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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good evening.
Today is March 14th, 7:00 p.m., City of Novi Zoning Ordinance. I would like to welcome all of you. And please stand up for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please
be seated and put your cell phones on mute. You can see overhead on the TVs. And if you have any questions or anything, you can raise things. And I'll please call for the roll call.

MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?

MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. We have
a full quorum, Anita?
MS. WAGNER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Public
hearing and format, and we have all the forms on the back side. Please go through it and when you have the time, public hearing, is the time where you can talk. You have a limit of time is three minutes only. Please make a note, three minutes time. Not more than that. And April agenda for the last month, somebody can make a motion.

Approval of agenda.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Motion for the agenda?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I move that we approve the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Somebody make a second, please.

MS. WAGNER: Excuse me. There is an amendment on the agenda. We have moved the appointment and election of chair and supporting officers to the end of the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Anybody have any questions on the agenda before I move to this?

Okay. Looks like none. Thank you.
Okay. Public remarks, as I said, and public hearing. And let's move on. Today we have five cases --

MS. SAARELA: Excuse me. Did you actually do a motion where everybody approved the agenda or did we just sort of --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I --
MS. SAARELA: Did we do like everybody in favor, that part of it?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Anybody have any questions on the approval of agenda?

MS. SAARELA: All in favor?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All in favor say,
"Aye."
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays?

Thank you. Okay. Let's move on. We have today's five cases. And first case PZ23-0001, Catholic Central High School, 27225 Wixom Road, south of Twelve Mile Road, west of Wixom Road, Parcel 50-22-18-200-026 and 50-22-18-200-027. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance from Section 3.1.1.E to allow the maximum height of the parking deck to be 42 feet, 35 feet permitted, variance of 7 feet, at the stairwells and for the light poles; Section 5.3.12 to eliminate painted end islands within the parking structure; and Section 5.7.3.A to allow the height of the field light poles of 80 feet, 25 feet permitted, variance of 55 feet. This property is zoned Residential Acreage, RA, and One-Family Residential R-4.

Is the applicant present, please?
Yeah. Please come to the podium and present your case where we can help you tonight. Anybody along with you presenting? Only the one person or anybody is joining you?

MR. TUREK: My name is Ed Turek, president of Catholic Central. Our whole team is here to answer any questions. We're thankful to be here and we are asking
the variance as we improve our --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Excuse me. Excuse me a second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Can you spell your name for our court reporter, please?

MR. TUREK: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. Ed Turek.
Last name T-u-r-e-k. President of Catholic -- Detroit Catholic Central High School.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. TUREK: No. I'm the president.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. TUREK: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Please proceed where we can help you tonight.

MR. TUREK: We are looking for a variance as we improve our campus for safety and we build a parking structure. We are looking for variances on the parking structure. And our team is here to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other thing you would like to add?

MR. TUREK: I'm sorry?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Would you like to add anything?

MR. TUREK: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No?
MR. TUREK: Andy Wozniak would.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. WOZNIAK: Good evening.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Could you spell your name?
MR. WOZNIAK: My name is Andy Wozniak, W-o-z-n-i-a-k. I'm with Zeimet Wozniak. We're the civil engineers for the project. And I'm not an attorney.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Swear to tell the truth?
MR. WOZNIAK: I swear to tell the truth.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. WOZNIAK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and proceed.

MR. WOZNIAK: So we are looking for three variances, as you're aware. One is for the height of
the parking structure itself. The entire structure, the maximum height we can allow is 35 feet and the structure height we're looking for is 42 feet and that's just at the stairwells and for the light fixtures. Our hardship is we need to provide enough parking on the campus and we're limited with the amount of land that's available.

The -- you know, it's a big piece of property, but much of the property is wetlands. So for us to get enough playing fields and all the amenities we need, we thought it was a good option to build a parking structure. And three floors provide 702 parking spaces which helps us get to the goal of having enough parking.

So the 42 foot variance, again, is only at the stairwells and it's for the light fixtures. What else are you looking for? You're looking for hardship?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please. MR. WOZNIAK: And -- let me just grab my notes here. Sorry.

So the -- the standard -- or it's not a self-created issue. Again, there's limited space on
the campus. So a parking structure is required to meet the parking needs of the campus.

The architectural features proposed for the parking structure are consistent with the development goals of the campus and the recent STEM addition which is on the campus being built right now.

Standard number three strict compliance. Again, a three level structure is an efficient use of land and reduces the area of the hard surface by 75 percent by -- obviously, by going up three stories. The required stairwells and light poles are not possible below the 35 foot height limit.

And is the minimum variance necessary? The height of the variance, again, is just for the stairwells. The entire building will -- the bulk of the structure will remain below 35 feet.

And then, as far as adverse impact on the surrounding area, we have a front yard setback of over 150 feet from Wixom Road. The rear is well over 600 feet. And then to the east, which is our nearest neighbor, we're 500 feet away from them. So the parking structure also is -- if you see the drawings of the structure, it's designed to look like a building.

And as a matter of fact, the Planning Commission treated it as a building for landscape purposes and they also for architectural review and they commented on how much they liked this. They liked the architecture.

So the neighbors to the east are going to see a building that's in keeping with the STEM addition which is going on, which is Gothic architecture versus looking at a parking structure.

And I'd just like to add and I don't know -think this has any bearing, but we did get unanimous support from the Planning Commission for this project, including the parking deck.

And are you going to consider each of these separately or should I keep going?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You can continue.

MR. WOZNIAK: Okay. So the second variance we're looking for is the painted islands, to eliminate the painted islands within the parking structure. And, again, due to the limited space -- so not self-created. Due to the limited space, the parking structure is required to meet the parking needs of the campus.

