

Absent: Colling, Duistermars **MOTION CARRIED**
4. **SIGN BOARD OF APPEALS**
PUBLIC HEARING – FILE NO. 00-001

Location: 45441 Dequindre, located on the Northwest corner of Dequindre and M-59, identified as Parcel No. 15-36-426-006, Zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, and known as Audi Bavarian Motor Village.

Request: A variance of (3) feet in height, from Table 4-17 of Chapter 4-17 of the Code of Ordinances, which limits the maximum height of monument signs to (7) feet. The submitted sign permit application is requesting two monument signs to identify “Audi” at a height of (10) feet.

Applicant: Heileman Signs
22901 Stadium
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080

Mr. Douglas Randall of 45441 Dequindre Rd, Rochester. Hills introduced himself as the Sales Manager for Audi of Rochester Hills and spokesperson for the signs.

Mr. Randall summarized his case to the Board.

Mr. Randall asked the Board to consider the uniqueness of the Audi property & business located on the northwest corner of Rochester Hills in their determination for the variance. Those items of uniqueness are:

1. Poor Visibility from Roadways
2. Shared Driveway with Village Green Apartments
3. New Move into the Community
4. Service Drive Road Entrance Confusion
5. Dequindre Rd Four Foot Drop in Grade

The Audi site development has very poor visibility when exiting off M-59 whether traffic is moving north or south on Dequindre Rd. Mr. Randall passed around some pictures he took and labeled that show this argument. Two pictures each passed to Board members and will become part of the record. He acknowledges the purpose of the sign ordinance but he would like to offer more explanation why he has come before this Board for an exception.

Understanding that this Audi dealership business is moving from Eastpoint out to Rochester Hills many previous Audi customers/clients will be driving this way for the first time. Audi’s been in business for 30 years at that particular location and this move represents a new enterprise for them. It should be noted that the Eastpoint facility is closing. Customers will be directed to the dealership via M-59 and told to get off at the Dequindre exit ramp and turn right. Mr. Randall asked the Board to look at some more pictures he distributed to see there is no other building identification. He notes the Audi building is barely visible from the roadways. He continued that when one exits off westbound M-59, it appears you’re looking at an intersection that would lead you to the service drive of the dealership, but in fact, there is no service drive. If a customer doesn’t turn right to go northbound on Dequindre and doesn’t see something to bring him to that direction, he would probably continue through the intersection thinking if Audi is on the corner, he would enter the entrance way off the Service Drive. However, that is the entrance ramp to westbound M-59 so it’s important that Audi has more visibility so the customer will know to turn right on Dequindre. Also his argument is that looking down the street, in the right-of-way, all you would see is a large white Village Green Apartment sign. The customer coming from the east and heading westbound is going to be looking for something that has Audi on it. The logo pylon sign, seen in the pictures, show a graphic panel, vertical in design, with the word Audi on the top but placed below the logo rings.

The entrance into the Audi facility is the same entrance used to enter the Village Green Apartments. No one knows where the Audi building is and it doesn’t present itself from various directions, either as you are driving northbound or southbound on Dequindre, or coming off the exit ramp. It’s just not visible. However, Mr. Randall noted that if one drives the opposite direction, eastbound off M-59, the Audi logo sign with the identifiable rings can be seen.

He asks the Board to remember that getting off on Dequindre is really not Dequindre but instead, the Service drive road. There is a directory telling one to make a left hand turn and then turn left again. The first thing seen is a large sign that says westbound M-59 with an arrow so, under the bridge way, there’s still no dealership to be seen. If one continues north on the roadway there still

isn't anything visible except the Village Green Apartments. The Audi sign is not nearly as obvious as the Apartment sign. Audi's sign is a 4' wide vertical panel sign.

Mr. Randall hopes he was able to give the Board a feel for what the site is like. He expressed Audi's commitment to be a model tenant in that property. He said they aren't trying to do anything garish. They don't have body shop signs, used car signs or parts signs. He illustrated on poster board, the typical type of signage that a pylon sign is with 2 columns on it aimed up in the air.

He added that Audi is asking for two signs, one on the M-59 right-of-way and one on Dequindre at the driveway. Audi has different sizes of logo signs and since he understands that the 15' high one is not allowed, he's asking for acceptance of the vertical sign that is 9' 10" tall. He hopes the Board finds the Audi sign tasteful with its stainless steel finish and its night illumination of the rings and silhouette.

