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sign and code section to allow one additional wall sign. The property is zoned office service commercial.

Good evening. Would you please state your name and then spell your name and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.

MR. STIEBER: Patrick Stieber,
S-t-i-e-b-e-r.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you
swear or affirm to tell the truth as the case is before you?

MR. STIEBER: I do. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. STIEBER: So the property in question, I am sure you guys have all had a chance to go by and take a look at it. It's a new hotel development on Town Center Drive.

We are requesting a variance for an additional ground sign and a small additional wall sign in the lower level of the hotel.

We feel that due to the size of

there is a lack of identification and these signs are needed to direct people to the property.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you have samples of the signs? You could put them on the -- did you bring samples with you?

MR. STIEBER: Samples for the signs?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your drawings. I'm sorry.

MR. STIEBER: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Could you put them on the board, please.

MR. STIEBER: That's the monument sign, double sided.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board
members, you're going to have to look on here.
MR. STIEBER: Like I said, the size of this sign, under 22 square feet. For a monument sign, it's more like a directional type sign with how small this thing is. And then this will help alleviate the traffic flow issue off of Town Center for traffic flows
going south and north, because there is no identification, you know, when you're to the north there, pulling onto Town Center, you know you just see a big building there. You really can't tell what it is until you're past it, with the building sign that's up high.

Just so you guys all know, I
think -- I don't know if you have had a chance to see, the building sign is currently already there and installed, the letters are up high, sign A. The sign does face to the south, so you can see the dilemma there.

This is the main entrance to the hotel, so there is no visibility at all for any signage off Town Center, which is what this small monument sign will help alleviate that.

Sign B, you can see it highlighted there, this is the small non-illuminated letter set that we are proposing there at ground level. Again, it's very small in size. It's not lit, it's a brushed aluminum letter set. And this sign will also help give them identification for the

letters were mailed out, four letters were returned, there were zero approvals, zero objections.

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

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Would you kindly show us where the ground signs are going to go?

MR. STIEBER: Sure. So this is all three signs on the site plan. Sign A again is the one that's already installed up high on the building, the south elevation. Sign C is the small monument that's in question here.

Again, this is the main entrance road here, so this sign is going to help identify the building because there is no signage on what would be the west elevation there.

And then like I was saying, the traffic to the south off of Eleven Mile, there is going to be traffic flows coming in from, you know, a few different directions on this site.
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MR. SANGHVI: I am talking about the new signs you are talking about, the ground signs, what you call a monument sign, I am calling ground sign.

MR. STIEBER: Yes, ground sign.
MR. SANGHVI: Where is that going to be?

MR. STIEBER: Right here, sign C. So it's double sided, so that traffic flow can see that sign from Town Center.

MR. SANGHVI: I was there the other day I was saw two different signs on the ground. One is on the north side of the building with the drive that goes to the other part of the complex -- of your complex, and the main sign was on the south side of your driveway into it, am I right?

MR. STIEBER: That's the Courtyard Marriott sign to the south. That's the existing -- that would be right here you're talking about, the Courtyard Marriott right to the southeast, that's their ground sign right there.
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MR. SANGHVI: You're not putting any sign on their site?

MR. STIEBER: No. That is not their property.

MR. SANGHVI: How big a sign on the north side?

MR. STIEBER: This right here, one right there, that is 22 square feet, which is, like $I$ said, rather small for a monument identification sign. Four foot eight inches wide, by four foot, eight inches tall with a one foot, one shroud (ph) underneath the sign to get up off the ground. So the overall site is six foot tall.

MR. SANGHVI: What you have got there is the sign or is it a mockup?

MR. STIEBER: Mockup. The one that's on the north side, right here, it's not on there -- you know, their drive. You know, just right here within their property. Yep. MR. SANGHVI: Really you are asking for two signs, one wall sign and one ground sign on the north side?

MR. STIEBER: Correct.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Anyone else? Member Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: Can you clarify where the entrance will be for the -- for visitors to come in and drive in?

MR. STIEBER: Yep. Main entrance here, but again, there is going to be a lot of traffic flows coming in from this direction, too. You know, the ingress and egress to both the Marriott, to the east, and then I believe there is a Town Place Suites over there as well, so there will be traffic flows coming off of Eleven Mile right there as well.

MS. KRIEGER: You have some directional signage there?

MR. STIEBER: Nope.
MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I can see why this particular layout would be so confusing. I spent close to 20 minutes driving around looking at it, quite frankly. At first
actually made two trips over there.
My first trip was, they don't
need a sign. They have got this big Courtyard sign. Courtyard is going to do all their advertising for them. Then I went back past the building, and I drove to the next driveway where this ground sign is proposed, and my first question, I don't know if anyone else here at the table thought about this when they drove by, is why a ground sign, why not a sign on the building up higher.

