were hoping for the board's consideration in light of the fact that it's such an unusual circumstance for how their clients would enter into that property, so that really only one sign is visible at a time, and it would

2.0

Page 17 1 be difficult for anyone to identify the 2 business, if there were not a sign on the property which would face -- we have it at 3 the -- sort of the intersection of Crescent 4 5 and Ingersoll, I know that Primanti Brothers 6 has a similar circumstance there, we are just 7 hoping that you would like to consider 8 granting approval for this. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything 10 else? 11 MR. DETERS: No. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Could you 13 perhaps describe the additional sign that you 14 are going to be -- that you're proposing this 15 evening? MR. DETERS: 16 Sure. 17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Maybe if 18 you could put the sign up, if that helps. 19 MR. DETERS: The sign that we are 2.0 proposing is an identical sign to the one that 21 has been approved already by the building 22 department. 23 So the one that's -- really

Page 18 1 just go over the entry, as a marker for where 2 their patrons would enter the store, the sign that requires the variance is the one that 3 4 would actually be seen for traffic that 5 drives around inside the center, and the sign 6 is within -- when it's approved, it's within what the ordinance would allow for that. 7 8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you 9 for that clarification. Is there anyone in 10 the audience that wishes to make comment on 11 this case? 12 Seeing none, building 13 department? 14 MR. BUTLER: No comments at this 15 time. Standing by. Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 17 Are there any correspondence? MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 85 letters 18 19 mailed, 11 returned, zero approvals, zero 2.0 objections. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Board members? 22 23 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How big is the

	Page 19
1	sign? Same size you have current?
2	MR. DETERS: Yes, 32 square feet.
3	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything
5	else? Anyone else?
6	Member Montville.
7	MR. MONTVILLE: I would just
8	reiterate that that is a unique parcel
9	directionally, from the west where Novi Road
10	is, the main entrance coming into the Town
11	Center. I have no problem. I think it's
12	warranted. Esthetically it's the same design
13	as the original sign, so I'm in full support
14	as requested.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
16	When are you opening?
17	MR. DETERS: I don't know exactly
18	when that is, but it's going to be fairly
19	soon.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Hopefully
21	when the construction is done.
22	MR. DETERS: It wasn't easy to get
23	here tonight.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I have no 2 problem with this, as we don't usually -- when we are reviewing cases, we review it on it's 3 4 own merit, but this particular location does 5 present a challenge with vision from all 6 sides, and being that you're a new business, I 7 think that proper identification is important, 8 especially in that location. 9 I am in full support, have no 10 objection, and if there is a motion, I would 11 entertain a motion. Member Ferrell. 12 MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. 13 14 I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0040 sought by the 15 16 petitioner for an additional sign in the back 17 of the building. 18 The petitioner has shown 19 practical difficulty requiring additional 2.0 signage, due to the topography of the lot and 21 the land. 22 Without the variance, the 23 petitioner will be unreasonably limited with

Page 21 1 respect to the use of the property and making 2 it difficult to find the location from the 3 back of the building. 4 The property is unique due to 5 its location. The petitioner did not create 6 the condition. The relief will not. 7 8 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or 9 surrounding properties. The relief is 10 consistent with the spirit and intent of the 11 ordinance, also due to the way the building 12 was designed. The lot again, is really difficult to see which business is actually 13 14 for which part of the building because there 15 is no signage in the back. 16 MR. MONTVILLE: Second. 17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you 18 accept a friendly amendment. Instead of using 19 back, can we just use west elevation? 2.0 MR. FERRELL: Sure. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will remove the back and the use west elevation for 22

Thank you.

the motion.

	Page 22
1	MR. FERRELL: Sure.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
3	moved and second. Any further discussion?
4	Seeing none, Monica, could
5	you please call the roll.
6	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
7	MR. FERRELL: Yes.
8	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
9	MR. BYRWA: Yes.
10	MR. FERRELL: Member Montville?
11	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
12	MR. FERRELL: Member Peddiboyina?
13	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
14	MR. FERRELL: Chairperson
15	Gronachan?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
17	MR. FERRELL: Motion passes five
18	to zero.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
20	variance has been granted. Good luck and
21	welcome to Novi.
22	MR. DETERS: Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I don't

Page 23 1 think you're going too far. We get to see you 2 again. As a matter of fact, I think 3 4 you're going to stay right there. Are you on 5 the next case? 6 MR. DETERS: Yes. 7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The next 8 case is PZ16-0042, 43575 West Oaks Drive. 9 applicant is requesting a variance to allow 10 installation of an oversized wall sign. This 11 is for Rally House. 12 Would you please state your 13 name for the recording secretary. 14 MR. DETERS: My name is Paul I'm with Metro Detroit Signs, 11444 15 16 Kaltz Avenue in Warren. 17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Raise your 18 right hand, please. 19 MS. SAARELA: It's okay. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It carries 21 over. Please proceed. MR. DETERS: You know, I would 22 23 also like to call up with me, there is a

Page 24 1 representative from Rally House here. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you state your name please, and spell it for our 3 4 secretary. 5 MR. MELNAR: John Melnar, 6 M-e-l-n-a-r. 7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you 8 raise your right hand and be sworn in, please. 9 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to 10 tell the truth in the testimony you are about 11 to give? 12 MR. MELNAR: I do. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please 14 proceed. 15 MR. DETERS: So before you this 16 evening, I have a case where Rally House is 17 requesting relief from the board to consider 18 allowing a slightly larger sign than what 19 would be permitted based on the frontage that 2.0 they have there. And like some of the other 21 tenants in that center, who have come before 22 you before, they're hoping for a little larger 23 sign, just due to the setback that they have

there.

The sign is set back quite a bit for the driveway, as you know, for anybody entering along West Oaks there. And what we feel is the sign that we are proposing is still within the spirit of the ordinance.

And also if you might consider too is the fact that Rally House probably could make the identification larger, if they just included just the lettering, like some of the other tenants have.

