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CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Good evening. It is 7:00 p.m. and it's time to call to order the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Novi. Will you please all rise and join me in the
Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Please sit down.

Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa?
MEMBER BYRWA: Present.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Ferrell?
MEMBER FERRELL: Here.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan?
MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Olsen?
MEMBER OLSEN: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Here.

Thank you. The next item on the agenda is Public Hearing Format and Rules of Conduct. The Rules of Conduct and all the details are available on a printout up in front. So I will not repeat that.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. We have an agenda before us.

Madame Secretary, are there any changes? Additions?

MS. OPPERMAN: There was a small change to PZ-18003. There was a clerical error. So it should read an aggregate total of 40.32 feet as opposed to 40.32 square feet.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I'd appreciate a motion to approve the agenda.

MEMBER FERRELL: So moved.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

THE COURT: A motion has been made and
seconded. All those in favor, please signify by saying "Aye."

  MEMBER BYRWA: Aye.
  MEMBER KRIEGER: Aye.
  MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye.
  MEMBER FERRELL: Aye.
  MEMBER NAFSO: Aye.
  MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.
  MEMBER OLSEN: Aye.

  CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Those opposed, same sign.

  Next item on the agenda is minutes for February 2018. I hope you had an opportunity to look at the minutes. And if there are any additions, deletions, omissions to modify, this is the time to do it.

  If there is none, I will expect a motion to approve the minutes.

  MEMBER GRONACHAN: So moved.
  MEMBER OLSEN: Second.
  MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second.
  CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made and seconded to approve the minutes. All those in
favor signify by saying "Aye."

MEMBER BYRWA: Aye.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Aye.
MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye.
MEMBER FERRELL: Aye.
MEMBER NAFSO: Aye.
MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.
MEMBER OLSEN: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All those opposed, same sign.

Being none, moving on. The public section remarks.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board about anything other than what is on the agenda tonight?

Please come forward, identify yourself and state your name and address. Come to the podium over here.

MS. DUCHESNEAU: I have a layout map. May I lay that down on here so you can see what I'm talking about?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Just for clarification, this is regarding nothing that is on the agenda this
evening, correct?

MS. DUCHESNEAU: Correct. Correct. It is not on your agenda at the moment, but I believe it will be coming up shortly.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: We need your name, please.

MS. DUCHESNEAU: My name is Dorothy Duchesneau. I live at 1191 South Lake Drive in Novi, Michigan. I am part of the north end that lives on the lake up in that area. And thank you for hearing me tonight.

I'm here today because of a project that is in the beginning process and that will be coming before you in the near future. This is called Lakeview Townes by Robertson Homes. This developer will be asking for a rezoning of parcels located in the north end of Novi, south off of Thirteen Mile and Old Novi, directly south of Pavilion Shore Parks. His are those in yellow.

Most of the residents of this area had no idea that this section left and right of Old Novi Road and the section across from the park has had its zoning changed under the new master plan and that the City is targeting us as one of its three redevelopment areas. Under this approved master plan, our R-4 zoning in this
area, which has been in effect since people started building around the casino and amusement park years ago before Novi became a city, is now named Pavilion Shores Village.

As Pavilion Shores Village, our R-4 density of 3.3 homes per acre has now been increased to 7.3 homes per acre. Many of these older homes are on 40- and 60-foot lots and we live very well on them. It is a peaceful up-north area that happens to be in Novi.

We now have a developer who has read the new master plan guidelines and he wants to build 57 three-story townhome of condos on three acres of this eight acre parcel. These proposed 20-foot wide attached townhomes are literally being built on the property lines on top of our neighbors. The builder intends to request that the City give rights-of-way to Old Novi Road to help facilitate extra parking on both sides of the roadway since their units only account for two cars physically in the garage.

He has also been in discussion with the folks over in Planning Department and has even met with the local residents twice in the last month -- once in early February. And I guess he didn't hear us the
first time. Yesterday's meeting at the Novi Library we had over a hundred neighbors in attendance. This will grow.

We bought and built in Novi because we wanted, in this area, this type of laid back lifestyle. We are not against building. We are not saying, "Don't build anything."

We are saying keep to the zoning density. This development is not appropriate for this area. It's too densely built. It will do nothing but bring traffic, traffic and traffic to a quiet area on a residential road, which is what Old Novi is considered.

He claims he can't make any money unless he builds a lot of units and that these units are what the City wants to see there per the revised master plans. We don't want to see another Sandstone where a developer gets to run roughshod over long-time loyal residents.

His parting words to my husband last night were along the lines of, "Oh, they'll let us build. Because if not, we'll get even."

Sorry. Keep him to the density when he shows up before you. He has to.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you, ma'am.

Thank you. Moving on with the first case PZ17-0055, Adrienne Lenda, 1209 East Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and south of 14 Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-127-019. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ordinance section 3.32-10, Section ii.a, for the building of a proposed 500 square foot shed on the waterfront. A hundred square feet are allowed by the code. And another variance is Section 3.32-10, Section ii.b, to allow a 10.5 foot height. Eight foot are allowed by code. This property is zoned single family residential R-4.

Is the applicant here?

MR. AGIS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Would you please identify yourself with your name and address.

MS. LENDA: My name is Adrienne Lenda at 31132 Lagoon Drive.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Could you please come to the microphone so they can hear you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Would you come to the
podium and both of you, identify yourselves and be sworn in by our secretary if you are not attorneys.

MS. LENDA: My name is Adrienne Lenda. I live at 31132 Lagoon Drive, Novi. And I have here ...

MR. AGIS: My name is Joe Agis. I live at 5228 Washakie Trail in Brighton, Michigan.

MEMBER FERRELL: Either of you an attorney?

MR. AGIS: No.

MS. LENDA: No.

MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead and raise your right hand for me.

Do you swear to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. AGIS: I do.

MS. LENDA: I do.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Please start your presentation. Thank you.

MR. AGIS: And we have Igor over here as well.

MR. SHPILBAND: Should I introduce myself?

MR. AGIS: Yes. Go ahead and introduce yourself, Igor.
MR. SHPILBAND: My name is Igor Shpilband and I live at 31132 Lagoon Drive, Novi, Michigan.

MEMBER FERRELL: Can you spell your first and last name.

MR. SHPILBAND: Igor, Shpilband, I-g-o-r, S-h-p-i-l-b-a-n-d.

MEMBER FERRELL: Do you plan on giving testimony in this case?

MR. SHPILBAND: If I have to.

MEMBER FERRELL: I'll swear you in. Go ahead and raise your right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. SHPILBAND: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead.

MR. AGIS: I'll try and get through this as quick as possible.

Hi. My name is Joe Agis. I was here at the last board meeting, the last zoning meeting. And I have been hired by Adrienne and Igor to graphically demonstrate their hardship.

I have read through the minutes and I would like to address their request for the 25 by 20 by 10.5 lake shed at 1209 East Drive.
Per the minutes when their last zoning meeting was, there was a request for a full rendering, which they gladly hired their architect and paid them. And I would like to start with that right now.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You're upside down.

(Documents being displayed.)

MEMBER GRONACHAN: There you go.

MR. AGIS: Well, the rest of them will be correct.

So the first time they came here we only had the rendering of the house, which the ground has been broken. This one shows the shed and the proportion with the size of the house, which it shows it fits really nice with the material's on there.

And it also demonstrates with an eight-foot drop from the road to the lake level that only a small portion will actually be seen unless you're on a boat out in the water. So only the tip of that roof will actually able to be seen by any of the neighbors or anybody driving by. It's a full, eight-foot drop.

This house is going to add beauty and prestige to this neighborhood. All the wood on the existing holding wall will be restained. Any kind of
boards replaced, and all new landscaping as well around the lake shed.