My thought process was, as I drove further away, then when you're coming back, you can't tell that that's really a hotel.

MR. STIEBER: From the north you can't you see anything, it's just a big building.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I understand -- we as ZBA members are not in the position to tell the petitioners what to do. However, if the whole idea of coming for a variance is the least minimum amount of, you
know, variances that we grant, then I think you should get the most punch for your packet, so to speak.

And I don't honestly see the purpose of that ground sign where you're putting it.

I think that -- I understand about the identification, I think that you have a unique configuration of a lot, number one.

So I do agree that there is a need for something out there.

I think that in the back of your building, you're missing an opportunity to identify people coming from -- somebody help me out with this -- is that Crescent --

MR. SANGHVI: From the north side.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: From the north side, from Crescent down Town Center Drive. Because people that are coming from Crescent, they could pick your building first before they pick Courtyard, if that sign was identifying the building.

And if you don't know that it's
a hotel, you're going -- if you do a search or whatever, then I think you might get Courtyard before you get yours, that was my whole process. That's why I spent 20 minutes, I'm surprised somebody didn't call the police and have me followed.

I'm serious. I drove down all the driveways, I drove into Courtyard, I drove down Town Center, went down Crescent, I came back and I am looking at all the options because the first time $I$ went it was snowing, you guys didn't come before us in February, when you were supposed to be here.

So then it was snowing. It was really difficult to figure anything out with all the snow on the ground.

So as a consumer, I am going to have that same difficulty when I am out there, trying to find your building.

As a ZBA member, I try to help
in that if this is supposed to be for identification, what's going to be the best piece of identification.

So I am in support that you need identification. I am going to look this way to see if the city attorney is going to tell me how far I can go with this.

But can I recommend a building sign as opposed to a ground sign or do I leave it up to the petitioner? Can you help me?

MS. SAARELA: You can give your opinion on what they're asking, you know, just has an impact on the practical difficulty and, you know, what you observed. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I just don't see where that ground sign is helping you. But $I$ do see that if you put identification on the back of that building, that there is plenty of -- in my opinion, there is plenty of reason to have identification on the back of the building. I just named about four reasons. Visibilty from Crescent, visibility from Town Center, and I don't think that the ground sign is going to give you that visibility for the distance.

And as this area continues to
grow, that ground sign could get lost. I really think that something high up would be better.

And as far as the front part, I am in support of the B sign. And the biggest reason why I am supporting it, I could barely see the sign that we allowed on the building. It's very difficult to see. And so I think that this almost needs to get reworked because your first sign is not really serving a lot of purpose, and that back sign, I think that you could do something better so people could see it.

You know, the Town Center is growing, and it's going to continue to grow. And as one of the longest running members on the ZBA, Novi is not going to standstill. As things change, we want our businesses to succeed and to be seen. And not have to come back to us at any point in time. That's why I am making these suggestions.

MR. STIEBER: I understand that.
You know, I think part of the reason for coming
in with the monument sign was to try appease the board, you know, to put another building sign up there, you're talking about another sign that's going to be readable up there to be another 65 square feet, versus this 22 square feet sign that we are asking for now.

Now, I would agree that a sign
there could definitely help give them the visibility that was talked about, and based on the sign code and research on past variances, they were timid to come ask for it even. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Let me just stop you right there. And please excuse me. I am not trying to -- but each case is viewed on its own merit.

MR. STIEBER: Absolutely. Based on the site conditions. I get it. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Exactly. I feel, and we can listen to other board members. I know Member Sanghvi has something in addition to add, but when you go out and drive that, this is not just looking at this map and saying, oh, yes, well, let's just stamp this
here and stamp this there.
When you go out to that site, there is a need, and I think you have established that. But $I$ just don't know that you're utilizing the need to the fullest. Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I was
about to say the same thing what you just said. Then I checked myself, I said (unintelligible) an expert how to do his own business. He's in the sign business.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes, I
know.
MR. SANGHVI: I think
(unintelligible) he has got a major sign in front of his own entrance, and was there when you look at. That's why I ask you to point it out, and very clear to you and everybody else, there is a wrong hotel sign in front of your entrance.

And if you wanted better
identification, you need to find something better than what you are already providing, in
my opinion.
But I didn't want to express my opinion because I think it's not my job to tell an expert how to do his work.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think I clarified as to why I am making these suggestions.

I think that you and I have been on the board a long time and that we see it that way, we feel it that way because we are in support of our businesses, and that's -- I wouldn't have spent 20 minutes driving around in circles. If $I$ would have looked at it and said, this is fine, then $I$ would have just gone on my way.

But it bothered me and I went back again. And then it wasn't snowing. I still couldn't see it.