However, their logo is such that they have some decorative elements in there with the flags, sort of their corporate identity, which takes away and not only that, but the irregular configuration of their sign also takes away from the allowable area that they would have. They think that that's much more an esthetically pleasing sign to have it the way it's drawn there, and we are hoping that if you were to grant this, it would just

allow the lettering that's on there, the
Rally House lettering itself, to be slightly
larger than what the 65 square foot sign that
would be permitted in the ordinance would
allow us for and just make it easier for
folks identifying them as you're traveling
along the entry drive to the shopping center.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Would you like to add anything else?

MR. MELNAR: I believe the current design as you see it on the front of the building, too, really adds to what the size comparably is to the rest of the stores. Our sign is not oversized, I would say, in that manner, but comparably to the two signs, Michaels and the Container Store, left and right to our sign, we have tried to make it so that it is all -- it looks uniform in that manner.

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

Seeing none, building

2.0

1	department?
2	MR. BUTLER: Just only comment,
3	due to the fact that it's because of a
4	setback, their requirement for an oversized
5	sign is justifiable just so people can see it.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay,
7	thank you. Is there any correspondence?
8	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 34 letters
9	mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals,
10	zero objections.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.
12	Thank you. Board members? Member Ferrell.
13	MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam
14	Chair. For the building department. Do we
15	know what the other size of the signs on the
16	buildings are over there?
17	MR. MELNAR: I have got a picture

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MELNAR: I have got a picture of the front, if you want to see it.

MR. BUTLER: We don't have the dimensions. Around 60 square feet, they're pretty close. From driving by there, they're pretty close to that size. I think as esthetics provices, it fits in.

Page 28 1 MR. FERRELL: Okay. 2 MR. DETERS: I believe the 3 Container Store is 100 some square feet, is it 4 not? 5 MR. BUTLER: That could be a 6 little bit bigger, but --7 MR. DETERS: When we had worked 8 with T. J. Maxx, it was 100 and some square 9 feet as well, but those were larger store 10 front, as the gentleman there had said. 11 I think this is -- what we are asking for is in proportion with the 12 store front, so it's still keeping within the 13 14 ordinance and spirit of the ordinance as well. 15 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 17 Anything else? 18 MR. FERRELL: No. 19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member 2.0 Montville? 21 MR. MONTVILLE: I would just make 22 the comment that it is a unique situation with 23 the setback being so far back, and clearly,

the esthetic value of the property has been well thought out by the applicant and the team and from a relative size standpoint to the frontage that they had to work with, I am comfortable with the 79 feet that's been requested versus typically 65 allotted, additional 14 feet are warranted, I would be in support of the sign as it's requested.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone else?

We have had several people up in front of us in the past from this strip mall, and the challenge still is the same.

The setback and the fact that you guys are at an angle, you're not facing straight onto any major road. Granted there is a side road, but by the time you're not normally traveling, that's not a through road. And especially at night, with the increased traffic in Novi, I think that you did a good job on this. I appreciate the fact that you went in -- you didn't over -- you didn't go overkill. I think it's

2.0

consistent and it's uniform as you mentioned, and I am in full support of this request.

Is there a motion? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance requested in Case No.
PZ16-0042, sought by Metro Detroit Signs for the oversized sign of 79 square feet requested versus the allowable 65, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring an oversized sign. Without the variance, as being requested, petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to the use of their retail consumer property due to the limited visibility and also the high traffic, high density area and potential safety concerns with customers finding that location.

The property is unique due to the significant setback from any major roads. The petitioner did not create this particular condition, as I mentioned, the unit and the current store location is at a considerable

2.0

Page 31 1 setback. 2 The relief granted will not 3 unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or 4 surrounding properties, as the esthetic value 5 will be enhanced due to the professional design due to the time that was put into the 6 7 the design. The relief is consistent with 8 9 the spirit and intent of the ordinance. For 10 those reasons, I move that we grant the 11 motion as requested. 12 MR. FERRELL: Second. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been 14 moved and seconded. Is there any further 15 discussion? Seeing none, Monica, will you 16 please call the roll. 17 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell? 18 MR. FERRELL: Yes. 19 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? 2.0 MR. BYRWA: Yes. 21 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville? 22 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. 23 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

Page 32 1 Peddiboyina? 2 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. 3 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson 4 Gronachan? 5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes 6 7 five to zero. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your 9 variance has been granted and when are you 10 opening? 11 MR. DETERS: We'd like to before 12 Thanksgiving if we can get a building permit. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That's out 14 of our jurisdiction. Good luck and welcome to 15 Novi. 16 Our next case is PZ16-0044, 17 Walsh College of Novi campus. Is the 18 petitioner here. Come on down. 19 The applicant is requesting 2.0 variances to allow construction of a one 21 oversized ground sign at 73,000 -- am I reading this right, 73,125 square feet, to 22 23 allow the second 42-inch directional sign.

Page 33 1 MS. DRESLINSKI: There is a 2 period --CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 3 73.125, to allow a second 42-inch directional. 4 5 evening. Now that I messed that up. 6 Are you both giving testimony 7 this evening? Would you step to the mike and 8 give your names and then be sworn in by our 9 secretary. 10 MS. BERGERON: My name is 11 Stephanie Bergeron, B-e-r-g-e-r-o-n. 12 MS. STOUT: My name is Christine Stout, S-t-o-u-t. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Will you 15 raise your right hands to be sworn in, please. 16 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to 17 tell the truth in the testimony you are about 18 to provide. 19 MS. BERGERON: I do. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: If you 21 have any renderings of your sign, you can put them on the overhead for the audience at home. 22 23 MS. BERGERON: While Chris is

doing that, I'll start with an introduction.

I am Stephanie Bergeron. I am the president and the CEO of Walsh College. I am here today to personally apologize because we want you to know the highest level of the institution, we are very sorry that the sign was installed without meeting the ordinance requirements for sign size.

I am here to tell you that it was done without malice, without intent. It was done because of an oversight within our institution in terms of communication, an oversight by our contractor. But we are here to make it right and we want you to know that we feel that way from the highest level of the organization.

We have been in Novi since 1993, and in our current location since 1998. We value our relationship with the City of Novi, its residents, its communities, its businesses. We want to be viewed to be a respected value of the community. But we are here tonight to set it right.