But I want to address the hardships right away. I went through the ordinance myself and went through it and it is fitting. A lot of the lots are smaller. But I just want to show, when these things were -- when this ordinance was instated that this was a typical family. This is not a -- this was a typical family at lakefront place. They would have their wood skis, the old inner tube.

Well, my point of showing this is is times have changed. These items now are way more expensive, bigger and there are a lot of different items which I'm going to go through really quick here.

We still have the skis, but everybody knows these paddleboards. These two are 11 foot tall. You still have the skis. Carrying these up a 200-foot driveway with an eight foot incline just to get up the lake, you can see even at 11 foot how they would fit in a 10 by 10 shed.

These are more items that are -- wakeboards, wakeskates, surfboards and even the old orange vest have been replaced with full wetsuits and wakesurf
boards.

That's a little bit big, but you can get the idea. And that old inner tube that used to fit in that 10 by 10 shed has now been replaced with a new and improved tube that you see all over these lakes. These tubes are bigger. This one is seven foot long. So you're talking about -- well, some of these things would fill up a regular two-car garage, taking up half the garage in there.

Some other items that they own and are bringing to the slate is wind surfers. They're both professional athlete trainers. And these are things that they utilize for themselves as well.

A two person kayak, which is 19 feet long. These things can be very expensive and they need to be stored inside an environment.

A two-person or single-person catamaran. These things are 25 feet long and 10 feet high with the pole broken down. These are some of the hardships. And these are not self-brought-up hardships. These are typical items of someone that would live on a lakefront that they would own and want to be stored.

Not to mention Jet Skis.
Some small rakes and potted plants that you're going to want to have down there by the waterfront.

A couple of chaise lounges and a small dining room set down by the water. These things can all be fit inside this shed that is 20 by 20 foot.

And you can see them here demonstrating some things underneath it. But even at that size we are pretty much going right to the edges of these items. And once again, these are not untypical items with someone of a house this size and a block this size to have as recreational equipment.

That's our hardship, number one, is personal property preservation.

The second part, the second hardship, is a security hardship. These items are very expensive. Even if it's a paddleboard, you don't want to leave these things out or any of these items out. You want to keep them locked up.

Igor and Adrienne are olympic trainers. So they travel a lot. They're going to be -- they leave sometimes up to three weeks. They're not going to want to carry everything up 200 feet to the house, and it
would be nice to have all these items inside one
locked, secured, lake shed.

Hardship number three: This is a diagram
from the house that fits on there. Going up the eight
foot grade, crossing the road, up the driveway to the
garage, we're talking 200 feet. On a downhill, it's
great. But walking up it's a whole other story.

We have -- Walled Lake's notorious for its
wind. There's a tornado. And we also have a neighbor
here today that ...

Can you see that? There. This is a neighbor
right here. This was at -- this was by the lake. This
thing was picked up from the lake, crossed the road and
hit the telephone pole and a house before it stopped.

So having a shed is a justified hardship for
these items, very expensive items, that are typical of
a lake house. You can see there that was hit by the
thing as well.

A part of the -- the part of the health and
safety hardship for number three is the getting across
this road as well. They're going to have lots of
family and kids coming back and forth. And it's one of
the things that the neighbors have brought up as well,
is keeping everything down below is a lot better.

Last but not least, I want to show you the size of their property which they're building on. It's over a hundred feet wide and it's got quite a large house on it. A lot of lots next to it are 40-foot lots. This shed does not seem in perspective outrageous on the size.

This is -- I highlighted it and you can see the existing shed there, right? And this is the size of the shed. It's not that much bigger for this size of the piece of property.

This hardship on number four is -- I wanted to get it out of the minutes.

Was the need. The need on this is the self-preservation of these personal items. The security of these personal items is the need. And also the need is the safety of having to transport these things back and forth if they could not be fit into this 10-foot shed.

But I think it's part of an ordinance that dates pretty far back. This piece of property right here as well, these people have made an investment and, they're. Making a huge investment in the house. But
just that piece of land in the front is a separate
taxed item other than the property that the house sits
on. This property, just this lakefront property, is
$5,000 a year in taxes in Novi. Not including the
house or the property that it's on.

To fully utilize the justification of
spending that money by these two people, they really
feel that this 25 by 20 foot shed will fit these items.
The size of the shed was designed for the catamaran,
for the paddle boards, for the wind surfer. For these
items to fit in there. The 25 by 20 wasn't just an
abstract number. We took all these pieces together and
figured out what would be the exact amount on there.

On behalf of Igor and Adrienne, I would like
to thank the panel for their consideration. I do
believe this will enhance the neighborhood, increase
property values and keep the integrity of the lake.

And they didn't want me to mention it, but in
the last five years -- in the last decade, these people
are professional Olympic trainers. Two of their
athletes that they have personally trained has received
a gold and silver medal for the United States. And I
think even to have some celebrities like that right on
the lakefront would be a nice addition as well.  
So I appreciate you considering the additional space that they are requesting.  
Any questions, please?  
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: We'll come to that later. Thank you.  
Anything else you would like to add? Anybody else would like to add?  
Go ahead.  
MR. ENGLING: Hello. I'm Carl Engling. I live at 1389 East Lake Drive, down the street from this property.  
MEMBER FERRELL: Can you spell your last name for me, Carl?  
MR. ENGLING: E-n-g-l-i-n-g.  
MEMBER FERRELL: Are you an attorney?  
MR. ENGLING: Nope.  
MEMBER FERRELL: Can you raise your right hand and be sworn in?  
Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?  
MR. ENGLING: Yes.  
I just want to say I think it's a great idea.  
It's great that they're actually giving forethought to
think of putting away all the stuff you have on the lake. I myself have a lot of problems trying to keep my yard clutter free from all the toys you get from living there with kids and all that. And I just want to go on the record and say I'm for it.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Anybody else?

Thank you.

MR. AGIS: I wanted to add one more. The neighbor next door has, I believe -- has everybody gotten this letter from the neighbor next door that was opposed to it at the first meeting?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yeah. We've got all the letters.

MR. AGIS: You got all that. I just want to make sure on that.

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anything else for your presentation? Are you done?

MR. AGIS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: We'll get on to it. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to say anything about this case?
Seeing none. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, is there any correspondence?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair. There were three letters mailed. Two letters returned. One approval and zero objections.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Turn your mics on, please. They can't hear us in the other room. So if everybody can speak up a little bit, please.

MEMBER FERRELL: The first letter it says: "To whom it may concern." It's from Alan DeZell and Nicole DeZell at 1217 East Lake Drive.

"We are writing to withdraw our objections to the proposed variance for the shed to be located at 1209 East Lake Drive. Specifically, we no longer have concerns that the roofline of the proposed shed will block our water view or negatively impact the overall appearance of the lakeshore for the neighbors or the community. Additionally, we understand that they require additional space to store their water sports equipment. As all of us know, transporting water equipment across the street can be hazardous, it will be helpful for them to be able to safely store all of their equipment near the water. Thank you."
The next one is an approval from Gordon Wilson at 1345 East Lake Drive, Novi.

"My name is Gordy Wilson. I live at 1345 East Lake Drive, Novi, Michigan. After reviewing the drawings with Ms. Lenda, I am in full support of this project in granting her a variance. This parcel is approximately a hundred feet in width and can easily handle the proposed structure. Also, with the structure being several feet below the road, it will not obstruct the view of the lake. This is exactly the type of protect East Lake Drive needs. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. Gordy Wilson."

It look like there's another one. This one is from Jodie Condon, C-o-n-d-o-n. No address. It's in the letter.

"To Whom it May Concern. My name is Jodie Condon. I live at 1193 East Lake Drive. In regard to the lakefront property at 1209 East Lake Drive, I believe the proposed plans to build a 20 by 25 parcel by the water would be a beautiful addition to the lakefront home. The architecture nicely matches the design of the new house and does not obstruct the view of the lake from our house or any property nearby. I
agree to all plans that they have proposed. I believe this is a very good addition to the neighborhood."