Summing up, Mr. Randall said the Dequindre roadway is not straight and level. It has a four-foot drop so, aesthetically, the road would have to be raised four more feet just to bring it up to grade level and the 7' height.

Ending, Mr. Randall said he hoped he had expressed opportunities that would support the possibility for granting this variance.

Lastly, Mr. Randall said representatives from the dealership and Audi were in the audience if the Board had any questions for them.

Mr. Cockey said there had been two requests in the past couple months for auto dealership signs one of which was for height variance. Mr. Cockey is asking the Board if he and Mr. Rosen, as GM employees, should be excused again as they were for those others.

Mr. Rosen stated that the Bill Fox case had nothing to do with the actual sign panel itself as did the Cadillac and Mercedes Benz situation. This case has nothing to do with the sign situation that is peculiar to a dealer. City requirements say that I must serve but my employer is more restrictive, that is, in any situation where there is, or could be, any perception of impropriety, I must excuse myself. The City ordinance and State case law says that I must serve and the employer says that I should not. So I'm asking for the Board's decision whether Mr. Cockey and myself should sit or not. Ordinarily that doesn't mean too much except in tonight's case, a quorum would not be met.

Mr. Cockey said for the applicant's benefit, he's an engineer but has nothing to do with marketing absolutely nothing to do with dealerships or dealerships. Mr. Cockey continued that he thinks the issue of a quorum or not is pertinent because if there is a conflict, there's a conflict with or without a quorum, and if there is not a conflict, likewise.

Mr. Verschueren asked Mr. Cockey if he can be impartial, and if he can, the Board would like him to sit. Mr. Brennan added he can relate to how the employer is thinking but he doesn't see any involvement or even a potential conflict here. The city, as members of the community, has asked that a decision be made on a sign variance and it is only coincidental that it has to do with another auto dealership. Mr. Brennan continued that he doesn't see Mr. Cockey nor Mr. Rosen harboring any bias or prejudice against this company. Mr. Brennan doesn't think they should recuse themselves.

Mr. Simon says both the city and state do require they serve unless they see a conflict. If they see no problem with their employment, there should be no problem.

Mr. Cockey said Bill Fox Chevrolet and the Mercedes dealership that shares property with Crestview Cadillac is also a GM corp. So the Chairperson asked the Board members if they intend to serve or not. Both replied they would. The Chairperson then asked if the applicant had any problem with the two members deciding to stay and vote. Applicant replied that he had no concern whatsoever.

The Chairperson asked the applicant if he had received a staff report from the city. The applicant responded that he had not seen a staff report, and a copy was provided to him.

Mr. Verschueren said he drove around the Audi building and noted they have six logos on the building. He asked Jack Sage, representing the city's Building Department, if these are considered signs. Mr. Sage answered yes and added that Mark McLaughlin of the building department was the originator on the permits. Mr. Verschueren then asked Mr. Randall if he and

Audi were aware that in the year 2004 pylon signs will no longer be allowed in Rochester Hills. Mr. Randall answered, yes.

Mr. Duistermars entered the meeting at 7:52 pm.

The Chairperson **declared the public hearing open**, calling for proponents and/or opponents who wished to speak. No telephone calls or letters were received by staff regarding this request. There being no persons wishing to speak, the Chairperson **declared the public hearing closed**.

Mr. Cockey clarified that the site plan has an incorrect north arrow placement.

Mr. Brennan read Audi's application that said they needed three additional feet of signage for proper driver visibility and safety. He asked Mr. Randall why he thinks he needs a height of 10 feet. Mr. Randall answered there are two reasons for consideration:

1. The Village Green sign is going to be relocated from its current right-of-way and between the two driveways due north. Therefore, the sign will then be in a straight line of visibility with the Audi sign. Normally, you wouldn't have a sign in the right-of-way. If you line up your signs with the set backs, each sign becomes visible as needed, but when you put one sign out forward of another sign, and that sign is almost six feet tall, as you're driving, it completely blocks your line of vision. My concern is heading northbound, (and that is when you exit the freeway ramp - M-59) and you look to the right. Numerous pictures were taken of the existing car dealers up and along Rochester Rd. We don't have this kind of building elevation to put up signages and we don't choose to. (Mr. Randall passed out more labeled pictures).