1 2

3

4

5

good reasons to obtain the signage variance.

I'd like to be able to ask Chris Stout, our

assistant vice president of facilities to

explain to you some of the reasons why we

think the signage that's installed is

6 7

appropriate.

8

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

We think that there are some

9

MS. STOUT: Hi. I'm Chris Stout.

Consistency of branding for

10

I am in charge of the facilities at Walsh, as

Stephanie has mentioned, we certainly regret

11

our oversight in terms of the size of the sign

12 13

permitted. So we have put some internal

14

measures in place to insure that that will not

15

happen again. So, we are committed to being

16

good citizens of Novi.

17

18

the college is an important factor both for

19

our students and our faculty, as well as for

20

the overall image of the college. We

21

recently went through a re-branding process,

22

when we did a renovation at our Troy campus.

23

That included changing the signage at Troy.

When that process was completed, what we were trying to do was to consistently brand Novi as well, and make the signage consistent so that our students would understand that we were a multi-site campus, and that they were part of that institution.

When we requested the sign, we used the same contractors that performed the work at Troy and unfortunately they simply replicated the size of the sign that's utilized for our Troy campus, without confirming that the dimensions met the ordinance of the city or permit process.

As Stephanie has stated, our administration was not aware of this fact and only became aware when the compliance officer let us know.

The particular signage at issue is an expensive sign. It was over \$50,000 for that sign, for the two signs actually.

We believe the sign does enhance the overall look of the area, and is

2.0

a significant improvement to the prior signage, which I think is in your packets.

These are attractive. They are high quality.

They're extremely expensive and I believe they add to the overall esthetic.

We have spoken with the neighbors and the landowners and they have given us letters of support, which are also in your packet, and they also indicate they believe that the new sign is an attractive addition to the area.

More importantly, as we have stated in our application, the sign is necessary for visibility, particularly due to two issues, one is the vegetation that grows along Meadowbrook Road over the -- by the overpass of I-96, and the other is for especially the southbound traffic on Meadowbrook Road coming over the overpass.

The site line visibility
makes it very difficult to see where the
driveway is there. I'm sure you're aware
that the entrance at Gardenbrook, Meadowbrook

2.0

and Eleven Mile there is all very close, so there is not a lot of time to make a decision. So a bigger sign we feel is a little bit safer for those people who are coming into the campus, especially those who are new and that are unfamiliar kind of where that driveway is.

So we are an Il district, the sign is I think comparable to other signs in the area. It is not out of range and doesn't appear to the South University sign that's at Twelve and Meadowbrook, and we are hoping that you will understand how we got in this situation.

So in closing, we believe that the dimensional variance should be granted for the following reasons.

The variance will enhance visibility and provide greater safety for those coming to the college traveling along Meadowbrook. It is not detrimental to the nearing properties and the property owners that express their support.

Page 39 1 I think it does support the 2 intent of the ordinance, which was insuring a traffic business area. And a smaller sign 3 4 does not do as well with the objectives of 5 both safety and visibility as well as our 6 branding. 7 Do you have any other 8 questions for me or Stephanie? 9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. 10 Well, we'll get back to you. 11 Is there anyone in the 12 audience that wishes to make comment? 13 none, building department? 14 MR. BUTLER: No comment at this 15 time. Standing by. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 16 Member 17 Montville, is there any correspondence? 18 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 20 letters 19 mailed, two letters returned, three approvals. 2.0 First is from Joseph F. 21 Cozic, he notes the approval, no concerns. Ι am looking for his address. He's writing 22 23 from Woodward Avenue in Bloomfield Hills, JF

Investment Company. He notes his approval.

The second approval is from

Ms. Teldrin, her address is a P. O. Box in

Novi Michigan, P.O. Box 8002. She is the HR

director for Michigan Milk Producers

Association, they note their lack of concern.

They have no concerns for the sign as

proposed.

And the third approval is from Freddy Simpson, who is the president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance, Way (ph)
Employees Division, their address is 41475
Gardenbrook Road, Novi, Michigan. And similar to the previous two approvals, notes zero concerns regarding the variance request from the college.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.

Board members? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: To just clarify too. So the two requests, the one for the oversize sign and then the second for the additional sign, which I think is a delivery sign on campus.

2.0

Page 41 1 MS. STOUT: Yes, the monument sign 2 is on Meadowbrook and Gardenbrook. There is another sign into the driveway off 3 4 Gardenbrook, that kind of directs traffic. 5 MR. MONTVILLE: The oversized sign, I agree. I think it fits the lot, 6 7 especially with the vegetation and I-96 8 overpass. There is limited visibility that 9 vegetation has grown out. Clearly it's very 10 well thought out, the design and esthetic 11 value to the property. 12 As far as the second request 13 for the delivery sign, again, it's a big 14 property. I don't know what your acreage is 15 off the top of my head. I'm sure --16 MS. STOUT: We are at 11 acres. 17 MR. MONTVILLE: I'm sure trucks 18 coming in and differentiating between -- where 19 they are going, I think that's wanted to label 2.0 where the delivery area is, too. I support 21 that variance request as well. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okav.

Member Ferrell?

Thank you.

1 MR. FERRELL: Being a student at 2 Walsh, I know coming over Meadowbrook, going north -- southbound. I saw the sign for the 3 4 first time, I didn't know you guys had it. It 5 was like, oh, there is Walsh. But I have in 6 the past come the other way northbound, and 7 had passed the driveway. I do know you guys 8 need a bigger sign. 9 One thing I don't like is you 10 built the sign first then came, that does 11 bother me. However it is needed. I do agree 12 with the size of the sign. I think it is definitely well placed, well done. Branding 13 14 is great. As far as the other sign, I 15 16 do agree that we do need a sign. It is a big 17 lot, big piece of property, people will know 18 where the deliveries are and such. So I am 19 in support of this as well. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. 21 Member Peddiboyina. 22 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, I do agree

with my board members. I also do a couple of

classes at Walsh. We need the education purpose. This is very important.