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Anything from the City, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: The only one I have is the fact that this is considerably larger than what is allowed by code. I would just like to say that. Otherwise, no other comments from the City.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I'll open it up to the board.

Yes, Mr. Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: I'm having a hard time swallowing the size of this here. I think it sets an unreasonable precedence. It's like a 500 percent increase. And to other properties up and down the beach, I see it kind of setting a precedence where they'll be in here asking for large structures on the beach.

You're blessed where you can afford a lot of recreational equipment -- but, you know, if I could afford 10 cars and I came in here and asked for a variance for a 10-car garage, that doesn't make it right for me. Or if I went into my boss and said,
"Hey, I want a 500 percent increase," you know, you'd get laughed out of town.

And I understand how negotiations work sometimes. Sometimes you're willing to settle for 300 square feet. But even 300 square feet is outrageous. That's a 300 percent increase in the size out there and it's just an unreasonable departure from the ordinance that is a hundred square feet in size. And I worry about it setting a precedent up and down that beach for large structures.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Anybody else?

Yes?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question regarding the term "shed." Because a shed is usually 10 by 10, is there another word that we would use as an accessory structure to have so much equipment? I mean, there's a safety concern. Is shed the right word?

MR. BUTLER: Shed is the correct word. Unless you went out to say it's a garage.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Ms. ...

MEMBER GRONACHAN: It's Gronachan. I know...
you've been gone for a while. Welcome back.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, I pulled the minutes because I couldn't remember back from the December. I guess there is a sign.

And I want to thank you for presenting your information. After all I'm the one that asked for it. I think that the presentation cleared up some of the concern despite the previous speaker's comments.

Because I did ask for what was the hardship. But I'm going to step back from that for a minute, and this is basically to do a review.

When the petitioner was here in December, it was not clear to us that this building was only going to be used for storage. There was a gray area that it wasn't going to be a party -- a gazebo-type thing. And so that's why we kept asking for we need to show what the hardship is.

You -- and I apologize for your last name.

MR. AGIS: Agis.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Agis.

MR. AGIS: "I haven't seen you in ages."

MEMBER GRONACHAN: There you go.
Mr. Agis, I think that you clarified a lot of what we asked for in the statement: "That the current building on the property does not serve the purpose of the modern day items, which the new shed would be able to. And by having that new shed, it would enable the petitioner to use this property for what it is intended for."

Having said that, as long as it's not going to be a gazebo, that it is not going to have an awning, that it is not going to be a bar, then I would be in full support of this. Given that statement, also given your testimony and your presentation, number one.

Number two, given the size of the lot and that it's in proportion.

Number three, given the safety factors that you clearly stated again. Because just because it's a safety factor, that still isn't a hardship. Okay? Everybody can have safety issues from where they live. So -- but to tie it in with the height factor of the property, the drop from the road, the modern day equipment and all of those issues, then I would be in support of this.

But with those stipulations -- and I'm going
to be very clear about it. Because your petitioner --
the petitioner was not clear in the previous meeting
that we had about the gazebo or the bar or anything
else. So those are my statements and I wanted to get
them on record.

And I'll throw it to my other board members.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Anybody else?

MEMBER NAFSO: Yeah. I just want to say I
think you did a good job of responding to the concerns
we had. In particular -- you know, showing the -- I
think you did a variation of what you have up there,
but, I mean, actually showing the footprint fully
enclosed in -- or the old footprint fully enclosed and
the new footprint is helpful. And I think seeing the
rendering of what this thing looks like makes a
difference.

And I think one of the big factors as to why
I support this, and I think that the person that ended
up coming around really realized, that this doesn't
really obstruct the view at all. I mean, you can have
an eight-foot structure that can be completely at road
level, which would come up eight feet higher -- six
foot higher than what you have there.

So overall I think it looks really good. I think it's a good complement to the house. And I think when you put in perspective this lot compared to the two surrounding lots, I think this makes a lot of sense.

MR. AGIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Let's see. I agree with the first board member, with what he said as well. I agree with Ms. Gronachan except -- I agree with the part of not having it as a party structure. And I agree with yours as well.

The only thing I'm having a hard time with is I don't think the equipment you're getting to put in the shed is a hardship. That's a choice. You're making those choices to buy those specific items to use on your property. I also agree that the height of the shed is okay. I think with the views from the upper part. I just think the size is a little excessive and I'm a little concerned with the other neighbors wanting bigger sheds to make their accessory buildings. I look
at this as like an accessory building. This isn't really a shed. This is huge.

I get that you want to store things in it, a larger size, but I don't know. I'm just having a hard time with the size of that. So I just kind of wanted to get that out there, too. But I don't really know unless the board members have some other suggestions on sizewise. It seems like some are okay with it and some aren't. So I don't know.

That's it, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Anybody else?

Yes?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you for the good presentation. And I agree with you on the practical difficulties of all this equipments and the crossing the road and the other board members what they said. I have no objections. I like it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Yes?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Round two. I would just like to add, maybe to help Member Ferrell on this, not to sway or anything, but I'm going to put it out there.
So I do agree that some of the ordinances on the books from time to time need to get reviewed and re-evaluated as times change. That's why our building department and the city council does go and look at this. And this may be something that this may have to be taken under advisement so in the future people don't come and ask for a thousand square feet on a hundred foot wide piece of property.

I'm not worried about other cases coming to us. This case is -- the decision that we make on this property is with this property.

And I think that when we make the motion, if we decide to move forward with this, that that's what our words are going to address.

When we look at other cases, we tell people that each case is standing on its own merit. And although we draw from other cases for experience purposes, I don't think any of us really use that material to make a decision on each case.

So having said that, for this particular case alone, that's why I feel comfortable. I think that the petitioner did present -- address 90 percent of our concerns. And I think that the ordinance does need to
be put under review and we should forward that to the building department to take it under advisement. Because things have changed. You know, it's not the same boat anymore. It's not the same inner tube and I think that has to be taken into consideration.

And I do agree that this building is large. However, given the lay of the property, it's not the petitioner's fault that their house is up on a hill and their lake is, you know, three or four hundred feet away downhill. And when you're spending that kind of money -- and that's not an excuse. But I'm just saying when you're spending that kind of money, you want to be able to use the property. And I feel that a hundred feet just wouldn't do it.

So that's where I'm coming from, if that helps any.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Anybody else?

Yes?

MEMBER FERRELL: Sure. Do you know the size of the sheds on the adjacent properties? Because you guys were referring to the property size of 40 feet on your size. As far as any of the others, do you know
what size the sheds are?

MR. AGIS: On either side of them are 40 foot property.

I have been tubing on this lake since I was in a truck tube. So I have seen the houses and the lots getting bigger. And I think you're correct in addressing each one individually. You wouldn't want to put this big of a shed on a 40-foot lot.

So there is another shed that's 20 foot?

MR. SHPILBAND: 20 By 20.

MR. AGIS: 20 by 20 on an 80-foot lot down the street. We're not bringing that up. But you just asked if there was other ones.

And you have seen the houses on this lake. The stuff is scattered all over their lawns. You know, there is other lakes that we would like them to get a shed and put everything in it, you know. There's some of those. There's some things like that as well.

But -- and I -- the zoning member that -- I think when Adrienne came here, you know, she did not come before a Zoning Board commission before.

There's no running water in this. Just to let you know. There's no running water. There's no
plans on making it any kind of a bar or any type of a gazebo. These have retractable doors that go up into it so she can get these large items in there.

And I'm over 50 and we're not getting any younger. Just getting to and from the water from the shed, you know, you want to do your exercising on the water, not pull your back out trying to get it up a driveway. So I appreciate all that and I do agree with you on individual considerations.

