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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good
evening, everybody. And thank you for joining. Welcome to the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals. And today is Tuesday, March 9, 2021. The time is 7:00 p.m.

Okay. And there will be ...
Member Longo, can you Pledge of Allegiance, please.

MEMBER LONGO: Everybody place your hand over your heart. You don't have to turn your mic on, and we're going to say the Pledge of Allegiance. (Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Longo. Everybody participated. Thank you so much.

Okay. Katherine, can you call for roll call, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, of course. And this is a reminder. We're still identifying the location from which you're speaking.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Present. Linda

Krieger, Novi, Michigan, Oakland County.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you. Member
Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Present. City of Novi, County of Oakland County and the state of Michigan.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Present. From Novi, Oakland County, Michigan.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you. Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Hi. This is
Joe Peddiboyina. I live in Novi currently. And Novi, Michigan, Oakland County.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker is
absent. Excused.
Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Novi, Michigan,
Oakland County.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you. And Member
Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Present, Novi, Oakland County, Michigan.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine, for the roll call. And all right. We
have enough for a quorum?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Sounds good.
Okay. We have enough for a quorum. And public hearing format, rules and conduct you can see on our website. And there's no printing because of the COVID situation we're doing it electronically. Make sure, your phone should be muted, you know, on silent mode.

We'll have a public hearing in the case called upon to state your name and remarks and everything. And anybody in the public, you can raise your hand for our acting secretary. Katherine can take care of that one and she can watch you. And there's no podium here due to it's COVID and we're doing it electronically.

And we can see on the $T V$ also as well. And when the people come, state your name in full clearly for our court secretary. And she can take the oath.

And please allow the people -- when the case comes, please talk slowly and clearly so they can record all the meeting minutes. And if you're an attorney, no need to swear for my secretary. And
that's all.

And we have total -- today we have six cases, am I right?

MS. OPPERMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. We have total of six cases. And let's go to the April agenda meetings. Can somebody make a motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: We have approval of the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any changes or modifications or anything, please?

No?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

Okay, Member Sanghvi and Member Krieger, thank you so much for the approval of agenda.

Say aye, anybody. Any objections or anything please, say.

Say, aye, everybody.
THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank
you so much. And approval of agenda of the meeting anonymously approved for February 2021.

Coming to the public remarks, anyone having any other public remarks apart from the --


Next. And thank you for the public remarks, you know. Member Sanghvi, thank you.

And we have agenda is approved.
And coming to the -- for today's first
case. I go to the first case.
Okay. Before I go to the first case, any other people, you know, public remarks?

Any, Katherine? Anybody is raising
their hand? Anybody have any public remarks?
MS. OPPERMAN: No one is raising their hand for any comments unrelated to the cases.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
Because we don't want to -- in the middle we don't want to move or anything or any changes. Thank you so much.

Okay. Coming to the first case today. PZ20-0066 -- no. I'm doing the wrong one. I'm sorry.

Okay. I have the right one.
PZ21-0002, Patrick Ziarnik, Z-i-a-r-n-i-k, 1601 West

Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive and south of West Pontiac Trail, parcel number 50-22-03-131-007. The applicant is requesting variances from the Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 4.19.1.E(i) for the construction of a 930,25 square feet accessory building, maximum of 850 square feet allowed by code; a variance of 80.28 square feet.

Section 4.19.1.B to install the accessory structure in the front yard when by code accessory building should not be erected in any required front yard or in any required exterior side yard.

Section 4.19.G. for a proposed five-foot side yard setback, six feet required by code; a variance of one foot. This variance will accommodate the building of a new carport. This property is zoned single family residential, R-4.

Is the applicant present?
MR. ZIARNIK: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Are you
Patrick, sir?
MR. ZIARNIK: Yes, I am.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, thank you. Please, sir, are you an attorney?

MR. ZIARNIK: I'm a retired attorney,
yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, you are retired attorney.

Katherine, he has to be sworn or no?
MS. OPPERMAN: I would have to defer to Beth on that. I'm uncertain.

MS. SAARELA: He's not appearing here as counsel. I would swear him in.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Please, Katherine can you take care of sworn by Patrick today, please? Thank you.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. If you could please state and spell your name for our court reporter and then swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MR. ZIARNIK: Yes. My name is Patrick Ziarnik, P-a-t-r-i-c-k. Last name is spelled Z-i-a-r-n-i-k. And yes, I -- you know, I affirm that I will tell the truth during this presentation.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Patrick, are you the only one person who is handling this case? Any other person would like to join in this case?

MR. ZIARNIK: No. I'm here alone.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Sounds good. Thank you so much. You can proceed what you want and we can help you on this case, please. Thank you.

MR. ZIARNIK: Okay. What I'm asking for is both a garage remodel and a carport construction. The garage remodel is largely just cosmetic. We're replacing some shingles that are cupping and have failed and as a result water is coming in through our garage. The wood siding on the front of the garage is starting to rot and we'd like to replace that with some vinyl siding.