But only one thing, what he said, the installation. That's the only thing. I support this.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I am happy that it's lighter. I live on Meadowbrook Road, driving all the time, and the one concern that I had about your signs, although I am not a student at Walsh, because I don't have enough time in my life to go. One day I will be there. I will get there one of these days.

One of the things that I did not like about the older signs is that it was too dark, and Meadowbrook is a very dark road. I am hoping that this is going to end that conflict. Because there are night classes, and with the increase in amount of traffic on Meadowbrook, they can be very dangerous.

It is unfortunate that they built it without going through the proper

2.0

Page 44 1 channels, however, in this day and age, I can 2 understand that communication can happen. However, I just want to say 3 4 that if this sign is ever changed again, I 5 hope that Walsh College has learned their 6 lesson. It sounds like it. 7 So, given the increase 8 visibilty of your sign, I am in support of. 9 I am also in support of the higher height, 10 and given the amount of snow that we get 11 especially out in there, it's like the snow 12 belt, that covers those signs, it covered 13 that sign before for years. 14 I'm sure you had a problem with it. I think that this decreases -- or I 15 16 should say increases your safety value for 17 having the property sign and for 18 identification and I will be in support of 19 it. 2.0 Having said that, I would 21 entertain a motion. Member Montville. 22 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we 23 grant the variance requested in Case No.

PZ16-0044, sought by Walsh College, the Novi campus, as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty, properly providing sufficient exposure on Meadowbrook Road, both due to the I-96 overpass and the current vegetation of lot. Additionally, at night the visibilty was an issue and this will be an improvement of the additional lighting and also with the heightened sign during the winter months especially.

The property is unique again, due to the vegetation, as previously mentioned, and the I-96 overpass creating the elevation of drivers going south towards the campus.

Petitioner did not create both particular conditions as they were preexisting.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, again, due to the increased esthetic value of the signs and also as noted by several of the neighbors in

2.0

Page 46 1 their incoming correspondence. 2 The relief is consistent with 3 the spirt and intent of the ordinance, and 4 for those reasons, I move that we grant the 5 oversized sign and the second request also of the delivery sign on campus, again, so the 6 7 applicant can have proper use of their land 8 as zoned for proper deliveries notifications 9 and efficient of traffic on campus. 10 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been 12 moved and second. Any other further discussion? 13 14 Seeing none, Monica, would 15 you please call the roll. MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell? 16 17 MR. FERRELL: Yes. 18 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? 19 MR. BYRWA: Yes. 2.0 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville? 21 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. 22 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member 23 Peddiboyina?

Page 47 1 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. yes. 2 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson Gronachan? 3 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. 5 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five to zero. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your 8 motion has been granted. Please see the 9 building department. I don't know what other 10 paperwork --11 MS. STOUT: I would like to thank 12 you for your support in consideration of our 13 request. I promise you, we are a learning 14 organization, we will make sure we will never 15 do this again. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. 17 Next Case PZ16-0045, Out and 18 Out Quality 2481 Glenda Street, north of Ten 19 Mile, east of Taft. The applicant is 2.0 requesting variances to allow construction of 21 an 850 square foot attached accessory garage, where 620 feet normally is allowable. 22 23 Petitioner is here, both of

	Page 48
1	you are giving testimony this evening?
2	MS. DRESLINSKI: The address is
3	24831.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: What did I
5	say?
6	MS. DRESLINSKI: You switched the
7	numbers. 24831.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
9	Correct that on the record, sorry. You are
10	both giving testimony this evening?
11	MS. TARPINIAN: Correct.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
13	please state your names and spell it for the
14	secretary and then raise your right hand to be
15	sworn.
16	MS. TARPINIAN: I'm Melinda
17	Tarpinian, last name is T-a-r-p-i-n-i-a-n.
18	MR. TAWSE: Robert Tawse,
19	T-a-w-s-e.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you
21	raise your right hands to be sworn in.
22	MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to
23	tell the truth in the testimony you are about

Page 49 1 to provide? 2 MS. TARPINIAN: Yes. 3 MR. TAWSE: Yes. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may 5 proceed. MR. TAWSE: We originally sent 6 7 this in to basically put an addition onto the 8 house with a new garage. 9 The present Tarpinians have 10 lived in the area for 32 years, the same 11 structure, they're getting a little bit 12 older, planning on staying here in Novi. We are moving the laundry facility from the 13 14 basement up to the main floor, and then the 15 garage that's there now is basically 16 following part back from the day when it was 17 built. 18 I was having some foundation 19 issues and the thought process here as to 2.0 make it easier as they get older to get in 21 and out of the house with their vehicles and 22 bring the laundry to the first floor. 23 Since we had turned this

stuff in for the variance, in the process, we were originally over 174 square feet, garage size to house size. Since that time we had gotten a building permit for the egress window for the lower level, so that should take care of the square foot issue of the garage being larger than the home.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Anything else?

MS. TARPINIAN: Our plan is to bring my mother to live with us, which is why we want to bring the laundry up. She is 83 and still somewhat independent. That's kind of we thought -- we talked about just rebuilding the garage. We knew we couldn't fix it, it's just too many things wrong. But we thought this would be the time to move it over. We plan to die in this home.

I think some of the variances, just because we want to cover the porch at the same time. So the garage will come forward more, it's not increasing car space, it's not going to give us a three car

2.0

garage, it's just more esthetic to bring it -- you know, so we can cover the porch and it will just look pretty, look really nice.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything

else?

2.0

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment on this case? Please come on down.

Would you state your name and your address.

MR. JILG: My name is Dan Jilg, J-i-l-g, I live at 24817 Glenda Street. I'm the neighbor just south of the Tarpinians. We have been their neighbors over 23 years. And what they're doing to the house makes the neighborhood -- I mean, brightens up that area. I mean, what they have done in taking care of their elderly parents is phenomenal. I reviewed the plans myself. My background is in architecture, education. The esthetics of it are beautiful and just make the whole house flow better. I think they have done an awesome job of how to live -- I have no

problems -- I live right next to them. I have been there for 23 years. They have awesome neighbors. I just want to give them my support.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.

Thank you. Is there anyone else? Seeing

none, building department.