Strict compliance. Eliminating the painting islands within the parking structure maximizes the number of spaces within the structure's footprint. And then I would like to note that two parking structures that we were able to find in the city of Novi, the ITC headquarters and also at Fox Run, neither of those have painted end islands.

And I've included photos of those in the packet.

And then is this the minimum variance necessary? We enclosed in our packet a letter from Rich and Associations. They've been doing parking structures forever and they're one of the experts in the area. And they say that end islands are really not an effective use. What happens is people end up parking in those striped islands. A better solution is to have a cross access aisle of 26 foot eight inches and that's what they're proposing.

Adverse impact on the surrounding area. Obviously, there will be no adverse impact on the surrounding area because you can't see it from off campus.

And then the final variance we're looking for
is the height of the poles for the field.
Let me just find my notes for that. You know what, $I$ don't have the written standard stuff for that. I think I'm going to have Nick Furgason from IDS get up here and talk about that because, obviously, he's a lot more knowledgeable than $I$ am on that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Yeah. Please go ahead and tell your first and last name.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Spell your name for the record.

MR. FURGASON: Nick Furgason, F-u-r-g-a-s-o-n. Design engineer for Integrated Design Solutions, the architect and engineer for Catholic Central for this project. I am not a lawyer.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. FURGASON: I do.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. FURGASON: The height of the athletic poles is necessary to facilitate the programming and athletics programs for the fields. It's not self-created simply for the fact that it's standard to run track meets and lacrosse meets into the evenings
and into the evening hours. The athletic poles will be very similar to the ones here on this campus adjacent property to you guys.

In fact, they would be better controlled from a lighting standpoint than the technologies that are currently installed on your adjacent property.

As far as adverse effects go to adjacent properties, the design is implemented with the adjacent properties in mind. The lighting design with this particular technology is very well controlled with optics, as well as the height of the pole which allows the fixtures to be aimed more directly downward and inward to the field away from adjacent properties.

So the Illuminating Engineering Society, IES, who we -- is the standard organization which dictates to us the best standards, dictates a certain amount of glare at adjacent properties to be acceptable or not acceptable. The variance documents as well as the site plan approval documents indicate those values being far below what the IES recommends for adjacent properties.

Are there any questions in regards to that?
A lower pole, say 35 feet, which is the maximum height, would require the fixtures to be aimed
more horizontally and would actually cause more glare and more damage to adjacent properties. Whereas allowing the variance would mitigate a lot of the issues that would typically arise out of that type of design.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you have any pictures that you can show tonight?

MR. FURGASON: Mr. Wozniak has them.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Where we can see, the audience and board members also. Of course we have the pictures, but everybody can see them too. Thank you.

MR. WOZNIAK: So the renderings in this packet show perspective views from different areas of the property based on computer simulations of approval documents and physical surveys and brush and trees and such. You can physically see the poles and you may even be able to see the light source on the pole, but the values of their brightness are below what the IES recommends.

MR. FURGASON: Do you guys have a copy of this in front of you?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, we do have,
but you can present to the audience where other people can see that.

Yeah. You can put it on the projector underneath.

MR. FURGASON: So this is the view towards the fields from the east property line which would be the nearest residence, right?

MR. WOZNIAK: No. That's -- from the east property -- oh, you're right. That's Berkshire.

MR. FURGASON: So Berkshire. This would be the view from Twelve Mile Road as you're approaching from the east it appears.

So you can physically see the pole, but you can still see it's a significant distance from the roadway in this particular rendering.

This is directly across the street at -what's the name of the subdivision?

MR. WOZNIAK: Leisure Co-op.
MR. FURGASON: Leisure Co-op. It would be a very similar relationship to the fixtures here on this campus to Ten Mile.

And, again, another view on Twelve Mile as we get closer to the fixture.
(Documents being displayed.)
MR. FURGASON: The pole closest -- I think it's hard to see in the rendering, but the poles closest to the road are actually aimed away from the road downward at the field and inward towards the property. Whereas the poles farthest from the road are aimed more downward and inward towards the field.

So really the poles that -- they're 100 plus yards away from the road.

MR. WOZNIAK: That's another one from Twelve Mile.

MR. FURGASON: Another one from Twelve Mile.

And then as we get to the west property line, brushes and trees.

Can I answer any questions?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anything you would like to add anybody?

MR. WOZNIAK: Hey, Rich. Why don't you come over and just talk a little bit more.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and spell your first and last name.

MR. KINNELL: Richard Kinnell, K-i-n-n-e-l-l.

I'm with Rich and Associates. We're the parking consultants for the design team.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you a lawyer?
MR. KINNELL: I am not a lawyer. MEMBER MONTAGUE: And do you swear to -MR. KINNELL: I swear to tell the truth. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MR. KINNELL: So as Andy pointed out, one of the keys here is for this parking project was to increase the capacity of the -- and provide the required number of parking spaces for the campus. And the end island conditions, the painted end island conditions would detract or reduce our capacity by anywhere from 20 to 24 spaces I think was the count we last anticipated.

In our experience, and as Andy pointed out, we've been doing this a very long time. I've been designing parking structures for 42 years. In the last 30 I can't remember one that we've ended up with painted islands within the footprint of the garage. The two organizations, the National Parking Association and the Institute -- International Parking and Mobility Institute that kind of govern our industry don't --
they're silent on the idea of parking the striped islands within a parking structure. Our belief is that it's a safer condition to provide a wider end aisle, end cross aisle, as Andy pointed out, than it is to provide that end island.