So, you know, I wouldn't be -you know, we are volunteers. We are not experts. And we do this job based on the information as provided to us. And to help guide, we have the city to guide us, and we
give opinions and we look at what the petitioner has for material and for findings so we can help support or deny that request.

And my suggestion would be that you -- I hate to say it, take a look one more time and go back to the drawing board, to better help your client with better identification.

That's my suggestion. We don't do that very often. As said, read the minutes from other meetings, but the case stands on its own accord.

MR. STIEBER: And getting it up high would help, you know, they thought that having a ground sign at ground level for the traffic flow right there would help. I know it's a little busy around the site right now with everything that's going on, that doesn't help the cause, or for visibilty.

You know, but this is what they wanted, this is what they decided on.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Sanghvi.

wanted, and that's what we are here presenting.
MS. KRIEGER: You can always come back, if they change their mind.

MR. STIEBER: If we have to re-apply and all that stuff anyway, do mailings again, everything like that, maybe that is something later in the future --

MS. KRIEGER: Rather go with what you have got here? MR. STIEBER: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I need to ask the city attorney something.

So if I -- I don't feel that the ground sign serves the purpose or meets the criteria, even though after I said that there is a need for a sign, I am confused as to -MS. SAARELA: Make a motion to deny it because you don't feel that it improves the practical difficulty, just go with the standards. You have a motion to deny here. They might have a unique circumstance, but you would just have to explain why you don't believe what their proposal improves the
circumstance.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Improves the circumstance.

Board members? Anybody else have anything to offer?

Member Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: I could see what the ground sign and -- regard of the speed limit is only 25, that is difficult with visibility, all these different buildings coming down that back -- behind the Wal-mart to come to the Town Center Drive, of course, it will building, but considering the speed and the other ground signs along that corridor, I am sure it would be expected that this building would also, at some point, need a ground sign.

So if that's what they want, I wouldn't be opposed to that. Although having a building sign in the future, if they feel that's a need, they could come back for it, I guess, their third sign or exchange.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That would be their fourth sign.

building is not done yet.
MS. KRIEGER: I know. Just to go with the thought process.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: As far as I
understand our terms of reference is to look at
the request for a variance as he has requested. It's up to us to decide whether to grant it or deny it. And let's stick to our terms of reference, is that okay?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes. (unintelligible) instead of make that kind of other recommendations, we can't go down that road.

MS. SAARELA: You can make a suggestion on what you think would provide more relief, but at the same time that's not what he's requesting now. You just have to look at the request that's been made either grant it or deny it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Are you going to make a motion?


#### Abstract

MR. BYRWA: I have a quick comment. I guess for our city attorney, tonight the vote would be a majority of the board -- the assigned board members, so he would need -- if I am right here, all five members to vote in the affirmative to pass his --

MS. SAARELA: No. MR. BYRWA: He would need a simple majority of the members present?

MS. SAARELA: For a sign variance, yes.


MR. BYRWA: He would need three out of five then?

MS. SAARELA: Yes.
MS. KRIEGER: In Case No. PZ16-0063, for Allied Signs for 26150 Town Center Drive, I move to grant the request of the petitioner sought. Without the variance petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of travel speeds from the north, visibility as the consumers come to look for the entrance or coming from the south, same

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

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: No.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes four to one.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your
variance has been granted. Congratulations. Good luck.

MR. STIEBER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our next
case is PZ17-0005, Gary Ehlers at 1705 East Lake Drive.

The petitioner is here. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for installation of a sunroom and storage room in the side yard.

because as it stands right now, you walk into the back of the house, there is no place to put coats, shoes or anything. And we are trying to make it look esthetically -- blend in with the house and it still leaves like 18 feet behind the house to park three cars. And I guess that's what I am asking.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Did you bring any drawings with you this evening? MR. EHLERS: I have my copy. I thought I left it, but, yes, I do have --

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We do have people at home and other people watching. We have it in our packet, of course, we would like you to share the wealth of information, if you will.

MR. EHLERS: This is the rendering. If you look at the top, you can see the sign line items there. The new structure behind the house there was -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's an
addition -- I'm sorry, go ahead.
MS. DRESLINSKI: It's the same
thing. You weren't here, but last month he was asking for 10 feet and his contractor wanted to keep it with the concrete line, so he's asking for three feet more, so it is the same thing from last month, just three more feet.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: This case was a part of last month, which we didn't have the minutes to, so that's why -- so this is in addition to what you already have given testimony except that the measurement is now three feet additional?