MR. BUTLER: I want to say. We had our inspector come out, and walked the property with them, looked at it. And the numbers they have come up with, it is a doable thing.

It's going to to -- of course, it's not overly sized or anything like that. But they crunched the numbers and said that it is doable.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I have a question for you. Can you address the egress window that he spoke of in his testimony?

MR. BUTLER: The egress window for the basement would be if they had made it so someone sleeping and using the bedroom in the basement, that is required to have an egress

2.0

Page 53 1 window in case there is a fire, they have 2 another way of getting out. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: How does 3 4 that affect the square footage? 5 MR. BUTLER: It adds to the square 6 footage because it is considered a living 7 space, because somebody is sleeping there. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there 9 any correspondence? 10 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were 29 11 letters mailed, zero letters returned, seven 12 approvals and one objection. 13 The first approval is from Sandra Turner, at 24903 Glenda Drive, she 14 15 notes her residence is immediately adjacent 16 and she approves the variance as requested. Second is from Talio and 17 18 Peggy Pachela (ph) at 24759 Glenda Drive, 19 they note their approval. 2.0 Next is from Sharon and 21 Martin Brooks at 24924 Glenda, they note 22 their approval. 23 And Daniel and Deborah Jilg

Page 54 1 at 24817 Glenda, that's the previous 2 testimony, approval. Joel and Margie Shimshock at 3 24741 Glenda, they note their approval. 4 5 is a copy. 6 And then there is an 7 attachment of an objection from Lee and 8 Ginger Berrons at 24777 Glenda, they have 9 three pages. I will summarize the 10 highlights. Say that the building is a 11 combination of the older sheds that are 12 built, when the home was originally built. 13 They note they believe that 14 there is loud machinery, the current building 15 is used for either work or hobby running loud machinery often. 16 17 They note that the 18 correspondence asking for letters of support, 19 they note they believe that does not describe 2.0 the actual detail of the project and leads 21 one to believe that this is just common 22 garage replacement. 23 They note they had lived on

Page 55 1 the street for 33 years and they would like 2 it to remain a place of quiet residential 3 enjoyment, and reiterate their objection. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 5 Boards members? Member Ferrell. Thank you. 6 Thanks, Madam Chair. MR. FERRELL: 7 How many years, 33 years, your mother --8 MS. TARPINIAN: 32, it will be 33. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your 10 mother lives with you --11 MS. TARPINIAN: No, we would like 12 to bring her in. She is 83 and she's needing to -- we raised our five kids there. 13 14 MR. FERRELL: Your laundry is 15 currently where? 16 MS. TARPINIAN: In the basement. 17 MR. FERRELL: What's the age of 18 the home? 19 MS. TARPINIAN: '60 or '63, we 2.0 bought it in '84. 21 MR. FERRELL: In regards to the 22 person that isn't approving you to do this, 23 what was meant by loud machinery? What do you

guys do --

MS. TARPINIAN: We are insurance agents. We work very long hours a day.

Clearly that doesn't make any machine noise.

But we do have a table saw. I have a grown son that occasionally comes and -- works on something, it's not very often anymore because he doesn't live at home.

My husband is handy, so he does, you know, he will fix -- we don't really have -- we have got a table saw.

Anybody is welcome to look at the table saw, skill saw, just typical laymen carpentry type stuff. We have an air compressor. We use that, you know, taking tires off cars and our cars and rotating our tires. That's about all we do for maintenance.

MR. FERRELL: You don't have a construction shop?

MS. TARPINIAN: No.

MR. FERRELL: 24 hours a day you guys are running machines?

MS. TARPINIAN: No. All you have

2.0

	Page 57
1	to do is call the police department and fire
2	department, they could tell you about that
3	complaint. We knew we would get that one.
4	She doesn't live next door to us.
5	MR. FERRELL: No further
6	questions. Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
8	Member Peddiboyina?
9	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. How
10	big is the house?
11	MS. TARPINIAN: 1,041 square feet
12	right now.
13	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How many
14	bedrooms?
15	MS. TARPINIAN: Three.
16	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Now you want to
17	move your mother
18	MS. TARPINIAN: The back bedroom,
19	part of the plan is to put in like a senior
20	bathroom in that back bedroom and add on just
21	that little bit back there. It's going to be
22	a walk-in shower. It's just my husband and I
23	now. Our kids are grown and moved on. It's a

Page 58 1 beautiful house. 2 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: No objection. 3 Thank you. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member 5 Byrwa. 6 MR. BYRWA: I would suggest that 7 if you're not aware of it, I believe the City of Novi has a construction -- that's tied to 8 9 like a noise ordinance, and it only permits 10 construction doing certain hours. You 11 wouldn't at 5:00 in the morning be running a 12 table saw. 13 MS. TARPINIAN: No. My son 14 doesn't live with us. He's grown --15 MR. BYRWA: They don't want you 16 going too late. But there is hours of work 17 that you can do, not weird hours at night or 18 weird hours early, early in the morning. 19 double check with the City of Novi 2.0 construction ordinance. 21 MS. TARPINIAN: That's not an issue we have. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything

Page 59 1 else? 2 MR. BYRWA: No. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 3 Member 4 Montville? 5 MR. MONTVILLE: If I could just 6 ask two things. 7 First for the building 8 department, just my understanding so if the 9 egress window wasn't added, would they need a 10 variance at all for that 174 additional 11 square feet or is that irrelevant? 12 MR. BUTLER: They still would. 13 MR. MONTVILLE: Just on the garage 14 structure that's deteriorating so that 15 would -- it basically needs new construction 16 regardless, would that be after that --17 Yes, and soon. MS. TARPINIAN: 18 MR. TAWSE: The slab is cracked. 19 It was originally back in the day, they used 2.0 to do a monolithic floor, where they poured 21 the floor, then they poured the slab all in 22 one shot. Then they set the plate right on 23 top of it. So, you know, after that many

Page 60 1 years the plate starts to go. Then you get a 2 little water underneath the foundation a little bit, you get a crack in it. It's going 3 4 to crack by the time you start trying to go 5 through there, trying to fix that, it's kind 6 of a bandaid. MS. TARPINIAN: I did email 7 8 pictures showing that it's really sad now. 9 MR. MONTVILLE: One small point of 10 clarification. 11 So the additional square 12 feet, this might be for the building 13 department, is part of that the overhang, so it's not actual --14 15 MR. BUTLER: It's just that 16 overhang to cover the porch, they're talking 17 about. 18 MR. MONTVILLE: Okay. From a 19 self-creation standpoint, I think the garage 2.0 deteriorating, I think that is going to 21 create -- it's not a self-created situation 22 for the applicants. 23 To kick this off, that's --

2.0

Page 61

one of the things we have to -- we are tasked with judging is it self-created. We all want extra space. It seems like the design is well thought out, but I think for me, that garage deteriorating, that makes it not a self-created situation for me, which is no thought process for us. So I would open it up to the fellow board members at this point. I'm leaning towards approval, being in support at this time.