Because typically within a parking structure, there's going to be a column there anyway. So we would rather increase the dimension of that cross aisle. We're only required by code, your code to provide a 24 foot wide cross aisle. We've provided almost a 27. I think it's 26 foot, eight. And with the column at the end and the fact that in cases that we have seen these end parking islands, very often the parkers within a parking structure will just park in those spaces anyways. You can't really put a curb there and the stripe doesn't deter them from parking in the space so they end up parking there anyway.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. KINNELL: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
And --
MR. WOZNIAK: We have one more. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. Please go
ahead. Yeah. Go ahead and --
MR. LA TONA: Adrian La Tona.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Could you spell it, please?
MR. LA TONA: A-d-r-i-a-n. Last name L-a, space, $\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{a}$.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you come closer to the mic, please so that everybody can hear? Thank you.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney? MR. LA TONA: I am not an attorney.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Not that many in the room
tonight I guess. Do you swear to tell the truth?
MR. LA TONA: I swear to tell the truth.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. LA TONA: Just expounding a bit on what Andy had mentioned regarding the design of the parking deck. The intent is it preserve as much of the natural beauty on the site as possible. And the parking deck allows us to do that by fitting more student spaces in a compact zone.

Now, with that parking deck and with
everything that Catholic Central does, it has to meet a certain level of quality. And it's really designed to
fit in with the rest of the campus. The vast majority of the parking deck is under that 35 foot zoning ordinance. But as you can see in these renderings here, there are some areas that pop up that enliven the facade, give it a bit of variability, but also create our code required egress stairwells and elevators coming out of the parking deck there. So it's not only an opportunity to give a bit of variety to the space, but it also allows for safer use of a parking deck from an egress standpoint as well as a security standpoint.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody, final call from your team?
Looks like none.
Okay. Audience, anybody who would like to comment on this in the audience?

Okay. From the city, Charles?
MR. BOULARD: Mr. Chairman, just one question. Just want to get clarification, which of the fields would -- does the lighting variance apply to? Is it both the new stadium and the practice field?

MR. WOZNIAK: Yes.
MR. BOULARD: So both of the fields, but at the far west of the site be, basically, behind the
parking structure?
MR. TUREK: Right.
MR. BOULARD: If you're -- in terms of the
homes to the east --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Can you be on the podium while presenting the case.

MR. BOULARD: In terms of the homes to the east, both of the fields with the lighting are at the far west against the --

MR. TUREK: There's actually --
MR. WOZNIAK: Six poles.
MR. TUREK: -- six poles. Six total poles.
(Court Reporter requests clarification.)
MR. TUREK: I did. There's six total
poles --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no.
(Court Reporter asked for clarification.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please one person can talk at the podium, not in the seating --

MR. TUREK: There's six total poles --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. TUREK: There's six total poles and two of them are located just to the west of the parking
deck. And then two of them are located between the two fields. And then the last two are on the west side of the track, which is the westerly field adjacent to the new city bark.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. BOULARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
Okay. Correspondence, secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: There were 46 letters
mailed. Five returned and two objections.
Objection number one, lack of clarity on timing of use of lights will -- use lights will be on. Late night lights cause privacy issues and put lights on our bedrooms. And that was from $A-s-u-h-a-s-h-u$-I can't read the letter, maybe $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{s}-\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{u}$, I believe.

The handwriting is sometimes a challenge.
The second objection, the light poles are much higher than the permitted height. The light from these poles will come -- will cause light pollution and disturbance to the houses in the neighborhood. And this is Arun, A-r-u-n, Chandrasendarin, C-h-a-n-d-r-a-s-e-n-d-a-r-i-n, I believe. Sorry.

THE COURT: Any other things?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: That's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, secretary.

Okay. Good presentation. And it's open to the board. Anybody would like to speak and comment on this case, please.

Okay. Member Linda.
MEMBER KRIEGER: If one of you could explain about the lighting, the timing. Is it going to be during games just like at the high school here? And then for the parking structure, I'm sure you'd want to have lighting at $24 / 7$ anyway from school years and then the changing of the time, like when it gets dark.

MR. FURGASON: Nick Furgason with IDS. As far as the field lighting goes, it would be very similar to the football field and its current use on the property.

The school does not anticipate games going or events going past 10 p.m. in the evening. So during the summertime, spring or fall games it gets dark seven o'clock. So that would be the point there. They would only be utilized during events which is a handful of
times in the year.
As far as the parking lot lighting goes, the parking lot lighting, the national energy code requires that during the hours of 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. the lighting dims at least 30 percent beyond its full brightness. That is the minimum requirement set forth by the state. The controllability of the light fixtures within the parking deck allows us to turn those lights on and off based on predicated usage of the parking deck. We wouldn't want to turn the lights off purely for safety and security. It creates a security hazard.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right.
MR. FURGASON: But we have the capability to dim the lights almost to 10 percent of their output to keep some level of light on the parking deck.

Additionally, the fixtures around the perimeter of the parking deck will be provided with what we call outside (phonetic) shield which cuts off physically with a physical barrier on the optics, just like the site lighting around the perimeter of the lighting. And on the roadway itself, they're pointed inward from the property with outside shield that cuts off the visible
light of the fixture, but also the light trespass leaving the parking deck. All of the lighting calculations that we have performed result in a zero light trespass of zero foot candles at the property line. Now, you can still -- if you look hard enough, if you look up at a light, you can still possibly see the point source, but you're at such a great distance, you're well outside the recommendation -- or well within the recommended glare value set forth by the IES.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you. MR. FURGASON: Yeah. No problem. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other board member who would like -- Member Sanghvi. MEMBER SANGHVI: I came and visited the site yesterday. Drove around. As far as I'm concerned, it's a good idea to go higher than cover of the ground. So I'm all in favor of that. And for the safety sake you need light and you need -- you are going higher so you are going to need a higher pole. So this is all common sense things actually in my opinion. And you answered my question, which I had about the lights and that it's going to go down. It's not going to spread
out to the neighborhood or anything. So there is no problem in supporting that.

My only question is, where is going to be the egress on the Twelve Mile Road that you are going to talk about later on because I didn't see anywhere when I drove around, any sign saying toward -- going towards Twelve Mile Road?