MR. EHLERS: Yes. It was something that in my error, we, I guess forgot, to have the engineer go back and redraw the drawings, so we weren't allowed to build any further than what the drawings were, so I had to go -- come back again one more time and have the new drawings submitted to the building department, so it's really the same as last month, only we now got the drawings correct on the same -- I guess the same story as last, just allows us to continue to have parking and it will be a nice little breezeway for coats and a nice looking
shed blending in. I think it's definitely going to enhance the neighborhood. I think it will end up looking really good.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Again, I just want to verify. The testimony that you gave last month is the same, the difference in this case is that there is a three feet addition that you're asking for based on the back of the residence. That's the only additional information that you're requesting?

MR. EHLERS: The original last month drawing was 10 feet away from the house, this is 13. Everything else is the same. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you very much. Building department, do you have anything to offer?

MR. BUTLER: Nothing to offer.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.
Correspondence?
MR. BYRWA: The city mailed out 74
letters were mailed, we had 12 letters returned, three were approvals and zero objections.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MS. KRIEGER: Second. |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been |  |  |
| moved and second. Any further discussion on |  |  |
| the motion? |  |  |
| Seeing none, Monica, would you |  |  |
| please call the roll. |  |  |
| MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa? |  |  |
| MR. BYRWA: Yes. |  |  |
| MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger? |  |  |
| MS. KRIEGER: 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 five |  |  |
| to zero. |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your |  |  |
| variance has been granted, and as nice as you are, we don't want to see you back here again. |  |  |

So good luck.
MR. EHLERS: I think I have run out of things I can think about. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our last case is PZ16-0009, Kingsway Construction, 101 Lashbrook north of Thirteen and west of Novi. Petitioner is here. Come on down. I know there is a big crowd, a lot of people out there.

I will read slow, give you some
time. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow reduced setbacks for front and rear side yards and reduced lot coverage for additions to existing residence. Property is zoned single family R4.

Good evening, and you are?
MR. HENNINGER: I am owner of
Kingsway. I don't normally come to these. Our architects couldn't make it, so I am filling in.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Lucky you.
I'm sure your name is not Kingsway
Construction.

asking for four variances, is that correct? MR. HENNINGER: The architect turned in the drawings. I believe -- I think what it is, $I$ think the existing structure isn't compliant as it sits, I think is why we are needing additional variances. It doesn't meet the setbacks of the current variances now. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Hold that thought. For the building department, in my packet I have no measurements that they're requesting.

MS. DRESLINSKI: It's on the drawing. If you go to the drawing page. CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You can hardly read it. That's why $I$ was hoping somebody was going to clarify. It wasn't on the first page.

So, I want to get this right.
So for the record, the front is required
30 feet, he's requesting 19?
MS. DRESLINSKI: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The rear
setback is the -- they're requiring 30 feet and


MR. HENNINGER: She is looking to make this her permanent residence, moving from a larger home into this home. She has owned this home apparently for many years. It was a vacation home or lake home for them. She is wanting to make it her permanent residence now.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building department, do you have anything to offer?

MR. BUTLER: Due to the size of this lot and stuff, they really didn't have much area to go. As you can see in the measurements, the distance to the house next door, they still have about 35 feet, so they got four foot one on the side, but they still have plenty of room there. That's about all they really could do with that lot.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:
Correspondence?
MR. BYRWA: Yes. We mailed out 66 letters mailed, three letters were returned. We had one approval and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can you
tell us who is the approval from?

through on the west side where the -- towards the lake, is that an easement or do you know?

MR. HENNINGER: I don't know.
MR. BUTLER: I haven't been out to that lot, so I really haven't -- it usually is an easement, but not being there to look at it, I couldn't tell you.

MS. KRIEGER: So for construction
is there anything the city has to --
MR. BUTLER: No.
MR. HENNINGER: Is it Consumers or
DTE --

MR. BUTLER: Consumers or DTE, that's directly between the owner of the house, and if they need any hookups or disconnects.

MS. KRIEGER: It looks like a very nice setup. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member
Sanghvi.
MR. SANGHVI: I went and saw your place a couple of days ago. You have a very narrow lot wedged between two bigger houses. And you are quite a ways from the lake, then


going to add that, then you need to add the subject, what those things are. So if there is anything else that you want to add, then strike that last sentence.

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: No, I don't want to add.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Strike that
last sentence.

MR. SANGHVI: Second.

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

MS. SAARELA: Does he accept the amendment that he proposed?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do you accept my friendly amendment?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Friendly amendment has been accepted.

Any further discussion?
MR. SANGHVI: Your amendment is
accepted and no further decision from this point of view. Thank you.
Monica, would you please call the roll.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa?
MR. BYRWA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?
MR. SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson
Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes five
to zero.
CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you
for your patience and congratulations. Good luck.

MR. HENNINGER: Thanks a lot. Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So that concludes our heavy schedule for this evening.


|  | adjourned. <br> (The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.) |
| :---: | :---: |
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