Because the times are definitely changing and they're going to change. They're changing faster on that lake every month.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I have a motion, if you're ready for one. If there's not any further discussions.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I'll make my own comments.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Number one, as far as the updating the ordinance and everything, that is the function of the -- that is a legislative function and that is the function of the elected officials. It's not our function. So we have to interpret what is on
Okay. We can't rewrite the ordinance for any specific case, that's not our job. And I think you need to remember that every time we look at all these cases.

I know maybe the city council is not up-to-date with it, but that is not our business. I think we need to be very clear about it. So when they get around to updating, hopefully they'll redo it and it will come up-to-date. But I don't know of any city around here which is really up-to-date in organizing their ordinances because times keep changing faster than this kind of work that gets done by the councils.

MR. AGIS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Whatever legislature mandates goes all the way up into the congress, but we won't go into that.

But as far as this particular case is concerned, the current ordinance prescribes a specific size of the shed. And we are talking about here the size of this five times greater than what is allowed under the ordinance and that is where the hardship comes in the picture and that is where the
interpretation comes into the picture. And to be quite honest, I'm very happy that you mentioned all the things you are going to keep there. And I am so glad that you can afford all those equipment to be kept there, but the fact still remains, that the ordinance is at a particular level and you are asking for five times the size. And I am not quite happy about that substantial increase in the size of the thing.

But that's just my point of view and every member of the board here has their own individual opinions.

So, having said that, I will entertain a motion in whatever way you want to.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'll go ahead with it. We'll give it a shot. In case number PZ17-0055, I move that we grant the variance in this case sought by petitioner ...

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Adrienne Lenda.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Just hang on. I'll get there. Just one second. Sorry.

Adrienne Lenda for the building of the proposed 500 square foot shed on the waterfront because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty
requiring an increase of this building.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property, which is a lakefront property. The current building, which meets the current ordinance, does not serve the purpose of the modern day items which this new shed would be able to house and protect -- I'm sorry. Which would be able to house and protect.

The property is unique because it is split. Providing two separate pieces of property with height variances which cause a safety feature with the road in between the two pieces of property. The petitioner did not create this condition because it was in existence upon purchase.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties as stated by the surrounding neighbors with their letters of approval and in agreement to this petitioner's request.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it enables this petitioner to use the property, which is a lakefront
property, for the summer months or the winter months by housing the equipment and the items that they purchased to enjoy their property and also to expand their professional business. So, therefore, I move that this variance be granted.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Yes?

MS. SAARELA: Can I suggest adding what you had mentioned as that the size of the shed is not disproportionate to the size of the property so it does not impact the surrounding?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: The size of the shed does not have a negative impact because it is not disproportionate to the size of this current property.

MS. SAARELA: And you also mentioned that you wanted to add conditions about not using it as a gazebo or bar.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And state those conditions that this shed would be used as storage only, no gazebo and no bar or for entertainment purposes.

Would that clarify? Is that broad, the entertainment, or is that ...
MS. SAARELA: If that's what your intent was.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. Thank you.

So I need a second.

MEMBER NAFSO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made and seconded. Any other comments by anybody? Seeing none, Madame Secretary, call the roll.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: No.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: No.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

MR. AGIS: Thank you all.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Did she call you?
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No.

MS. OPPERMAN: Oh, my goodness. Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I said no.

MS. SAARELA: Is it four to four?

MS. OPPERMAN: It's four to three.

Motion passes, four to three.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So the motion does pass?

MR. AGIS: We passed?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You passed.

MR. AGIS: Thank you all for listening. And we can't wait to become an active part of the neighborhood as well. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Moving on with the next case.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: PZ18-001, Mamnoon Siddiqui/Siddiqui Orthodontics, 27250 Wixom Road, east of Wixom Road and south of Grand River, parcel number 50-22-17-101-024. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4 to eliminate the requirement for a loading and
unloading zone. The loading zone is required by code. This property is zoned light industrial.

Is the applicant here?  
MR. ABDELNOUR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Will you please identify yourself with your name and address. And if you're not an attorney, please be sworn in by our secretary.

Thank you.

MR. ABDELNOUR: My name is Ghassan Abdelnour from GAV & Associates Architects. I am here presenting with the owner, who is here with me tonight, Dr. Siddiqui.

My name is Ghassan, G-h-a-s-s-a-n, Abdelnour, A-b-d-e-l-n-o-u-r.

MEMBER FERRELL: Are you an attorney?  
MR. ABDELNOUR: No.

MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead and raise your right hand. I'll swear you in.

Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?  
MR. ABDELNOUR: Yes, sir.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay.

MR. ABDELNOUR: Actually, we're here in front
of you to kind of present this new project. The owner bought this property and it used to be an existing bank. We're trying to change it to a medical building. And we're keeping the existing square footage of the existing building. It's close to 4,200 square feet and we're taking the area that used to be the drive-thru and we're adding an office next to it. It's around 2,669 square feet.

The existing building would be used for medical center for like a regular doctor's office and the new addition we'll be using it for an orthodontist office.

And with the help of the Planning Department and with the City of Novi, we come up with a new site plan and revision to the existing site. That we made the site works as a two-way street and we added more parking and we added more landscaping. And we just kind of -- we tried to meet all the requirements of the setbacks and the parking.

The only part that we were having -- kind of going through the process with the City was that loading area. According to the zoning, here is like you can use it as an office, but originally it's an
industrial zoning. And the existing zoning asks for
75 by 10 feet, 75 feet by 10 loading area.

And this type of business, the doctor -- it's
orthodontist and it's a family doctor. And we don't
have actually trucks or anybody coming to this office
for a loading area. The maximum we usually get, we get
a van or we get, like, somebody stops in the parking
structure to take some medicine or stuff like this or
maybe bringing a patient or something. And that's
usually used where the handicapped parking is.

But besides this -- the hardship that we
face, that if we add the 75 feet by 10, that almost
going to take four parking area that nobody will
actually would be using and because we don't have any
of these trucks coming in.

So our hardship is we're asking you if you
can help us relieving that requirement. And I think we
would like to kind of explain what we need to do.

But, actually, as a medical center, we don't
need that loading area because we don't have anything
to load or to fill. So I'll take any questions from
you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Do you have your diagram
with you?

MR. ABDELNOUR: Yes.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Would you please put it up on there.

(Document displayed.)

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you.

MR. ABDELNOUR: So actually, this part here, this is the existing building. And the new addition is that little area over here. And we kind of created -- we fixed the driveway. It used to be one-way on the back of the property. Actually, we're pushing all the curbs, like, maybe two feet to make it two-way to meet the City requirement. And we're fixing all this area here. We're adding all the landscaping required and we're adding, like, the bicycle racks and all the kind of requirement that the City -- it's in the code.

But the only part that -- the only area that we can put a loading zoned area is in this side here. And, actually, if you take this whole area -- the requirement is 75 feet. With 75 feet, you're going to take almost eight cars. Because every parking is 10 feet. So we're going to be losing eight parking just to add a loading area that actually is not going to be
used with this use. This is a medical use. And really, there is really no use for it. 

    Even with the bank, it used to be they didn't have a loading area. The only thing is they had a drive-thru that goes in that area. They have three lanes that's used as a drive-thru. 

    And we just ask you to kind of help us in that situation. 

    For the building itself, it's going to look something like this. 

    So this part here, this is the newly added upper 2,669 square feet addition. That's where the orthodontist is going to be. And the tower area, this is where the existing building that used to be part of the bank. And we're trying to kind of put the building all together and matching the brick and the materials so to make it look like it's not an addition to make it look like one full building. 