MR. WOZNIAK: So the -- Andy Wozniak again. So the connector road is a separate project that was approved by the Planning Commission and is currently under construction. You can see when you're traveling on Twelve Mile Road now that it's paved, there's an apron that they put -- the city installed on the south side and that is the new entrance for the connector road at Twelve Mile Road. So everything this project is doing is located west of that apron.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Good. Thank you. I'm very glad that you are going to have more egress to get out of there in case of an emergency. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi.

Any other board member who would like to speak? Yeah. Go ahead, please.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I guess I'm asking the City. The variance for the lighting, is that also for the lighting on the parking deck or is that just the poles around the fields?

MR. BOULARD: So there's -- there's three -there's basically three variances. One is for the height of the stairwells and the lighting poles on the parking deck. And I believe the parking -- the roof is a plus or minus 35 feet for the stairwells for the parking deck and the top of the light poles is about 42 feet. Those are for the parking deck. That's the first variance. The second is for the -- leaving out the end islands, the painted end islands within the deck. And then third variance is for the field light poles.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Yeah. That was going to be my second question. How high was the -for the lights on the parking deck, so. You say they're 42 feet, the lights on the parking deck?

MR. WOZNIAK: Yeah, 42 feet. I think we have a little bit of slush in there just to make sure. But give or -- 42 foot or less.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. How tall are the
current light poles on the football field?
MR. FURGASON: The current field -- the current stadium lights are 80 foot poles. I believe what is in this design is two -- the poles farthest to the west, two feet are 90 foot poles because of the bleacher structure in front of them to get the downward angle that's necessary. And then the rest of them, the other two are 80 feet.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: On the stadium or on this one?

MR. FURGASON: The existing -- let's put it this way, the existing football stadium are 80 foot poles. That's what they have on the site now. The six poles that are proposed, the two farthest to the west adjacent to the park are 90 foot poles, so 10 more feet. And then the other four poles are 80 feet. And it has to do with the contours of the site and the feature structure on that side of the site to get the downward angle.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other thing you would like to?

City, Charles, go ahead.
MR. BOULARD: Just a point of clarification,

I believe the application had the field poles at 80 feet.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, 80.
MR. BOULARD: Which is I believe what was noticed.

MR. FURGASON: I do apologize. I misspoke. They are all 80 feet. I was looking at the wrong project on my template, so I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: If you don't mind, can it be on the -- excuse me. Nick, can you be on the podium, please or somebody can present until the case is done.

MR. FURGASON: I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you be on the podium for a few minutes?

MR. FURGASON: Yep.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

Okay. Any other board member who would like to speak on this case tonight?

Okay. Looks like none.
Yeah. I agree and the timing. And also, you mentioned that, you know, midnight, 12 noon, am I right?

MR. FURGASON: Those are the minimum requirements set forth by the state. The current lighting poles on that property are being programed to dim $I$ believe at 10 ''clock down to a lower light level and then they can come back up at like 6:00 a.m. when people start arriving back on the property.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. I have no objection on this case and it's open to the board finally and somebody can make a motion.

MEMBER LONGO: Yes. I'd like to make a motion. I move that we grant all three variances in the case PZ23-001, sought by Catholic Central High School for parking deck and lighting standards, a variance in height. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty of space utilization of the property.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because they really need a lot of parking, additional parking, and it needs to be properly lit, as well as sports fields need to be properly lit.

The property is unique because it is a large
high school and continues to grow. Petitioner did not create the condition. The school continues to grow. The relief granted will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of the setback from the streets. The additional landscape and the proper use of the lighting to be not shining on civilian property.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because this structure and lighting offer a lot of usefulness to the high school and to those people that go there.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Support. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Roll call, please.

MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
MEMBER LONGO: Good luck.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Good luck, guys. Good job. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Going on to the seconds, PZ23-002, Burlington - Allied Signs, on 43480 West Oaks Drive, south of Twelve Mile, west of Novi Road, Parcel 50-22-15-200-105. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Sign Ordinance Section 28-5(b) (1) a to be allowed a 250.027 square feet illuminated wall sign (65 square feet maximum allowed, variance of 185.027 square feet). This property is zoned Regional Center (R-C).

Okay. Please go ahead and present your case.
Tell your first and last name clearly for our court record and the secretary will take the oath. Thank you.

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, F-i-e-l-d-s. Allied
Signs, Clinton Township, Michigan.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney? MR. FIELDS: No, sir. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Swear to tell the truth? MR. FIELDS: I do. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MR. FIELDS: We're here seeking a square footage variance for the Burlington being constructed out at the mall. This site has brought many challenges due to the depth of the property itself, the large scale of the parking, the access along Twelve Mile and visibility. We've been here for multiple locations. There is a deviation in that the variance being asked for, there's already 150 square foot variance applied back in '86 for this. So they're asking for a variance above and beyond the 150 square foot to go to the 250 as proposed.

To be able to see, the line of sights are a challenge as you come into the property. The text, the way Burlington presents their text is much similar to
the way the Bob's Discount layout is where you have a large body of text and then you have a small body of text. So as you past the property, it will turn into kind of a blur.

So with the setbacks, the size of the lot, the visibility, everything comes into play in trying to get more attention and identify the frontage.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Anything you would like to add?

Anybody?
Okay. Looks good. Thank you.
Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case?

Looks like none.
From the city, Charles, any comments?
MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Correspondence from the secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: There were 13 letters
mailed and four returned. No approvals and no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. It's open to the board.

Dr. Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your place yesterday. I wasn't sure how long that sign is going to look like without a mockup. But the question is, how many of those are there pertaining to the Burlington store?

MR. FIELDS: How many what?
MEMBER SANGHVI: How many those entrances?
MR. FIELDS: There's just the main double entrance at the front of the building which compromises I believe four pillars. That was the old -- I think that was the Kids $R$ Us building was that one. The one next door was the Toys $R$ Us.