MS. TARPINIAN: The architect is not here, but he could voice the fact that I am the opposite. I am a minimalist. I do not like extra space. So it's just -- this is going to be really pretty. You won't find anything in my house. I am not a -- there is nothing under the beds, the cupboards are empty. It's more just to, you know, match up with the covered porch and that's really all it is.

MR. MONTVILLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think

that perhaps, I detect nervousness. It's been

very rough and we got emails all week on what was going on. So you can take a deep breathe. None of us will bite. And I can appreciate the effort that you put into this, that you just want to improve your home.

The garage is in poor shape.

As Member Montville indicated, we have to
justify, if you will, what the hardship, what
it is that -- why do you have to do this, or
better yet, why can we approve it.

So I concur with the members that this is not self-created, without using -- without tearing down the current garage, which is basically not really operational for much longer based on those pictures and that foundation, and also improving the safety in your property. I mean, my gosh, that cement was -- that's not a good place to have -- so I think that you're increasing your safety, and you're increasing -- you're improving the value of your home.

I think that given the

request that you have, because of the additional requirements that we have with the easement, with the window, for the basement, I think that that adds to it, and I don't think that you would be asking for as much if we didn't have additional ordinances, now that you're doing the construction.

So given those indications, and given the condition of the current garage, along with all the full support and with the plans, reviewing the plans and seeing that going smaller wouldn't necessarily -- you would still need some sort of variance, I am in full support of the request, based on all the testimony given here this evening. I would entertain a motion. Member Ferrell.

MR. FERRELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0045, sought by the petitioner for an additional garage.

The petitioner has shown

2.0

practical difficulty requiring the addition to allow movement of the laundry of the main floor for her 83 year-old mother that they plan on moving into the house. The garage being in poor shape and the cracked cement.

Without the variance the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, due to having trouble possibly with the mother moving in, using the laundry that's in the basement, planning on living there forever and trying to utilize the residence further for the amount of time they have already been there, 32 years.

The property is unique because due to the age of the home, that was built in 1963, as the petitioner stated, the garage is deteriorating and there is cracks in the cement.

The petitioner did not create the condition. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties and actually enhance

2.0

1	
	Page 65
1	the neighborhood by improving the home.
2	The relief is consistent with
3	the spirit and intent of the ordinance.
4	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
6	moved and second. Any further discussion?
7	Seeing none, Monica would you
8	please call the roll.
9	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
10	MR. FERRELL: Yes.
11	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
12	MR. BYRWA: Yes.
13	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
14	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
15	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
16	Peddiboyina?
17	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
18	MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
19	Gronachan?
20	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
21	MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
22	five to zero.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your

Page 66 1 variance has been granted. I told you you 2 could take a deep breath. Please see the 3 building department and good luck. 4 MS. TARPINIAN: Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. 6 Our next case is 814 Development, LLC, PZ16-0046, south of 96, and west of Beck. 7 8 This applicant is requesting a variance from 9 city code to allow absence of required loading 10 area. 11 Is the petitioner here? 12 MR. BLIGHT: Rodney Blight. I'm director of construction for Rainbow Child 13 14 Care, 814 is our development company, our 15 general contractor (unintelligible). 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you 17 please spell your last name for the secretary 18 and be sworn in by our secretary. 19 MR. BLIGHT: Blight, B-l-i-g-h-t. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Raise your 21 right hand. 22 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to 23 tell the truth in the testimony you're about

to give?

MR. BLIGHT: We are asking Yes. for a variance for the requirement of a loading zone for our child care. We own and operate 120 child cares across the country. And we do a heat and serve type menu at our centers. We don't have large semi deliveries, we don't have big trucks coming in and out. And typically do a delivery for the first year of school, typically every other week, and then once we get a full capacity school, hopefully within a year, we have maximum once a week deliveries and it's typically a van, a box van or a cargo type delivery. So they typically pull into a parking space, and then wheel stuff in on a hand truck, very small deliveries.

We have the requirement for the parking ordinance, we are trying to match that requirement and leaves the loading zone there, to provide us -- prevent us from being able to meet some of the parking ordinances that we are trying to comply with, plus we

2223

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

Page 68 1 typically would like actually a little more 2 parking than most ordinances require to make sure we don't have problems with parents 3 4 coming in, dropping off and have congested 5 neighborhood. We like to have a little extra 6 room, if possible. 7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. 8 Anything else? 9 MR. BLIGHT: No, that's pretty much it. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. 12 Building department? 13 MR. BUTLER: I researched it and 14 it's not required by state, so it's not like 15 they're required to have it. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: For the 17 record, there is clearly no one left in the 18 room to voice an opinion at this point. 19 So we would go to our 2.0 correspondence? 21 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 58 letters 22 mailed, six letters returned, zero approvals 23 and zero objections.