    But our hardship, I will say it again, there's really no use to lose eight cars to be able to put a loading area. So, really, the doctor doesn't use it. And that's really what we have to say. And I would like to get your questions.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: That's it?

MR. ABDELNOUR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board regarding this case? If there is none, we'll close the public remark section and go on to Mr. Secretary.

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair. There was 15 letters mailed. One letter returned. Zero approvals. Zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good.

Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yeah. For him to express that the taking away that amount of parking, it was determined that, yeah, we kind of agreed that that would impact the clients coming in there. They'd lose eight spaces and that may provide some difficulties for the functioning businesses.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Well, as far as I'm concerned, I went and saw your property the day before yesterday, actually and looked around. That was, I think, a bank and they had a drive-in situation in the back and you are renovating
everything and increasing the work space in the
building itself. As far as this kind of building is
concerned, I agree you don't need a loading and
unloading zone. So as long as the property is being
used for medical or dental use, I have no problem with
your variance request. Thank you.

Open it up to the board.

Yes, Mr. Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I'm a little confused
on the parking there. Usually when you add square
footage you add parking. There's an addition to the
parking requirements. I was wondering what the net
gain or loss in parking is and what is required by
ordinance for that square footage.

MR. ABDELNOUR: I can answer that.

Actually, by the existing building and the
new addition, the requirement is 39 cars point seven.
And we provide now 40 cars. So we meet the requirement
for parking for medical.

We have almost the exact number. A little
bit more than the exact number.

MEMBER BYRWA: And you're saying that you
would be able to get eight more parking spaces in if
you don't get the loading dock in?

MR. ABDELNOUR: No, I don't. Because I said we might be able -- we would be losing eight parking spaces. We may be having some hardship meeting the requirement of the parking. If we take eight cars, we won't be meeting the requirement of the City.

MEMBER BYRWA: Right. So do they need a parking variance on this here, then?

MR. BUTLER: Actually, no. They only need a variance of whether they get the loading area or not. That's what they're requesting.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. So how many spaces is the lot increasing by?

MR. BUTLER: The lot, if I remember right, they had 40.

Was that 40 spaces you have now?

MR. ABDELNOUR: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: That they made in the lot with the addition put on. By putting in an offloading zone, he would lose approximately eight of those spaces. So he's asking for the variance to not put in a loading area.

MEMBER BYRWA: My understanding is that the
existing parking you are saying was 40 and then he
built a -- what is the square footage of the addition
there?

MR. BUTLER: No. The existing -- the parking
that he has right now is 40. What was there with the
bank was totally different. I'm not sure what was
there when it was just a bank, but he put on that
addition to the building.

MR. ABDELNOUR: We added nine cars from the
existing.

MR. BUTLER: Yeah.

MR. ABDELNOUR: The existing one used to be
31 cars.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. So we're going from 31
to 40 to accommodate the additional square footage,
right?

MR. ABDELNOUR: Correct.

MR BUTLER: Yes.

MEMBER BYRWA: Thank you for the
clarification.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So how many businesses are going to be in
MR. ABDELNOUR: Two. The orthodontist office and the regular medical office.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. I have a question for the City. So this was zoned light industrial?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, it was.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And I have to admit that I'm not up to my zoning on the light industrial. So how did this get into the light industrial area?

MR. BUTLER: That was done at the planning end of the deal where they were authorizing to put that in. I don't believe they rezoned that. I believe it's still light industrial.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. And that's why they need the variance?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's why they need the variance, because the zoning wasn't changed.

MR. BUTLER: Correct.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And that the Planning Commission allowed this business to be in the light industrial?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MEMBER GRONACHAN: Then maybe I do know about zoning.

I don't have any objections. I think that your presentation indicates that due to the size of the lot and your addition, there's no need -- given to the type of business that you have. There is no need for a loading and unloading and it would be silly for us to not approve this based on the zoning, the current zoning of the property.

So I will be in support of your request.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else?

Seeing none, I would entertain a motion.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Brent?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.

MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you.

Okay. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ18-0001, sought by the petitioner for the elimination of the loading and unloading zone because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty with no need for a loading zone due to the type of business which is going to be used for medical and ... Orthodontic?

MR. ABDELNOUR: Orthodontist.
MEMBER FERRELL: Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because they would lose eight parking spaces if they were to keep the requirement for the loading and unloading zone.

The property is unique because it is being reconditioned from a bank to a medical use facility. The petitioner did not create the condition due to zoning requirements from light industrial to ...

Member Gronachan, can you help me out with that since you just learned your new zoning?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: That it is currently zoned light industrial.

MEMBER FERRELL: Light industrial one, is it?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. The relief being granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been
made and seconded.

Can I just make an additional comment, with your permission granted?

MEMBER FERRELL: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: So long as the business is medical and dental, this approval will continue. If the nature of the business changes, then we might have to come back for loading and unloading later on.

MEMBER FERRELL: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Do you accept?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right.

Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN:  Member Peddiboyina:

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA:  Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN:  And Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN:  Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  Thank you.

MR. ABDELNOUR:  Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  Thank you. Welcome to Novi and good luck.

MS. OPPERMAN:  Pardon me?

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN:  Our recording secretary asked that we take a short break so that she might be able to use the facilities.

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  Do you want to call for a break for five minutes, please?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  You want a break?

All right. We'll adjourn for five minutes. We'll adjourn for five minutes and come back in five minutes.

(At 7:58 p.m., matter adjourned.)

(At 8:03 p.m., matter resumed.)

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  We will resume.
The next case on the agenda is PZ18-0003 -- I beg your pardon.

MR. BUTLER: Two. You skipped one.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: PZ18-002, ID Enterprises, 41875 Carousel Drive, east of Novi Road and north of Twelve Mile Road. Parcel number 50-22-02-400-011. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 28-5(f)(3) to allow a proposed replacement sign located one foot from the right of way and 10 foot distance required by code. This property is zoned Mobile Home.

Is the applicant here? Please come forward.

(No response.)

MEMBER GRONACHAN: After all of that, they're not here.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No. the applicant is not here.

Madame Secretary, anything?

MS. OPPERMANN: There was no contact to me.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Well, with your permission --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: -- we'll table this and
we'll call it last on the list.

And we'll go on the to next case, if the applicant is here. It is PZ18-0003, Kensington Family Homes, east of Beck Road and south of Eleven Mile Road. Parcel number 50-22-21-103-003.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a side yard setback variance of 9.68 feet. For an aggregate total of 40.32 feet, 50 feet is required by code. This property is zoned residential acreage.

And the applicant is here. Can you please identify yourself with your name and address and if you are not an attorney, please be sworn in by our secretary.

Please go ahead.

MS. LONGO: Hi. I'm Julie Longo I live at 47501 Airplay Court, Novi, Michigan.

MEMBER FERRELL: Can you spell your last name?

MS. LONGO: L-o-n-g-o.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Are you an attorney?

MS. LONGO: I am not an attorney.

MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead and raise your
right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MS. LONGO: Yes, I do.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. LONGO: I am a local resident and a small business owner. We have a client looking to build a modest, aesthetically pleasing home here in Novi. They're currently renting. Trying to stay within the Novi school district. They have an interest in the lot located at 42245 Eleven Mile.

Their home design requires -- I'm sorry.

Excuse me.

Their home design is 39.8 feet wide.

We meet the RA zoning front setback requirement of 45 feet. We meet the rear setback of 50 feet. We meet the -- on the west side we have our 20-foot side setback, but on the east side we are -- we fall short 9.68 feet.

We're requesting a reduction in our side setback.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: That's it?

MS. LONGO: That is it.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
MS. LONGO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board regarding this case?

Seeing none, I will close the --

MEMBER FERRELL: No. No.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I do?

Go ahead. Please come and identify yourself, your name and address.

MR. WEINERT: My name is Rick Weinert. I live at 47235 Eleven Mile Road. I own the home right next to the property that is requesting the variance.