And I don't even know that that's required for a building permit, but I mention it only because -- to get a little perspective. Because that was the impetus for the larger project, which is really the carport construction. We figured as long as we had to make these changes to the garage anyway, we might as well do something that we've always anticipated doing and that is to build this carport.

And when I use the term "carport," it's really a shelter for our boat. I didn't know how else to call it. We're not going to house a car there. We're simply going to use it as a shelter for our boat in the winter months when it gets cold and we take the
boat out of the water.
The carport that we envision
constructing would be -- it would be built on to the side of the garage. So part of the carport would lean on the garage itself. It's a concrete wall garage and so, you know, one-half of the carport would be there. The other half would be supported by three six by six treated posts.

And, you know, I think a lot of people when you hear the term "carport," they get a little concerned that it's going to be some flimsy structure, and I can assure you that this is not the case. I went to a structural engineer and I had this carport designed. And he's got laminated beams for the ridge beam and from the front and back of the carport I've got doubled up $12 \times 12$-- 2 x 12 s , rather, that run along the side of the carport. He's proposing hurricane straps to tie down the rafters to the top plates of the structure. So the structure we're proposing is a very, very solid structure.

In fact, when I saw laminated beams and all these other hurricane straps and all the other stuff, I saw dollar signs. And I asked the structural engineer, I said, "Do we really need all this bulk?"

And the response was, "Well, if I was
building it for myself, this is what I would do." So I've gone ahead and I said that's fine.

When I showed the blueprints to the builder, he just kind of laughed and he said, "Well, that building's not going to blow away in a storm."

So if there is any concerns over the solidness of the structure, $I$ can assure you that this is a very solid structure.

In terms of the problems that we face, I think we've got sort of a unique situation. We have several factors that make our particular lot somewhat unique. First of all, we're on a lake lot. We're on Walled Lake. So the lake is way beyond our backyard and that creates some issues.

Secondly, our lot is very narrow. It's long. It's 220 yards long, but it's very narrow. It's only 45 feet wide at the widest point and then beyond that it also comes to a point on the western end. So it's kind of shaped like an arrow, if you would, and it literally comes to a point on the far west end of the property. All those things kind of, I think, come together to create kind of an unusual lot situation.

And I guess on top of that, is the fact that both our house and the garage were constructed 70 years ago before any ordinances were put in place. So the placement isn't ideal. If you were placing the structures on the lot today, you would probably do it somewhat differently.

As was indicated earlier, there is -as I understand it, there's three specific variances that we need to deal with. And the first is the placement of an accessory structure in the front yard. And while I will admit that that requirement makes a great -- that prohibition of putting an accessory structure in the front yard probably makes a great deal of sense in a typical city lot. We don't have the typical city lot. You know, basically, putting an accessory structure in our backyard would amount to putting the garage or the carport between our house and the lake and that's something that you wouldn't want to do, obviously, because you're going to impact your view of the water that way.

As a matter of fact, my wife and $I$ walked up and down West Lake Drive, the road we live on, and we counted 25 accessory structures on our lake -- rather, on our road on the lake side of our road. Every one of those accessory structures was, basically, in the front yard and not the backyard. So there wasn't one of those accessory structures that
complied with that particular ordinance.
So, again, that's one that $I$ think it makes sense for most lots, but it just doesn't make a great deal of sense for our particular lot.

The second variance that we're requesting is a six-foot side yard setback. And I think the code -- the ordinance requires a five-yard setback. A five-foot setback from the side yard.

And the reason we're asking for that is we'd like to have the front of the carport flush with the front of the garage. I think cosmetically it looks best that way. So if we do that, we need a 20-foot carport because our boat is a little over 20 feet, actually.

If we do that, it only gives us a five-foot setback. So we'd be one foot short of the required setback. But I can assure you, I talked to the owner who is next to us, the one that would be impacted by this, I talked to him at length. He's a very good friend of ours. And he has indicated that he has no problems whatsoever with a five-foot setback as opposed to a six-foot setback on the side yard.

And then the last variance we require is, $I$ guess we're exceeding the permitted size of an accessory structure when you add the existing
carport -- the existing garage with the carport. And all $I$ can say to that is that we've tried to minimize the size of the carport as much as possible. As I indicated, we're asking for a 20 -foot long carport. My boat is actually in excess of that, but it'll provide structure. If I make it much shorter than that, however, it's not going to cover the boat and it's really not going to serve the purpose that it's intended to serve.

Furthermore, $I$ think it's important to note that the structure we're asking for is going to have three open sides. It's going to be supported by posts on the west side. So the front and the west side and the back will all be open. And so my feeling is that that kind of a structure is going to look far less imposing, far less formidable than, you know, a four-sided building.

So -- and I guess the last thing I can
mention is we live in a very small community here. We've lived here for 18 years now in Novi and we're very good friends with all of the neighbors here. We get together with them socially. They've become friends. And most of the people here we -- have lived here longer than we have. The newbies probably have been here seven or eight years. But we're all pretty
good friends and we would not do something that we know would cause problems for any of our neighbors. So I personally went and talked to eight or nine of the neighbors, all immediately around here and said, "Hey, this is my plan. This is what I'm looking to do. Does that cause you any concerns?"