See if I've got an actual rendering of the front of the building here. I should.

It should just be one set of double doors.
Bear with me. So much paperwork here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. About to ask that question.

MR. FIELDS: What's that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: About the presentation.

MEMBER SANGHVI: You're asking for such a
large variance, that's why I was asking that question.

MR. FIELDS: Sure. Yeah. The one entry door through the front panes here. Then you have your basic frontage.
(Court Reporter asked for clarification.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you talk
louder, please.
MR. FIELDS: So you have 103 linear feet of frontage. You have the one main entry with the glass. You're spanning over four columns of which the sign carries over two, as proposed at 250 square feet.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. That's fine. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi.

Any other board member, please? Member Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I notice it was boarded up so they're remodeling it to have --

MR. FIELDS: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: -- the one glass pane with the main entry and then have design over that?

MR. FIELDS: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And then it was difficult to tell from -- without a mockup. So to compare like with the other ones. So it will be proportional with the other businesses?

MR. FIELDS: So Bob's Discount Furniture next door is 224.93 square feet. The proposed at Burlington is 250 square feet.

Where so if you go right next door to Bob's, you're at 250. The old locations where this was was 150 square feet was Kids $R$ Us and 150 square foot was Toys R Us, which is now what Bob's is.

The Marshalls down the way comes in at about 150. I believe the Value City on the other side of the lot is about 272 square feet.

So when you look at the entire lot, again, with -- see what I got here. So when you look at the full footprint, you can see where Burlington is here. Again, that's the old Kids R Us. Bob's next door is 227 square foot. Marshalls next door to it is coming in at about 165 square foot. Five Below is another 150 square foot. Kohl's is relatively larger in their footprint because the letter height is in the seven
foot range so they're probably 180 square foot. Back there like I said on the Value City Furniture side it's 222 square feet of signage.

So, again, here's the challenge. When you're on Novi, you have no visibility coming off Twelve Mile so your main egress is coming in off Novi Road so you're really focusing and catching on the high angles coming back through here and then back through here on the other entry.

MEMBER KRIEGER: There was a second --
there's a second entrance area so that you can see it more easier than the 1,127 feet from the West Oaks Drive. And then this picture doesn't really do you justice for the -- in the front, the proportion of -you know, if you have Burlington it looks so small, but if you're there it's a very long building. So I'm just trying to match up the Burlington sign with the area you have plus that arch. So I'm having difficulty seeing if it -- how it would fit.

I guess I'll just leave it for other board members.

MR. FIELDS: Plus the arch meaning? You talking --

MEMBER KRIEGER: There's the -- the previous picture. It seemed like it was to the side. So it will be centered?

MR. FIELDS: It's centered in their lease space.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right.
MR. FIELDS: So what you're seeing there is the outer spots of their lease space. The sign is centered where the entryway is. So the entryway is here. That is their lease space. This is Bob's from here on over. Here on over the wall juts back and then it's Marshalls coming this way. Actually, I think it's Kirkland's and then Marshalls.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other board member, please?

Okay. Looks like none. It's motion time.
MEMBER THOMPSON: I move that we grant the variance in case PZ23-0002 sought by Burlington Allied Sign for the sign variance because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty, including approval requiring a larger sign on the basis of any of the following: That the request is based upon
circumstances or features that are exceptional and unique to this property and do not result from conditions that exist generally in the city or that are self-created. And that's just to match the other stores in the plaza.

That the failures to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of property and will result in substantially more or a mere inconvenience or inability to obtain a higher economic or financial return because it is off of Twelve Mile and har to find if you're not in the plaza.

The grant of relief would be offset by other improvements or actions such as increased setbacks or increased landscaping such that the net effect will result in an improvement of the property or the project ...

It's just fitting in with the neighbors.
The construction of the conforming sign would require the removal or significant alteration of natural features on the property, again, to match the construction and the look of everything else in the plaza.

The grant and the relief would not result in
the use or structure that is incompatible with or reasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties and will result in substantial justice being done to both the applicant and adjacent or surrounding properties and is not inconsistent with the spirit or the intent of the chapter.

Not to keep going back to it, but this is just going to make the plaza look uniform as other businesses in there have the same size signage.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER LONGO: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
MR. FIELDS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Congratulations.
Okay. Case number three today. PZ23-003,
Tim and Jennifer Kirk, 23070 Ennishore Drive, west of Meadowbrook, north of Nine Mile, Parcel

50-22-26-429-008. The applicant is requesting a
variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section
3.1.4 for a front yard setback of 24 feet (30 feet required, variance of six feet); for a proposed front garage addition. This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-3).

Okay. Please tell your first and last name clearly for our secretary -- sorry, for the court record and the secretary with take the oath.

MR. KIRK: Okay. Tim Kirk, K-i-r-k.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. KIRK: I'm not.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. KIRK: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead where we can help you tonight.

MR. KIRK: We're asking for a third car garage addition. The shape of our lot is pie shaped. We can't go out to the sides. We can only go towards the front of the lot or the street. If we went back the opposite way, it would be in our home. So we are restricted in our lot shape where to put a third car garage. I worked with the city building department just for counseling to make sure that we're doing things properly. And they agreed with that restriction and also the size and scope of it they thought was reasonable. So for what that's worth.

A garage is usually 12 to 16 feet wide. We indeed are only asking for the minimum 12 foot wide. It will be the same length as the existing garage. One neighbor was opposed to our original plan which would have followed the same parallel wall lines and so we shifted the garage to the south two feet which adds
some architectural detail but also keeps us the addition even further away from the side lot line.