Mr. Randall presented some of the unique features of the Audi site:

1. Not located along Rochester Rd. with other dealerships and didn't choose to be because they thought the City didn't want any more located there;
2. Believes Audi fits right in the gateway to Rochester Hills community and the building was turned to a 45 degree angle so they wouldn't face other roads; and,
3. They didn't load up the front of the building with signs trying to capitalize on identification.

Mr. Randall said his signs will not light up. He is trying to capitalize identification off Dequindre Rd or M-59. He wanted to share with the Board that he has been very familiar with GM signs of the past where "bigger was better" but that's not what's happening in today's market. Certainly this site with its acreage and frontages on both streets is in no way trying to challenge the square feet. He would be willing to give up the sign on the M-59 frontage. Mr. Randall wants to comply with overall ordinances and feels it's more important to concentrate on the apartment complex driveway. There are no other sites in the city that utilize an existing drive of an apartment complex as their entrance. We don't have a place for a curb cut for a private driveway. This is a totally unique situation. We are hoping that between the four-foot dip in the road, the shared driveway, the fact that we are the first business someone sees in Rochester Hills heading westbound, and that we are willing to give up the other monument sign on M-59, you will find reasons to grant this three additional feet in height.

Mr. Brennan asked for clarification that the request for the second sign is withdrawn.

Mr. Cockey said the applicant has made reference to the availability of standard signs. He thinks the Board should discount that argument. He then asked the staff if Audi wanted to put a sign up on the wall of their building, could they have put it up above the 20' grade? Mr. Sage of the Building department replied yes. Mr. Cockey asked Mr. Randall, if there is a construction sign up on the property and if so, how big is it? Mr. Randall answered yes, a temporary construction sign is on the diagonal corner of the property. Mr. Sage answered that that sign is no larger than 36 sq. ft. Mr. Cockey then brought up the 4' grade dip that Mr. Randall refers to and asked if that is four feet in fifty feet or four feet in 500 feet? He also asked what is the frontage length. Mr. Cockey said he would like to know the general grade of feet. Mr. Sage answered the general grade is 304 feet. Mr. Cockey said that is approximately a 1 percent grade which is considered a moderate grade. He continued that City Council had put in considerable time in establishing the height maximum and therefore, Mr. Cockey sees no rationale to grant the additional height size particularly since Audi could erect a larger sign on the building by applying for a normal sign permit. He ended by saying he didn't think the tradeoff was appropriate for the city to grant.

Mr. Brennan said he is inclined to grant the request based on the moderate grade, is convinced there is a visibility problem, is indeed unique in that they share an entrance driveway with an apartment complex, and that they are giving up one sign on M-59. Mr. Brennan votes to grant the variance request.

Mr. Cockey asked the applicant if the sign in the picture he was looking at is 10' high? Mr. Randall responded, Yes. Mr. Cockey then asked Mr. Sage how many permits does Audi currently have and how much total sq. ft. are they utilizing now. Mr. Sage answered they are allowed 300 square feet of sign area and he would have to go upstairs and see what Mr. McLocklin has already issued to them.

Mr. Rosen asked staff if a sign on the premise that is a ground sign not mounted on the building, is subject to the 7' height? Mr. Sage answered yes and said if the sign is visible to the public right of way, it is regulated by city ordinance. Mr. Rosen asked about the signs in the picture taken from the westbound M-59 ramp. Mr. Sage said those signs are mounted right on the building and are not free-standing. Mr. Rosen said regulation under Table 4-17 of the General Commercial Retail Premise category states one sign per frontage is allowed. And, according to footnote H, "ground signs shall not be permitted and placed along frontages or thoroughfares with a proposed right-of-way of less than 86 feet." This being part of the city transportation plan etc., would indicate counting M-59 as having greater than 86 feet which it obviously does, as well as, Dequindre. He added, the definition of major thoroughfare shall mean, "an arterial street which is intended to serve as a large volume traffic way for both the immediate city and the region beyond and may be designated or called a parkway, major thoroughfare, freeway, expressway or equivalent term." He also referenced page 212 whereby he noticed that 2-104 calls out, "entrance ramp shall mean a roadway connecting a feeder road with a limited access freeway and used for access onto such limited access freeway." So, it appears from the Ordinance, there is a distinction between the freeway itself and a major parkway or expressway or an entrance ramp. Mr. Rosen now asks for city opinion.

Mr. Delacourt answered that although the definition calls out an entrance ramp, and defines it separate from an expressway or thoroughfare, that it is, in essence, a part of that thoroughfare.