Page 69 1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. 2 Board members? Well, you know I'm going to 3 4 go out of order here. I watched the whole 5 Planning Commission with this complex. And 6 there is a great deal of detail and work. 7 You have had some challenges with the 8 uniqueness of the lot, and I think that you paid very close attention to this and I --9 10 based on this type of business, I don't see a 11 purpose for it. 12 Especially, given the -- it's 13 kind of good that you don't have those kind 14 of deliveries given the traffic on Beck 15 getting in and out there, so this type of 16 business is good for that location and the 17 fact that you don't need large trucks coming 18 in, and that your delivery is going to be 19 limited. 2.0 What are the hours of your 21 delivery? When you say a once a week, and a smaller truck, is it --22

MR. BLIGHT:

Typically once a

week, the routes would determine the time of day that they would come. Typically they usually come between 6:30 a.m. and noon, typically they come in the morning, sometimes they may be in the afternoon. But typically they come around midday.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So what impact would they have on the parking lot if there was no -- if there would be loading zone, per se, where would they go? Do you have a drawing, a rendering of your --

MR. BLIGHT: I don't. I thought maybe they will be on the screen. I do not have one with me. There is one, I believe in the back.

it. I was hoping if anybody was at home watching, but can you explain by not having the loading zone, would there be a negative impact when this small -- when these smaller trucks come in between those hours.

MR. BLIGHT: So our peak dropoff times are from 6:30 to 9:00, 9:30, in the

2.0

Page 71 1 morning, and then our peak pickup times are 2 typically from three until six in the evening. 3 So when they come in the middle of the day, 4 that's our lightest traffic time. As I mentioned, they only 5 6 take one parking space to park and bring the 7 food in. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right. 9 Anyone else? Member Montville. 10 MR. MONTVILLE: I have no problems 11 in supporting the motion as requested at this 12 time. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's not a 14 motion yet. 15 MR. MONTVILLE: The request as 16 being posed. 17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board 18 members? Any other input? I would entertain 19 a motion. Member Montville. 2.0 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we 21 grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0046, 22 sought by 814 Development, LLC, as the 23 petitioner has shown practical difficulty by

2.0

Page 72

including the delivery zone preventing the optimal and required amount of parking spots. That the petitioner can properly use their land for their day-care business.

This property is unique due to the location and the uniqueness of the angles of the lot and the incoming traffic petitioner did not create this particular condition due to it being preexisting.

The relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance, especially as the limited amount of deliveries that the business does entail will only take up one single parking space, it will be very limited and will be during low traffic hours for the business. For those reasons, I move that we grant the variance as requested.

MR. FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been

moved and second. Any further discussion?

	Page 73
1	Seeing none, Monica, would you please call the
2	roll.
3	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
4	MR. FERRELL: Yes.
5	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
6	MR. BYRWA: Yes.
7	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
8	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
9	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
10	Peddiboyina?
11	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
12	MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
13	Gronachan?
14	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
15	MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes
16	five to zero.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
18	variance has been granted. Good luck. When
19	are you opening?
20	MR. BLIGHT: Well, I don't think
21	we are going to get started before the frost
22	hits, so we are things go well, we get an
23	early spring, we are hoping early summer.

Page 74 1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Good luck 2 to you. Welcome to Novi. Our last case of the evening, 3 4 because this person loves being with us for 5 the entire evening, Metro Detroit Signs again, for PZ16-0047, for 43443 Grand River 6 7 Avenue, south of Grand River Avenue and west 8 of Novi Road. The applicant is requesting a 9 single wall sign -- I'm sorry, the applicant 10 is allowing -- is requesting an installation of a second wall sign for the business. 11 12 MR. DETERS: Good evening. 13 name is Paul Deters. I'm with Metro Detroit 14 Signs, 11444 Kaltz Avenue in Warren. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: For the 16 record, already previously sworn in, so you 17 may proceed. 18

MR. DETERS: Thank you. What we're hoping this evening is to -- for your consideration on a sign on the east elevation, for Athletico Physical Therapy. I think if you have been by the site, obviously there is a lot of congestion around there.

19

2.0

21

22

The difficulty that they're

Page 75

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

having is so many of their clients come to the -- that facility, coming off the expressway. And as they're heading south on Novi Road, and you go there, unfortunately, even though it looks nice, there are mature trees all along between the front -- where their sign is on that road, and it's very difficult to see where they're located and it's a difficult intersection for people that are from out of the area, and they were hoping for some -- if you would consider a sign on the east elevation, so if somebody is parked at the intersection of Novi Road, and Grand River heading southbound on Novi Road, that they would be able to see that -- that that is where the -- where Athletico is located, and make it easier for somebody to be able to turn there and figure out how to get into the facility.

So, that's really what it is. Struggling a little bit with people finding how to get there.

	Page 76
1	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is
2	there anyone in the audience that wishes to
3	make comment on this case?
4	Seeing none, building
5	department?
6	MR. BUTLER: No comments.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All right.
8	Is there any correspondence?
9	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 47 letters
10	mailed, seven letters returned, zero
11	approvals, zero objections.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
13	Board members. Member Montville.
14	MR. MONTVILLE: Can you confirm
15	it's the same design as the current sign that
16	they have on the west exposure I believe?
17	MR. DETERS: It's a little bit
18	different. In fact, if I could put up. Here
19	is a rendition of what they have on the front
20	of the building. The signs are in essence
21	almost identical, the same sign, real close
22	anyway. The front of the building, it's a
23	stacked configuration, and what we are

Page 77 1 proposing on the east elevation is a linear 2 layout, so it's just one layout that the band on the east elevation is not as tall as the 3 4 store front side, so a stack one wouldn't 5 really work there. It would just be too 6 crowded in, didn't quite look right. 7 MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. Again, 8 affirmative that it is a unique location, with 9 Grand River, Novi Road being such a high 10 volume traffic area, in that particular 11 development, not at any fault of the 12 petitioner, with the Athletico business is at 13 unique angle where anyone going southbound on 14 Novi Road, really any eastern exposure from 15 the building is without that second sign no 16 one -- it's going to be very difficult to 17 I would be in support of this locate. 18 variance as been requested. 19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. 2.0 Anyone else? Member Peddiboyina. 21 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: How big is the 22 sign?