MEMBER FERRELL: Can you spell your last name, please?

MR. WEINERT: W-e-i-n-e-r-t.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. WEINERT: And I'm not a lawyer.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.

MEMBER FERRELL: That's fine.

MR. WEINERT: So my main concern with the variance is that it is encroaching on my property. They're looking for the variance coming closer to my property.
This particular lot does not perc. We do not have sewers; therefore, we require septic fields. Because this lot doesn't perc, they're going to have to put in a septic field, usually an engineered septic field. My concern really is the water egress. They're putting a fairly large home that's going to take about 25 percent of this lot on a lot that doesn't perc.

Where is the runoff going to go? I want to make sure there's not a negative impact to my property.

The raised engineered field raises concerns for me. You know, a large home with the additional water runoff with -- you know, putting undue stress on my septic system.

And I have a basement. I probably shouldn't have a basement. The water table is so high that my sump pump runs constantly. If we lose power, my basement floods.

So with the additional water and stuff like that with the home, you know, that's really my concern is, you know, what are they going to do when they build the home and the grade level and making sure that there's not a negative impact or stress to my system.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Anybody else?

Seeing none. We'll close the public remark section.

Mr. Secretary, go ahead with correspondence.

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair.

There was 23 letters mailed. One letter returned, one approval. Three objections.

The first objection is from Farouk, F-a-r-o-u-k, middle initial I think it's "E.L". The last name is D-a-m-o-u-n-i. At 47250 West Eleven Mile Road, Novi, Michigan 48374.

"The property has been tested before and it failed numerous times. As a reminder, there is no sewage on Eleven Mile at this time. I do not want my property to be effected by land elevation changes."

The next one is an approval from Kurt, K-u-r-t, Smith, S-m-i-t-h, 9238 C-o-r-i-n-n-e, Plymouth, Michigan 48170.

"The owner of the property is trying to sell to get out. It would be nice to see the new buyers to be able to build a house. Thank you."

The next is an objection from R.M. Weinert, W-e-i-n-e-r-t at 47235 Eleven Mile Road.
MR. WEINERT: That's me.

MEMBER FERRELL: That's you.

MR. WEINERT: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Well, I'm going to read your letter anyway.

"The parcel on Eleven Mile Road has a very high water table, clay soil and has failed perc tests on numerous occasions. Any grade elevation changes, raised engineering, septic field and large building structures will negatively impact neighboring properties with additional water runoff. For these reasons, I object to a proposed setback variance."

This is from Linda and David Mackay, M-a-c-k-a-y at 47175 West Eleven Mile Road, Novi, Michigan 48374.

"Being part of Pioneer Meadows subdivision, we are sure all lights (sic) are single family. Not in favor of side yard setback variance of this lot. If the structure would be compared to the structures around it in our area, that would be fine. But no variance."

That is it.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you very much.
Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. We did look at it. And by reviewing the plot, we saw that their wetland floods on back behind the property. So they will just have to take into consideration the elevation and the slope of the property to ensure the proper drainage so it is not going off to the sides and straight to the back.

If I remember right, they are on a corner lot and there is no house on the side of them.

Yeah, I'm correct on that one.

But that's just going to have to be taken into it when they go to do the construction and make sure the elevation and the drainage is considered.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

I have a question for you.

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Is there any plans to have a city sewer system around here?

MR. BUTLER: That, I'm not aware of any future plans on that one, no.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Aren't there too many places in the city of Novi that don't have a public sewer system?
MR. BUTLER: There are a few places. And I know that even since I have been here there's a few places where the sewer is slowly going into some of the places, but it's a slow process.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I always worry about septic tanks and problems sometimes it creates, but that's besides the point at this end.

Okay. I'll open it up to the board. Anybody?

Yes, Mr. Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I was looking at the -- kind of like the plot plan here and it looked like there was some room out the front and a little room out the back. I think the front yard is requiring a 45-foot setback and the rear yard is requiring a 50-foot setback. I was wondering if there was a floor plan that could be designed that would push the front and rear setbacks to the limit and then minimize that side yard setback?

MS. LONGO: I'm sure that there is. That would make this a 30-foot wide home. So we're trying to do something that builds value for their subdivision that is aesthetically pleasing and you would be
hard-pressed to find something that is 30 feet wide that would improve the look of a community. It would be something kind of forced and engineered. So that's why we went with a 39-foot product. Again, they're not trying to push the envelope here. You know, they're trying to stay modest but, again, staying aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I have a question for the city attorney.

It's been awhile since we've had a case like this because there's been -- there's not as much individual building out there anymore. And I want it on record that the Zoning Board, do we or do we not, have any duty in regards to water runoff drainage or wetlands?

MS. SAARELA: No. That would be determined by Building at the time of plan review. When they submit their plot plan for review that would all be handled by Community Development.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay.

MS. SAARELA: If there is any problems there,
it would go to a Construction Board of Appeals or whatever other. If there was any variance, it would be handled separately.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So, again, for the record, because of the amount of complaints or objections that are in this file, I want it on the record that the Zoning Board does not have any jurisdiction, if you will, in regards to the wetland runoff, the water runoff. So when we're voting, the only thing that we're looking at tonight is this request for this side yard setback?

MS. SAARELA: Correct. And just fitting it into the standards that you look at for a zoning variance.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. So I'm not going to talk about water or runoff or anything else?

MS. SAARELA: Correct. That would be part of a more detailed plan.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Exactly. So the purpose of this meeting this evening and for this case only is that we're looking to see if the criteria is met for the variance of nine feet and that everything else about the septic and all that will be held by another
department?

MS. LONGO: Yes.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. Given that information, I think that this is a minimal request. And I agree that to go for the front or the back, then you have got to narrow the house. And I don't see that that's going to happen. I think it would be a 900 square foot house at that point and that doesn't even fit.

Would it? Would it be even smaller with that?

MS. LONGO: I mean, you can do a lot in that, but, you know, you're going up and there's high. Again, for us --

MEMBER GRONACHAN: My point was that it doesn't fit with the rest of the houses, the similar houses in the ...

MS. LONGO: Yeah. I brought this. I hope I have this right side up first try.

So you're right. Most of the homes are wide on the lot. They're not deep on their lots.

So this is two down, I believe. And then this one here is the neighboring home.
So you're right. That street there, Eleven Mile, the homes are more wide than they are deep. So it would be a unique structure to have kind of a deep, narrow home sitting there on Eleven Mile.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. That's the only question I have.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And I'll turn it over to the rest of the board members.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay.

MEMBER FERRELL: I had a question for the city attorney. So we don't take any consideration at all as far as other surrounding properties even if it has something to do with the water table? I thought that was kind of part of our duty.

MS. SAARELA: Yeah. We have the engineering review and the plot plan is submitted and they'll look at all that and see if all that works at the time of their review.

So, no. Engineering issues are not your concern.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay.

MS. SAARELA: There's no documented problem
here. That's not in front of us. If that did become a concern, it would be another -- really, different committee.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay.

Yes, Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Just to be clear, is this just east of the fire station, this property?

MS. LONGO: Well, actually, there is a lot that the City of Novi owns between this parcel and the fire station.

MEMBER NAFSO: Okay. So then it would be east of the fire station -- east of a parcel that is just east of the fire station?

MS. LONGO: Yes.

MEMBER NAFSO: And then Mr. Weinert's home would be just east of this lot?

MR. WEINERT: Right.

MS. LONGO: That's correct. His parcel is this parcel.

MEMBER NAFSO: Okay.

And, Mr. Weinert, and I just reviewed your letter again. And I apologize, I know you spoke. I
mean, did you have an issue with the distance from your home in addition to those? That this variance would create in addition to the other things that you've cited in the letter?