And as far as affecting the surrounding area. Our neighbors and HOA have all approved it. I don't think it's going to have much of a visual affect. Our house happens to be -- averages about 85 feet off of the street, a setback, because the plot of our subdivision originally was to have a boulevard running through our front yard and they never followed through with that plan so we have a very deep front yard and we're on the outside of a curve so the garage really isn't going to impede view of neighbor's houses.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Can you show a picture -- do you have a diagram of the garage?

MR. KIRK: Yep. Do you want what was in the packet or I've got other pictures?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Just a picture.
MR. KIRK: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Would like to see, is it a separate garage or is it a stacked garage. We would like to see the audience.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. KIRK: This would be -- I just

Photoshopped a third door onto the garage from our driveway side and then from the backside I believe I've got --
(Photo displayed.)
MR. KIRK: That would be the view from the backside with basically the garage just -- wall pulled out another 12 feet and offset.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. KIRK: And as far as the neighborhood, the majority of our subdivision, I have multiple views for you, but the 30 foot front lot setback is the standard. And since our house is twisted and also this line is a curve, if you take the average or about 85 feet off of the street, we're asking -- we have four -excuse me, six feet we can still go. Our existing garage is 36 foot setback. If we wanted to add on 12 feet, we'd need another six foot so that's the variance we're asking for. And the variance at one end is six feet, about 70 inches at the other end because of the angles is about 40 inches. So it's what I would think a fairly modest request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anything you would like to add?

MR. KIRK: No. Other than if you need more diagrams or pictures, but out of respecting your time, I will use those as requested.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case? This is the time to speak.

Looks like none.
From the city, Charles?
MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. From the correspondence, secretary?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: 27 letters were mailed. Two returned. One objection. One approval.

The approval. They are great neighbors and always willing to help others. I wholeheartedly support and approve their desire to improve their house. That's from Yousif Jiddon, J-i-d-d-o-n.

Objection. Rule number one says must be 30 feet. They want 24. Rule number two says must get immediate neighbor's approval. And approved and denied. Rule number three says must get board of directors' approval, not given. Rule number four says city approval requires approval of rules, not done. I
don't know what rules. Number two and number three. The ones we read I suppose. Should be denied. They are trying to do an end run around all rules. All 150 plus or minus homeowners have followed all rules for past 57 years. Newcomers should follow them also. They have only lived here for a few years. And it is Garet, G-a-r-e-t, I believe, Kidd, K-i-d-d. 53-year resident, it says.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Tim, I have no objection on this. It's open to the board and discussion. Anybody would like to speak on this case from the board members?

Okay. Dr. Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and saw your property yesterday.

MR. KIRK: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I have been familiar with that because I have been living in that neighborhood for 45 years. So I used to walk across and come around. Anyway. The main point I want to make and I agree with you, it is a pie shaped lot. Your front of your garage is on the side and not facing the road. And only way you can expand is just requiring the front
yard setback. There's no other way you can make it any bigger. So I understand your problem and I think I have no difficulty in supporting it. Thank you.

MR. KIRK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi.

Any other board member, please.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I'd like to also, you do have a site issue with the wide shape and obviously you're way farther back from the road than would be a normal setback to a property line. So I think it's not obtrusive at all and $I$ would support it as well.

MR. KIRK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other board member? Okay. Member Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. I would be also -- you followed the rules by coming to the city and giving a plot plan. So for that, I say I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ23-003 for the variance of request for a front garage addition sought by the petitioner because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty. Without the variance, petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the
use of the property because of its pie shape.
The property is unique because of the footprint of the house on that site and the shape of the property.

The petitioner did not create the condition because of the lot condition and the curve of the street. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it will enhance the neighborhood with the additional garage, which many people are searching for these days. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a reasonable request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Somebody make a second, please.
MEMBER LONGO: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Roll call, please, Anita.

MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?

MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
MEMBER LONGO: Congratulations, Dr. Kirk.
MR. KIRK: Thank you very much. Appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Today's case number four. PZ23-004, Catholic Central High School, 27225 Wixom Road, south of Twelve Mile, west of Wixom Road, Parcel 50-22-18-200-026 and 50-22-18-200-027. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Sign Ordinance Section 28-5(a) for a sign height of 10 feet (six feet allowed, variance of four feet); Section 28-5(b) (2) a for a total signage of 41.15 feet (32 feet maximum allowed, variance of 9.15 feet). This
property is zoned Residential Acreage (RA) and One-Family Residential (R-4).

Thank you. Please go ahead and tell your first and last name clearly for our court record and secretary will take the oath.

MR. ENDRES: My name is Steve Endres, E-n-d-r-e-s. I am not an attorney. And I will tell the truth.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. ENDRES: Thank you. Yes. We are seeking two variances on the sign that's proposed as part of our connector road project as was mentioned earlier in the meeting. This project creates vehicular connection to Twelve Mile Road. It is the only access point that the school has to Twelve Mile Road. Part of the request for the additional height and square footage of the sign is that the lineal footage of the property along Twelve Mile Road is approximately 1480 lineal feet, heavily vegetated currently. And the existing school sits back from Twelve Mile Road by approximately the same distance, but it's about a quarter mile away.

There are additional projects being proposed, as you saw some of them today. But even those projects
not being built right up to the setback line.
Being that this is -- there's going to be higher traffic volumes now coming out onto Twelve Mile as the volumes are now spread between the two Wixom Road entrances and now the Twelve Mile entrance, it warrants for visibility and way finding that is similar to what is already there on the Wixom Road entrances.

The sign is a natural stack stone walls with a steel beam with pin mounted letters. Again, similar to what is at the Wixom Road entrances, the north and south entrance. The portion of the sign that exceeds the variances are the interlocking CCs which are emblematic of Catholic Central. And the purpose for these obviously in having a consistent branding across the site also gives a visual cue from further away from the sign, identifies the property before you even get there. And with students coming in and out of these entrances, we think that it serves a benefit from a safety standpoint as well, alerting motorists to the presence of this entrance and the increased traffic volumes that are going to be coming at the beginning and end of the school day.