Luzod Reporting Service, Inc. 313-962-1176

MR. DETERS:

The proposed sign

Page 78 1 here is 55 square feet. 2 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Is there any 3 other color or just the blue color? MR. DETERS: It will be the blue 4 5 The raceway itself is painted to 6 match the building, so it blends with the 7 facade. 8 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 9 Anyone 10 else? This complex is a challenge for all 11 businesses and especially as the traffic 12 grows, I am -- I have no objection to this. I think that it's a minimal 13 14 size that you are asking for, and I think 15 that the configuration of the lot as well as the roads that were -- the intersection that 16 17 it's at presents the difficulty for these 18 businesses, and therefore, I have no 19 objection. I would be in full support of 2.0 your request. 21 Anyone like to entertain a motion? 22 23 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It wasn't

a motion. The chair can't make a motion.

MR. MONTVILLE: May I.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You

certainly may.

2.0

MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we grant the variance as requested in Case No.
PZ16-0047, sought by Metro Detroit Signs, for the additional wall sign on the eastern exposure of the building as the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the additional signs due to the uniqueness of the lot as currently designed, the layout of the building, lacking exposure to the eastern front for the high traffic density area and customers looking for the place of business.

The property is unique, again due to the preexisting layout of the Grand River and Novi Road intersection. Petitioner did not create this condition, and the relief when granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties, as the petitioner noted, the design of the

	Page 80
1	sign was carefully thought through and the
2	layout of the building was carefully
3	considered, so adds esthetic value and the
4	relief is consistent with the spirit and
5	intent of the ordinance.
6	So I move that we grant the
7	variance as it has been requested.
8	MR. FERRELL: Second.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been
10	moved and second, any further discussion?
11	Seeing none, Monica, would
12	you please call the roll.
13	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Ferrell?
14	MR. FERRELL: Yes.
15	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
16	MR. BYRWA: Yes.
17	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?
18	MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.
19	MS. DRESLINSKI: Member
20	Peddiboyina?
21	MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, ma'am.
22	MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
23	Gronachan?

Page 81 1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. 2 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes 3 five to zero. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your 5 motion has been granted and which room are you 6 going to be renting soon? 7 Anyway, Athletico, when will 8 they be open? 9 MR. DETERS: Very shortly, I 10 think. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please 12 tell them we welcome them to Novi and 13 congratulations. 14 MR. DETERS: Thank you for this 15 evening. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You're 16 17 welcome. For other matters for this evening, 18 I would like to take a moment, board members, 19 and if you noticed that had we have a new face 2.0 sitting next to Monica. And Monica has 21 received a promotion, and so she will be moving onto bigger and better things. I don't 22 23 think she is like president or anything, but

it's pretty good. One of these days.

So this evening, we have

Carol sitting with Monica, and Carol is going

to be Monica's replacement. Monica will be

with us for a couple of months. So first I

would like to congratulate Monica on her

promotion.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Not really a promotion. It's just Andy's job, just a chair over.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Nonetheless, congratulations.

And we welcome Carol who is new to the City of Novi as an employee, who lives in Green Oak Township and has extensive background in this and she is very excited, after talking to her this evening. So we want to welcome you and congratulate as you well.

MS. CHAPUT: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Having said that, I will tell the board members that next month we have ten cases, so anybody has Ipads that are not working, please get with

2.0

Page 83 1 Monica before --2 MS. DRESLINSKI: Not on the day of 3 the meeting. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: But like 5 the week before. MS. DRESLINSKI: The third 6 7 Tuesday, the 15th. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 9 everybody check their calendars, and please 10 let us know if you can't make it. And also, 11 have they posted that we need an alternate 12 yet? 13 MS. DRESLINSKI: I will ask 14 Courtney. 15 If you CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 16 could that, please. Then that's it. If anybody 17 18 would like to entertain a motion to adjourn. 19 MR. BYRWA: I have one comment 2.0 here. On the signed write-ups here, I think 21 it would be helpful if the allowable in the 22 zoned district, be put into the write-up. You 23 know, we are kind of -- you know, just seems

like, they want a second sign, or we use the word oversized, or whatever, and it will be helpful to know that this is what that zoned district allows. I guess we could all look it up, but we don't want to confuse it with another zoned district to try to memorize all the different requirements in the different zoned districts, but if we can get it in the write-up what's allowed and what they are asking for, you know, allowed, permitted, on the square footage.

MR. BUTLER: Not a problem.

MS. SAARELA: As long as we are talking about formatting, you got my email.

I don't know if anyone noticed, but the application, I guess, offering the option to choose not applicable on some of the standards and is sort of inducing I think a lot of the applicants to put not applicable on all the standards.

You guys aren't getting a lot of information on what their practical difficulty is in the packets. So I have

2.0

asked that we do away with the non-applicable and just put -- you know, if it's a choice between a couple different things for one standard, like it is in the sign ordinance just but or or, just so they know they have to write something there. I did notice a lot of missing information in the packet today.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Believe it or not, I had a lot of people, when they turn them in, they don't write anything, so I have to reach back out to them and say, you got to put something.

MS. SAARELA: They are supposed to meet every standard.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Because we were talking about that last month. And it does make it difficult, especially when you're reading these cases, and you're trying to piece them together.

So I think that Member

Byrwa's suggestion would be very helpful, and
city attorney's recommendation on that would
help things. Especially on this side of the

10/11/2016

	Page 86
1	table when you're studying it, you got four
2	days to pull it together. So any help we can
3	get is greatly appreciated.
4	Anything else? All right.
5	Seeing none, is there a motion to adjourn?
6	MR. FERRELL: So moved.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those
8	in favor?
9	THE BOARD: Aye.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Meeting
11	adjourned at 8:20 p.m.
12	** **
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
-	

Page 87 1 2 STATE OF MICHIGAN 3 ss. 4 COUNTY OF OAKLAND 5 I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the 6 7 witness whose attached deposition was taken before me in the 8 above entitled matter was by me duly sworn at the aforementioned 9 time and place; that the testimony given by said witness was 10 stenographically recorded in the presence of said witness and 11 afterward transcribed by computer under my personal supervision, 12 and that the said deposition is a full, true and correct transcript of the testimony given by the witness. 13 14 I further certify that I am not connected by blood or 15 marriage with any of the parties or their attorneys, and that I 16 am not an employee of either of them, nor financially interested in the action. 17 IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the 18 19 City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan. 20 21 11-28-16 22 Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183 23 Oakland County, Michigan