Mr. Rosen asked Mr. Randall about 3' variance for the sign along M-59. To make this perfectly clear, are we saying the variance is out or the sign is out?

Mr. Randall responded, Audi will not install a pylon sign or signage on that freeway right-of-way if the variance is granted for the Dequindre entrance sign.

Mr. Rosen told Mr. Randall that as part of the justification for granting the variance, the Board can do so on the basis that Audi agrees to reducing and permanently committing to a reduction in total signage. For example, to say no ground mounted sign can be located along M-59, can be a condition for granting a variance. He concludes that this is a policy call.

Mr. Randall announced he is willing to accept that condition and offers that they will not request or install any signage, ground monument, or pylon mounted signs along the M-59 frontage.

Mr. Verschueren asked for the difference between monument and pylon signs.

Mr. Cockey asked for Audi's current highest sign permit. He expressed this information could be a factor in this variance. Mr. Verschueren responded, he thinks it's about 15 feet high. Mr. Cockey then said the drawing he is looking at refers to an Audi pylon sign and from a visual standpoint, says he thinks the board should be looking for a fine distinction of about a foot, and a small amount of clearance that looks less than 6 inches. It appears to him if they put landscaping up to the bottom of the rectangular part of the sign that visually it would become a monument sign.

Mr. Verschueren while looking at the photo of the exposed pylon sign, asked if it was not exposed and was part of a condition, could this be accepted as a monument sign? Mr. Cockey said yes.

Mr. Duistermars asked for clarification on the distinction Mr. Cockey was citing. Mr. Cockey said he doesn't see a major distinction between the two types of signs.

Mr. Rosen believes the key phrase is what becomes nonconforming in the year 2004, are signs over 7 foot in height. Mr. Sage said it's not necessarily pylon signs. Pylon signs under 7 feet will remain. The issue is height for 2004, but a variance would take that out of the picture. Mr. Rosen says if the Board is serious about granting a variance on the basis of one sign reduction and square footage reduction, he would like to get some numbers to verify the total amount of signage they are allowed presently and then do the subtraction (of the M-59 sign).

(RECESS - 8:22 – 8:30 pm)

Mr. Sage reported 8 permits have been issued. There are two at 20 feet, two at 15 feet and the rest are 10 feet high for a total of 184.55 square feet. They are allowed 300 square feet. The proposed requested sign is 12 foot square so the whole pylon is 40 square feet. The lettering and logo makes up the configuration, not the monument base. The total sign area cannot exceed the current size of the structure.

Mr. Cockey and others discussed how the conditions should be written so that Audi won't return trying to seek out more and different signage and how to deal with the additional 40 sq. ft that could be allowed.

Mr. Cockey suggests that there be a maximum of 223 sq. ft. with the additional one 10 foot high sign not to be greater than 4' 1" in width. Mr. Verschueren then asked for a motion.

MOTION by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Rosen in the matter of File No. **00-001** that the request for a variance of three feet from Table 4-17 of Chapter 4.17 of the Code of Ordinances for two monument ground signs identifying Audi Dealership at 45441 Dequindre **BE APPROVED**, for Heileman Signs, 22901 Stadium, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080.

FINDINGS:

1. Specifically the dealership is located in a complex intersection where M-59 and Dequindre meet, there is a moderate grade in the roadway which affects visibility, and the dealership shares a joint driveway with an apartment complex.
2. Alleged hardships or practical difficulties or both include substantially more than mere inconvenience or mere inability to obtain a higher financial return. Specifically, we propose his sign is to provide reliable visibility and/or recognition of the dealership on Dequindre Rd.
3. Substantial justice will be done by allowing this variance because the dealership will be allowed to provide guidance to those customers who wish to locate them, the rights of others will not be affected by this variance, not be contrary to the public purpose and general intent for purpose of Chapter 4-17. Substantial justice will also be done based on the conditions below. because I'm going to ask that some conditions be imposed.

CONDITIONS:

1. There will be no signage on M-59 as long as this variance is in effect. Total signage will be limited to 223 square feet with a 10' sign approximately 4'1" wide. The sign is to be considered a monument sign and will be landscaped accordingly. All other city codes and ordinances will be adhered to.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mr. Randall asked for signage clarification since Audi hasn't opened yet, and he is unsure if the dual driveway will cause confusion. Therefore, he wants a full understanding of the balance of square foot signage remaining. He's questioning the following scenario. He's going to give up a surface area of 40 square feet yet the city has deducted 77 square feet which is more than what they gave up. So how could they have given up more than they had allowable to give up?