The lighting of the sign is going to be
indirect. Light sources are going to be hidden. It's going to be dark sky compliant. Again, lighting is going to be similar to the Wixom Road entrances where there are $B$ mounted linear LED lights that illuminate the beam and then spotlights that shine at the CC letters.

So, again, the idea is to carry forth the aesthetic that was established at the Wixom Road entrances and applied it similarly here along Twelve Mile.

For reference of scale, the south entrance sign at Wixom Road has a CC that is approximately -the interlocking CCs are approximately three foot by three foot. This sign is slightly larger being four foot by four foot with the interlocking CCs. But, again, being the only vehicular access point off of Twelve Mile, it kind of warrants a little bit more scale and presence along Twelve Mile.

I can show you some renderings.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. ENDRES: A night view of the sign.
Again, the CCs -- and you know what, I think I will put up one of my own here just 'cause it has some different
dimensions showing here.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. ENDRES: This indicating that the portion of the sign that falls within the variance is the stacked stone walls, the beam and the pin mount letters four feet above, which we are requesting the variance for are the interlocking CCs. And the second variance was for the square footage of the sign. 32 square feet are allowed at our current setback, we're requesting 42 square feet. And as you can see, the signage envelope drawn around both the pin mount letters and the interlocking CCs is composed mostly of void space. So the additional square footage is not visually obtrusive in that regard.

I'll turn it over for any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody would like to speak on this case on behalf of you?

Looks like none.
Okay. Audience?
None looks like.
Okay. Charles, from the city?

MR. BOULARD: Nothing to add. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And the correspondence?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: 46 letters were mailed. Three were returned. No objections. No approvals. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. So open to the board. Dr. Sanghvi?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. As I mentioned earlier, I went and drove around. On Twelve Mile Road there is no way of knowing where you are going to put your sign and I didn't see in any of your thing where you are going to site it. Can you have any idea at what location you are going to put this?

MR. ENDRES: Yes. Let's see. I don't know if any of the drawings are going to give much help. It's difficult to see in plan. All right. I can describe it to you from the narrative that was ...

Oh. Thank you. Team member comes to the rescue again.
(Document displayed.)
MR. ENDRES: So the connector road as you can see adjoins Twelve Mile here. We are approximately 433 feet west of the Berkshire development from the
property that abuts to the east. And approximately 700
feet from the drive that's on the north side -- Helfer Boulevard. So Helfer Boulevard being 700 feet, a little over the east. Okay. 700 feet from that entrance and then 400 feet from Berkshire. And currently across, directly across is a woodland.

So, yes, difficult to site because of the dense vegetation all around and no frame of reference while you're out there.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I'll ask you another way. How far are you away from the entrance to the next subdivision?

MR. ENDRES: From the subdivision to -that's on the north side of Twelve Mile we are 700 feet from their vehicular entrance.

MEMBER SANGHVI: 700 feet.
MR. ENDRES: 700 feet from their vehicular entrance, yes.

And then I'm not quite sure. I do not believe Berkshire has an entrance to our east, but -yes.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr.

Sanghvi.
Any other board member, please.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. It's time for the motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: May I have a minute?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Sorry.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. Go ahead, Member Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you have a Google Maps of the site showing Twelve Mile?
(Pause.)
MR. ENDRES: So this again is the 700 feet from the boulevard accessing the development across the street. And again, 433 feet from the property line at Berkshire.
(Court Reporter asked for clarification.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: So the sign is going to be at the entrance, the new entrance that you're creating?

MR. ENDRES: Correct. The new sign is going to be west of this new entrance here.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. So I just wanted to
add that it would be -- the new sign will be consistent with the Catholic Central's Wixom Road entrances that will be aesthetically pleasing as well as you had said and not visually obtrusive as you said. And also, for directional and safety that if someone is on Twelve Mile and they want to know where does this drive go to, they automatically know because it is hard to see the school from the road on Wixom, so I'm sure the same with Twelve Mile. I know probably with the lighting during the games it will be easier to know, just find the road. But $I$ would be in favor of the sign request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Krieger. Good question you ask the Google Map.

And, Dr. Sanghvi, I hope you got the subdivision from the entrance to the property. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. It's time for the motion.
MEMBER MCLEOD: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ23-0004, sought by Catholic Central High School for the sign variance height of four feet and the size variance of 9.15 feet because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty including
the visibility of the sign requiring the additional height. On the basis of that the failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more inconvenience or inability to obtain a higher economic or financial return because it significantly helps the parents and other students find the location of the school as you're driving there, whether it's nighttime or daytime. Similarly, it does match the aesthetic of the sign already provided at Wixom.

And that's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Somebody can make a second.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Krieger.

Okay. So roll call.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
Thank you.
MR. ENDRES: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Today's
final case. PZ23-005, Anne Ball and Mathew Norman, 317
Duana Avenue, west of Old Novi Road, south of South Lake Drive, Parcel 50-22-03-481-007. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1 .5 for a side yard setback of 3.15 feet (10 feet time 10 feet required, variance of 6.85 feet); an aggregate total side yard of 8.23 yard (25 feet required, variance of 16.77 feet); for a proposed second story expansion. This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-4).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And our secretary will take the oath.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. NORMAN: No.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. NORMAN: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MR. NORMAN: Sure. A little history on the house that we recently purchased in November. It was originally built around 1955 as a single story residential home. Continue on up to around 2012, the previous owner put a second addition, completely remodeled a three bedroom, one bath home and turned it into a one bedroom, two bath home with a second story addition. At that time in 2012, I'm pretty sure a variance was required and approved for that second
story addition.
What we are proposing to do is to take the current second story addition and extend it out another 20 feet to the back of the house.