MR. WEINERT: It's within the homes.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Can you come up to the mic so they can hear at home?

MR. WEINERT: My main concern really is not with the homes with the distance. It's with the impact of being a piece of property that does not perc. All right. We have a very high water table. And the stress of putting a large home like that, what that puts on my septic system which is, you know, over 50 years old. And, you know, with the high water table, you know, where is all that water going to go?

I just want to make sure that when they do this, because an engineer field is going to be required. That's usually raised. That things are taken into consideration where it doesn't have a negative impact on my property. That's my concern.

MEMBER NAFSO: Thank you.

MS. SAARELA: Just to add. That would be the Oakland County Health Department reviewing any septic
plans to make sure they work. That wouldn't even be something that the City would do.

MS. LONGO: Am I allowed to speak? I'm sorry.

So to speak to Mr. Weinert, I mean, we hear your concern. That is definitely something that we're aware of. We do have an engineered septic field plan here, which, in theory, would potentially relieve some of the water concerns not perpetuate them.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else?

Yes, Mr. Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I got a question for the City. Isn't it in the City Ordinance where you can't drain your property onto abutting or adjoining properties?

MR. BUTLER: That is true. You're not supposed --

MS. SAARELA: You can't ...

MR. BUTLER: Go ahead.

MS. SAARELA: You can't change the natural course of drainage. So if it's already flowing that way and it's not changing, that's permissible.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. But in this case here
there would be a grading plan.

MS. SAARELA: Correct.

MEMBER BYRWA: And the water that is hitting that property is going to stay on that property. It's not going to flow over the property lines?

MS. SAARELA: Well, they'd at least make sure it's not going anywhere different than it currently is. Because if it changes the direction, velocity, for amount of water from the natural flow of drainage, then there's a concern about needing an easement. So they will review it to make sure the drainage is either staying the same and if not -- if it's not staying the same, whether there's some alternate location for it to go that would not be impactful on the remaining properties.

MEMBER BYRWA: And then all those lots drain toward the front or toward Eleven Mile?

MS. SAARELA: I don't think that's information that we have right now in this plan. I think it's going beyond the scope of what is being looked at here today.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay.

MS. SAARELA: And it would be looked at in
detail when a detailed plot plan is submitted and our
ing engineering consultant would do that.

MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. Well, I was just asking
because it seemed like the drainage was the primary
issue here.

MS. SAARELA: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I have one
question. How many trees are you going to remove from
that?

MS. LONGO: Yeah. That's a good question.
We haven't gotten that far yet. We're not sure yet.
We haven't done our tree survey quite yet. We're just
trying to take step one here and obtain our side yard
setback to know if we can take the next five steps
through the building approval process.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Because when you cut
the trees, you will have an impact on the water flow
also.

MS. LONGO: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: And if you cut too many
trees, it's going to go somewhere else. It's not going
to stay on the side of the property. So it's a very
pertinent question. Thank you.
Anybody else?

MEMBER NAFSO: I have one follow-up question. This is what you may have been addressing with showing your diagram there. But the side yard setbacks on the existing houses to the east, so east of Mr. Weinert's house going down -- going east down Eleven Mile, those are more narrow than the 50 feet; is that correct?

MS. LONGO: That's correct. From the 50 foot requirement with RA we're asking for -- in percentage terms, we're asking for 19.5 reduction. But if these other homes were going in front of you today, they would be asking for 55.8, 57.2, 68.2, 64.8 and 55.4.

MEMBER NAFSO: So even at roughly, you know, 40 some -- you know, 41 -- 40.32 feet, there would be more distance between Mr. Weinert's house and Mr. Poe's (ph) house then there is between the east side of Mr. Weinert's house and the next house going all the way down?

MS. LONGO: That's correct.

MEMBER NAFSO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LONGO: And the property line that we share with Mr. Weinert, we're actually going to be farther away from that property line than he is to our
shared property line.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER NAFSO: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else?

Okay. I'll entertain a motion.

MEMBER NAFSO: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ18-0003 sought by the Kensington Family Homes for a variance from Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a side yard setback variance of 9.68 feet for an aggregate total of 40.32 feet, where 50 feet is required by code because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring the variance.

Specifically, without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because, although the property could be extended out on the north and south side, it would be a very narrow home.

The property is unique because of the size of the lot. It is -- it is a narrow lot. The petitioner did not create that condition. As well that is the nature of the land as it stands. And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. Because, as we've stated --
and Mr. Weinert honestly stated -- it doesn't interfere as it relates to what is within the jurisdiction of this board. It does not interfere with the use of his property.

In addition, the diagram shows of the surrounding properties of the east show that the side lot setback is less than what would -- what this home would have with the variance.

In addition, the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Again, because this is the type of situation, not necessarily contemplated by the ordinance.

With that I have nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER FERRELL: Second.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

MEMBER FERRELL: I'm sorry. I beat you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. If there is no further discussion, Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?
MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

MS. LONGO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

All right. Moving on to PZ18-0005, CA Senior Living Holdings, LLC, east of Novi and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-11-300-009.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4.1 to allow a proposed loading zone in the side yard. The rear yard location required by the code, Section 4.19.2.F to allow placement of a proposed dumpster which will be screened in the side yard. The rear yard
location is required by the code Section 4.19.2.A, to allow placement of a proposed transformer and
generator, screened, placement in the side yard. Rear yard location is required by code.

This property is zoned Office Service, OS-1, and residential acreage, RA, and is governed by the
William R. Eldridge versus City of Novi Consent Judgment.

The applicant is here. Will you please state your name and address. And if you are not an attorney, please be sworn in by our secretary. Thank you.

MR. DUGGAN: Sure. My name is Michael Duggan, D-u-g-g-a-n. The address is 3743 Northville, Chicago, Illinois. I'm not an attorney.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Raise your right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth in the case?

MR. DUGGAN: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. DUGGAN: So I didn't bring prints, but I have this on my iPad. I'm not sure if it will show up on this.

But overall ...
Does that work?

So the property in question is sort of a long rectangular shape. So we've got about 400 feet in front of Twelve Mile and a thousand feet deep. So the building itself is sort of a rectangular shape. Really our front is the side, on this side. So the rear of the building -- and this is a senior living building so all the functions of the building, the loading, the electrical, the main kitchen, the back of the house, service entries are all centrally located so we can properly serve both sides of the building.

So the request was to put those services in the middle of the building and based upon the shape of the site and the function of the building -- and as it is mentioned in the agenda, from Twelve Mile is screened both by the building itself and screen walls that surround those items that we're requesting.

So the loading zone has, I believe, a screened wall around it there and the generator and the transformers also have a screen wall around them.

Additionally, to our last plan, south is a cemetery. So between that property and our property we have landscape screening in addition. So to the point
of not to adversely effect the neighboring property
that those elements are screened in with that.

So I think that really covers the request and
the reasons for the request. I'm here to answer any
questions regarding that.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: He's done?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All done?

MR. DUGGAN: Yes. I'm done.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I don't see
anybody in the audience, except this lady. Do you have
anything to say about this case?

MS. DUCHESNEAU: No. But other than is it
Twelve Mile or Thirteen Mile?

MR. DUGGAN: It's Twelve.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: It is Twelve Mile.
That is what I was going to point out in a minute.
That was an error on the thing. It is Twelve Mile.

MS. DUCHESNEAU: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right.

Mr. Secretary?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr Chair. There was
11 letters mailed, One letter returned. Zero approvals
and zero objections.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Just a quick review. Looking at the orientation of the property, it is long in length. There is very limited areas for him to put it in the rear yard. So it is a reasonable request.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Well, I went and looked at your place like I do all the cases. You have a narrow street there. I like the way you have pointed out where you would like to put your dumpster and generator and everything. So I have no problem with it. Thank you.