Mr. Rosen explained Mr. Randall's request for one more sign to be figured out at the gross end of 10'x 4' which will be called at 40' square feet. Taking where Audi is today, add 40' to it rounded up to the next highest ten brings them to 230 square feet remaining. On that basis, that this is the signage wanted, the Board agrees that it is appropriate. And, yes, it turns out to be more than just the one sign because it is based on what the signage is today. Mr. Rosen continued that if Mr. Randall has legitimate concerns that he thinks he needs more signage than that, he is asked to make it clear and it will be considered. Mr. Randall said yes, he would like directional signs because there is none there now. He thought if he was asking for a surface area of 40 sq. ft. and took the 300 allowed and subtracted the 40' by identifying one of these smaller signs that would have been put up on M-59, that the Board would then take 300 minus the 40 leaving 260' remaining.

Mr. Simon says his understanding of the amount reduced of total square footage is similar to Mr. Randall's. Also, that he didn't expect them to give up more than approx 20 or 40 square feet of allowable signage along with giving up the possible sign on the M-59 footage in order to be granted the 3' variance on Dequindre Rd.. He continued that since this is Mr. Randall's first appearance before this board he should be given the same advantage as the manager of Pat Moran where a very similar situation occurred where they thought the signage was going to be internal directional signage but turned out to be visible from the road. Mr. Simon asked Mr. Randall if it could be possible that an internal directional signage could be visible from a thoroughfare. Mr. Randall said yes, it is very possible. Mr. Simon then requested the motion increase the signage reduction from the current 223' to a minimum to 260' and that he personally prefers 280'. Mr. Rosen says Mr. Simon's suggestion has merit and suggests it be written to a maximum of 260'.

Mr. Brennan moved to adopt Mr. Rosen's wording be added to the conditions as follows:

Limit the amount of signage on the site to a maximum of 260.

Complete Motion as Amended

MOTION by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Rosen in the matter of File No. **00-001** that the request for a variance of three feet from Table 4-17 of Chapter 4.17 of the Code of Ordinances for two monument ground signs identifying Audi Dealership at 45441 Dequindre **BE APPROVED**, for Heileman Signs, 22901 Stadium, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080.

FINDINGS:

1. Specifically the dealership is located in a complex intersection where M-59 and Dequindre meet, there is a moderate grade in the roadway which affects visibility, and the dealership shares a joint driveway with an apartment complex.
2. Alleged hardships or practical difficulties or both include substantially more than mere inconvenience or mere inability to obtain a higher financial return. Specifically, we propose his sign is to provide reliable visibility and/or recognition of the dealership on Dequindre Rd.
3. Substantial justice will be done by allowing this variance because the dealership will be allowed to provide guidance to those customers who wish to locate them, the rights of others will not be affected by this variance, not be contrary to the public purpose and general intent for purpose of Chapter 4-17. Substantial justice will also be done based on the conditions below. because I'm going to ask that some conditions be imposed.

CONDITIONS:

1. There will be no signage on M-59 as long as this variance is in effect. Total signage will be limited to 260 square feet with a 10' sign approximately 4'1" wide. The sign is to be considered a monument sign and will be landscaped accordingly. All other city codes and ordinances will be adhered to.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Brennan, Cockey, Duistermars, Rosen, Simon, Verschueren
 Nays: None
 Absent: Colling

MOTION CARRIED

4. SIGN BOARD OF APPEALS

PUBLIC HEARING – FILE NO. 87-808

Location: The northeast corner of Walnut Brook Drive and South Boulevard, Zones R-4, One Family residential, and known as Walnut Brook Estates site condominiums.

Request: Renewal of an on-premise real estate development sign permit per Section 4-17.03.05.A. of Chapter 4-17 of the Code of Ordinances, which permits a real estate development sign during development of a subdivision or other property for a period not exceeding two (2) years without approval of the Sign Board of Appeals, one (1) sign naming the subdivision or other property, developer, contractors and subcontractors, engineers, architects, brokers, and financial institutions involved, and advertising the development, having an area not exceeding thirty-six (36) square feet and a height not exceeding seven (7) feet. The submitted sign permit application is requesting an extension of the existing real estate development sign permit that expires August 16, 2001 identifying Walnut Brook Estates.