So as far as this turing on.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. NORMAN: So this is the way the house is currently. You can see the second story there that was added in 2012. Here's another side view of it. So what we're looking to do is basically extend this roof line out to about where this stack is here to add -- to take a one bedroom, two bath home to make it a three bedroom, two bath -- two and a half bath home.

This is a picture above.
(Photo displayed.)
MR. NORMAN: So this is the house here, the second story here and the first floor that we're going to add the second addition right along here.

This is the current back view -- rearview of the house that that upper second story is going to come out closer to the back of the story about 20 feet. And then this is the architectural rendering of the back of the house, the proposed redesign of the back of the
house.
That's all I have.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. NORMAN: Oh, well the side rendering is here showing that this is -- this is from the -- this is the west side rendering. This is the current second story and this is our addition that we're proposing. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Anything you would like to add?

MR. NORMAN: Nope.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Audience, from the audience?

Looks like none.
From the city?
MR. BOULARD: Just stand by for questions. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: That you, Charles.

And correspondence, secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: 31 letters were mailed. Eleven were returned with one approval.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: The approval says, thank
you. We own 313 Elm Court and we have no issues with the 317 Duana improvements and support the project.

And it's from Terry Duperon, $D-u-p-e-r-o-n$.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. I have a quick question. This house is built in 1955, correct?

MR. NORMAN: Correct. Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. How strong is the foundation for the building a second story? MR. NORMAN: We're going to have engineers look to make sure --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: So you want to be safe. I want to see that.

MR. NORMAN: Yes. Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's really important.

MR. NORMAN: Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Apart from that, I have no objection on that. Okay. So it's open to the board.

Okay. Dr. Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and saw your place yesterday. You have some construction going on already now, haven't you?

MR. NORMAN: No. Nothing at all. It's


Any other board?

MEMBER MCLEOD: So a quick question. The proposal you have just shows you're expanding the second story. Why do you require a side variance for expanding the footprint that you're already on? Yes.

MR. BOULARD: So the existing home is nonconforming and so by adding the second story over the nonconforming area, it would be increasing a nonconformity. So you've added additional volume that's within those setbacks. So that's the reason they were directed here, so.

MEMBER MCLEOD: Okay. Great. Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Any other?

Okay. This looks like a motion time. Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ23-0005 for a side yard setback variance of 6.85 feet and an aggregate total side yard variance of 16.77 feet.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to property use because additional bedroom would not fit within this lot because it is unique because it is a
small lot and we're trying to fit an extra bedroom in here.

The petitioner did not create the condition because the lot size was predetermined when he purchased the property.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because basically he's expanding the building within the existing footprint over the top of himself and it really does not impinge upon anyone else. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is allowing this person to maximize the use of their property for their own living.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can I add --
MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Before that, can I add one point?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Taking advice for the structural engineering for the -- before the construction. I really and greatly appreciate on that. That's the safety issue I want to add on that.


Congratulations.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.
MR. NORMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. It's appointing a chair for the zoning board. I would like to continue. Somebody can make a motion on that. Anybody would like to?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Nobody else wants to do it --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. I'll make a motion --

MS. SAARELA: Somebody would need to nominate to be chairman and then secretary and vice chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MS. SAARELA: So open it up to nominations for chairman.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So it doesn't necessarily need to be sequential or however --

MS. SAARELA: No. I mean, you can nominate whatever position you guys want to take first. You don't have to --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Yes, Mav.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Traditionally we have been promoting the vice chair into the chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER SANGHVI: And I think that is what we should continue as the next chair.

MEMBER KRIEGER: But Mike doesn't want to -Mike, do you want to do that?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Any problem?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I do not.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Not a problem.
Clift, what would you like to do? Vice chair or chair?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Vice chair would be good, yeah. That would be fine.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Vice chair?
Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah, vice chair would be fine.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: What about you, Linda?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm fine. As long as I can learn to make better motions, I'm good.

MEMBER SANGHVI: And just propose a --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So we need a secretary.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Who wants to do secretary?

You want to do secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm good.
MEMBER KRIEGER: You're good. Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You want to be secretary?
(Court Reporter asked for clarification.)
MS. SAARELA: So, yes. Can we state who's doing what position and then vote on it?

MEMBER LONGO: I think we should do that.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Well, yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: He's the vice chair, Montague.

MS. SAARELA: Who's going to do chair?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Joe wants to -- I vote for Joe to do chair.

MS. SAARELA: Do you have a second?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I nominate Joe to do chair for --

MEMBER LONGO: I'll second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: -- this coming year.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And the vice chair
is Montague. And secretary is Mike Longo.

MS. SAARELA: Okay. Is there anybody who has different position -- any opposition to those?

MEMBER KRIEGER: No. Member at large is fine.

MS. SAARELA: Okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: It's fun to be at large.
MS. SAARELA: Okay. If you don't have any
other nominations, I think you can just do a normal vote on that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Say "aye" in favor everybody.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All in favor for Joe being chair, aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And then all in favor for Clift being vice chair.

THE BOARD: Aye.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. All in favor for Mike Longo being secretary.

THE BOARD: Aye.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Very good.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Other
matters? Any other matters before I adjourn tonight? Okay. Before I adjourn, all in favor -MEMBER KRIEGER: Wait. What's up, Mav? MEMBER SANGHVI: Mr. Chair, can I have a moment?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I would like to propose a vote of thanks to the chairman who has continued doing it for two years, more than expected call of duty. And so thank you, Joe, for doing it for all this time. And we appreciate your service. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi. I appreciate it.

Any other?
MEMBER LONGO: I second that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before I adjourn, say all in favor.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All in favor adjourn, aye.
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Motion to adjourn. Good night.
(At 8:19 p.m., meeting concluded.)
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