I'll open it up to the board.

Anybody?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Except that it's listed as Thirteen Mile, is that a problem?

MS. SAARELA: Where is that listed?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: On the agenda. Is that part of the --

MS. SAARELA: What did the notice say?

MS. OPPERMANN: Well, it didn't have an address. It had a parcel number. So regarding the location, it's north of ...
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Twelve Mile.

MS. OPPERMANN: Just north of Twelve. So that was an error on my part.

MS. SAARELA: So if the notice is accurately described when it went out, it's fine.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: If the notice went out, that's what I'm asking. How did the notice get out? Because I couldn't figure where this was when I was out driving around. Because I was going north of Thirteen Mile and that didn't make sense.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I know. I looked at the map here and the local map and it was showing on here as Twelve Mile.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. Your eyesight is better than mine.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: That's why I knew where it was. But I didn't want to make too much deal about it. Anyway, thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: It's a kind of a typo, I think.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: As long as we're good with it, then.
MR. BUTLER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: If there's no legal problem, we'll go ahead and vote.

All right. Yes, Mr. Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: No. I was just going to make a comment. I think there is a very unique neighbor, the cemetery.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I know.

MEMBER BYRWA: And it's not like you're going to get any complaints about the generator or the dumpster.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No. I don't think they're going to complain about those. You never know.

MS. SAARELA: You never know.

MR. BUTLER: You never know.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You never know.

MEMBER KRIEGER: The visitors might.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Anybody else?

MEMBER PEDDIROYINA: No. I don't have any objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Comments?

Yes, Ms. Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I think you did a good job
outside of the Twelve and Thirteen Mile. So I'm going blind, but that's all right.

But I thought your request meets the spirit of the ordinance, quite frankly. I think your presentation represents why it needs to go where it is. The lot is unique and you're doing a great service to Novi with the type of business that you're bringing in and building because we certainly need that as our population gets -- is aging.

MR. DUGGAN: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I will be in support of this.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. All right. Any further comments by the board?

Seeing none, I will entertain a motion.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Oh, come on. Just for old time's sake.

MEMBER FERRELL: She's pushy tonight; isn't she?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Who is doing it?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I think, Linda -- Member Krieger's got it.
MEMBER KRIEGER: In case number PZ18-0005 for CA Senior Living Holdings, east of Novi Road and north of Twelve Mile, grant the request in this case. That the petitioner has shown practical difficulty -- Isn't this the same as that?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Practical difficulty in their location, the topography, the narrowness of the lot, that without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented from using the lot. It is unique because of its location and narrowness.

The petitioner did not create the condition because of its location. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. Putting the side yard will have ... There will be landscaping on the westm side?

MR. DUGGAN: Yes. Between us and the cemetery there, yes, there is landscaping.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So there will be buffering between adjacent and surrounding properties. The relief is consistent and within the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of the location.
MEMBER FERRELL: Second.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Any further discussion?

Seeing none. Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Nafso?

MEMBER NAFSO: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPEMAN: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MR. DUGGAN: Thank you.
MEMBER OLSEN: Congratulations.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. And that finishes the number of cases we have today.

The next item on the agenda is other matters and number one item of that is election of the officers.

MEMBER FERRELL: Wait a second. Do we need to call that case again and table it?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Well, I don't see anybody here.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So we have to table it.

MS. SAARELA: Table it until the next meeting. A motion to table it until the next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Table it until the next meeting. Motion to table it until the next meeting. Okay.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So moved.

MS. SAARELA: What case number is that?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made and seconded to table the case --

MEMBER FERRELL: PZ18-0002.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: -- all those in
favor --


    MS. SAARELA: Somebody make a motion to move that case number to the next.

    MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to table case number PZ18-0002 ID Enterprises for 48 -- 41875 Carousel Drive to move it to the April meeting. What's that?

    MS. SAARELA: April 10th.

    MEMBER KRIEGER: April 10th zoning meeting.

    MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

    CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. The motion has been made and seconded. If there is no further discussion, I will ask for a -- well, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye."

    MEMBER BYRWA: Aye.

    MEMBER FERRELL: Aye.

    MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye.

    MEMBER KRIEGER: Aye.

    MEMBER NAFSO: Aye.

    MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.

    CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All opposed, same sign.
Okay. Thank you. Moving on the next item on the agenda: Other Matters. That is election of the officers for this board for the coming up year. And I suggest that I will invite nominations for the position of the chairperson for the next year from the floor.

Yes?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I would like to make a nomination.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I would like to nominate Brent Ferrell for vice chair. Linda Krieger for --

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: We're only talking about the Chair.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Oh, sorry. Can I just get them all out now?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No. We'll do one at a time.


Now you give my whole secret away.

I would want to nominate Linda Krieger for Chair.
MEMBER FERRELL: Second.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made. Is there any other nomination from the floor? Seeing none. You're duly elected. Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Done.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The next one is for the vice chair.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Wait. I would like to nominate Brent Ferrell for vice chair.

MEMBER NAFSO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Any further nominations? Seeing none. And you are the only candidate. Congratulations. You're elected vice chair.

MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Now the secretaries.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I nominate David Byrwa for secretary.
MEMBER NAFSO:  Second.

MEMBER BYRWA:  I respectfully decline.

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  It's just to swear people in.

MEMBER BYRWA:  No, that's all right. I still decline.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  He is declining.

Anybody else?

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  I nominate Tom Nafso for secretary.

MEMBER FERRELL:  Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  Okay. Do you have any problem with that?

MEMBER NAFSO:  I'll accept.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN:  It could have been worse. I could've nominated you for chair.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  All right. Somebody seconded it, right?

MEMBER FERRELL:  Seconded.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI:  Congratulations, Mr. Nafso.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA:  Congratulations.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I don't expect any other nominations.

So congratulations, Mr. Nafso.

And so you have your officers for next year. Congratulations all around.

MEMBER FERRELL: Is this our next meeting?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Starting with the next meeting, yes.

The next item on the agenda is the dates for the ZBA training.

Mr. Butler, you are going to get some information from the different members. And what day would be the best?

MS. SAARELA: The 27th would be the best.

MR. BUTLER: The 27th would be the best date right now because Tom's not going to be available.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay.

MS. SAARELA: Of this month.

MR. BUTLER: Of this month, the 27th. Lunch will be provided.

MEMBER KRIEGER: when?

MR. BUTLER: The 27th.

MS. SAARELA: At what time?
MEMBER GRONACHAN: What time?

MR. BUTLER: I think it said 6:00 in the E-mail. 6:00 p.m.

MEMBER BYRWA: That's a Tuesday?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. That would be Tuesday.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: How long it takes?

MR. BUTLER: It depends on how fast you eat.

MS. SAARELA: I mean, in the past it's been between an hour and two hours. We're going to focus it narrowly on a topic and then I'll go through my little talk on the topic and then you can ask questions.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SAARELA: We're going to talk mostly about motion making.

MEMBER FERRELL: More importantly. What food is going to be served?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: It will be gourmet food.

MR. BUTLER: Beans and rice.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: So the date is fixed. The time is fixed. Everybody is in agreement to that that we are going to meet again on the 27th.

MR. BUTLER: Most of the time we get Panera.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. Is there any other business to come before us?

I don't think there is anything else so I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER FERRELL: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

All those in favor signify by saying "Aye."

MEMBER BYRWA: Aye.

MEMBER FERRELL: Aye.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Aye.

MEMBER NAFSO: Aye.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All those opposed, same sign.

The meeting is adjourned.

(At 8:40 p.m., matter concluded.)
CERTIFICATE

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
      ) ss
COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

I, Darlene K. May, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of ninety-three (93) typewritten pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes.

/s/ Darlene K. May
Darlene K. May, RPR/CSR-6479

March 31, 2018
(Date)