Applicant: Mr. Gary R. Leigh
Rochester Hills Real Estate Development Corp.
1128 Walnut St.
Dearborn, MI 48124

Mr. Gary Leigh, the Applicant, having a **new address of 3709 Walnut Brook Dr., Rochester Hills, MI**, was present and introduced himself. He passed out brochures to the Board.

Mr. Leigh presented a summarization of his request. His project site is currently at 60% occupancy. He is adding 21 lots in two sections as illustrated on the display and contained in the board's packets. There is one site plan map that indicates lots he's taking reservations on, and about half of them are reserved.

The Chairperson **declared the public hearing open**, calling for proponents and/or opponents who wished to speak. No telephone calls or letters were received by staff regarding this request. There being no persons wishing to speak, the Chairperson **declared the public hearing closed**.

Mr. Cockey asked Mr. Leigh how many lots there are in the current phase. Answer: 72. How many lots in general do you own? Currently, 53 lots have sold and 19 are unsold and presently for sale. When phase 2 starts, how many signs are you expecting to have on South Blvd? Mr. Leigh said he hadn't thought about a second sign.

Mr. Cockey stated that in the meeting of August 14, 2000 where the sign renewal was granted, there was a condition that said this sign permit will be superceded if a sign permit for real estate development sign for the second phase development was obtained from the Building Department and asked the applicant if he would have any objections to a condition such as that. Mr. Leigh responded no.

Mr. Rosen referred to the minutes of 8/14/00 where he made a point to ask the record to reflect that this development is so unique that it should not be generally used to justify real estate signs that would be defined by the 80% rule. Mr. Leigh is on his ninth year asking for renewal and this is his 17th year building this project.

Mr. Simon commented that in last year's minutes, it's on the record that the sign had been in place for 106 months and that one year later it will be 118 months setting a long term record for a development in the city. Mr. Simon continues his solitary conviction that this development would be better served by permanent signage than by a development sign.

Mr. Rosen asked everyone to follow page 9 from the August 13, 2000 minutes for the motion.

MOTION by Rosen, seconded by Duistermars, for File No. 87-808, that the request for renewal of an on-premise real estate development sign permit identifying Walnut Brook Estates, per Section 4-17.03.05.A. of Chapter 4-17 of the Code of Ordinances, until August 13, 2002, **BE APPROVED** for Mr. Gary Leigh, Rochester Hills Real Estate Development Corp., 3709 Walnut Brook Dr., Rochester Hills, MI.

Findings:

1. A substantial amount of the lots in the subdivision are undeveloped. Based upon the information provided, it does not appear that the subdivision has reached a substantial build-out percentage at this time.
2. The applicant has indicated a need for the sign to be retained in order to continue marketing the lots and homes in the subdivision and to build out the subdivision and thereby complete the project in a reasonable time frame.
3. The extension of the sign permit until August 13, 2002 is not expected to cause any difficulties with adjacent land uses, visibility, traffic hazards, or any problems that might be associated with the sign being kept in its current location.
4. The length of time that the sign has been in existence is due to the unique nature of this development project, specifically, the cost of the lots and the houses compared to the surrounding area.

Conditions:

1. The sign height, size and type shall be continued as they are. The sign shall not be increased in size, shall not be moved any closer to the road, and shall not be changed substantially from the current color scheme and aesthetic characteristics.
2. The sign shall be kept in good repair for the time that this sign extension is in effect, and upon notice from the city or anyone else that the sign is in disrepair, it shall be immediately repaired or removed, regardless of the time frame for the extension, whether it still exists or whether it has expired at that point.
3. Should the applicant desire to continue the sign beyond August 13, 2002, application to the city for a hearing before the SBA shall be made no later than one month prior to the expiration of this sign permit. Failure to do so would be a factor that the SBA would consider upon any such request that would be received after that date.
4. Failure of the applicant to follow through on his representations for the continuation of the development and marketing efforts shall be considered by the SBA at such time as the applicant might come back and request another extension of this sign permit.
5. This sign permit will be superseded if a sign permit for a real estate development sign for the second phase of the development is obtained from the Building Department.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Brennan, Cockey, Duistermars, Rosen, Verschueren
Nays: Simon
Absent: Colling

MOTION CARRIED

OLD BUSINESS:

None

Meeting Adjourned at 9:05 pm.

Next Meeting Date: Monday, September 10, 2001

Gerard Verschueren, Chairperson
Zoning Board of Appeals
City of Rochester Hills

Kristine Karns, Recording Secretary
Zoning Board of Appeals
City of Rochester Hills