And to a person they told me, "No, we don't have a problem with that. Go for it. We're behind you a hundred percent."

Those people that I didn't have an opportunity to get to, I wrote a one-page sheet detailing everything that we plan to do and I gave them copies of the blueprints and I put it in their mailboxes. Told them to contact me. I gave them my telephone number, my wife's telephone number, our home phone number. I said if you've got any issues whatsoever, please let us know. And nobody has voiced any opposition to what we're proposing.

So I feel very strongly that, you know, the neighbors, I think, are in agreement, are all in support of what we're doing. And if anybody did raise an objection, it would be certainly cause for concern and we'd go back and take a look at it. Because the last thing we want to do is upset the harmony that we've got in the neighborhood.


MR. ZIARNIK: Pardon me?
pictures show up online?
MS. OPPERMAN: If anyone wanted to view them, they would be able to go to the website to look at them.

MEMBER KRIEGER: We all have them, thank you.

MR. ZIARNIK: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so
much, Patrick. I appreciate on your presentation and also you already spoke to your neighbors and the way you presented. We really appreciate.

And let us see. And I open it to my board members. And before that I would like to talk to my City, Larry, are you there?

MR. BUTLER: I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any correspondence on this thing? Do you have any comment on this, Larry?

MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time from the City. Standing by for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.

Okay. Our acting secretary, Katherine any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 27 letters sent. One letter returned. Six approvals and no objections.

The first approval is from Tom Harvey who states, "I live next door to the Ziarniks on the south side. There's always been a great need for those of us on the lake for boat storage and off-street parking as streets are very narrow. The space next to the garage has always been used for these purposes without any issues. So I approve the request to construct the roof extension off the garage in order to cover this space and I appreciate the design leaving three sides open so the visibility to the street from my driveway is not obstructed."

The next approval is from John Jacob. It says, "Though the code is understood, if you look at this property and what these fine people are trying to accomplish, their plan will affect no one and actually makes it look better and brings value to the neighborhood. Too much oversight is never a good thing. Let these people build what they want."

Then from Hitham Semma, That's spelled H-i-t-h-a-m. Last name $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{a}$. They also approve and say, "This garage improvement and carport will not affect anyone's view in the neighborhood."


CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member
Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your place a couple of days ago and I agree with you, you also have a very small lot and it's very difficult to do anything.

I also notice that you have a pontoon boat. Looks like a pontoon boat on your yard there next to the garage; is that correct?

MR. ZIARNIK: Yes. That's correct.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. And I'm sure you'll need some protection from the weather. So I can wholeheartedly support your application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to speak on this case, please?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Could I?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I was by there as well. The lot is the special condition that we see a lot. A very small lot to fit it on. There's no way you could put it in the so-called backyard. You wouldn't have access to it.

MR. ZIARNIK: Right.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: And it's a very nicely done job and I appreciate you using the professional engineer to put the structure together. So I can support it as well.

MR. ZIARNIK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Montague. I appreciate that and that's a good point you raised. Thank you.

Any other board member who would make to speak on this case, please?

Okay. Looks like none.
Yeah, Patrick, I really appreciate one more time for, you know, the way you presented and the way you corresponded before coming to the City and also spoke to the neighbors. And also as my colleague member, Member Montague, mentioned there's no access on that in the backyard. With all those considerations, I have no objection on this case and I am fully supportive for this case.

And let's see and how things will go. And I appreciate for that. Somebody can make a motion.

Member Krieger, can you make a motion on this case, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. In case number

PZ21-0002 sought by the petitioner, on West Lake Drive, I move to approve the request. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because of its narrowness and positioning of the structures on the property and the front yard could be regarded as a side yard or even a backyard so -- because of this special area of Walled Lake. The property is unique because of its existence before our ordinances were created for Walled Lake.

And the petitioner did not create the condition because the existing structures that are there make it difficult to -- for the variance request to position because of -- the narrowness. And the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because, as the petitioner stated, structure itself will not be four-sided and appear as a greater structure than it is.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of it being on water property.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Member Linda. I appreciate your motion and thank you.


Luzod Reporting Service, Inc.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MR. ZIARNIK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank
you. Congratulations.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Enjoy.
MR. ZIARNIK: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank
you. Coming to today's business for today's second case. Case PZ21-0005, Venkata Chekka, 25762 Beck Road, east of Beck Road and south of Eleven Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-21-101-026. The applicant is requesting the variances from the Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.1 for a proposed front yard setback of 40 feet, 45 feet required by code, a variance of five foot; a proposed aggregate of side yard setback of 30 feet, 50 feet required by code, variance of 20 feet; and a proposed rear yard setback of 40 feet, 50 required by code, a variance of 10 feet. This variance will accommodate the building of a new ranch home. This property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Is the applicant present?
MR. CHEKKA: I'm present. This is
Venkata Chekka.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Good.

Are you an attorney?
MR. CHEKKA: No. I'm not an attorney. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Pardon me? MR. CHEKKA: No, I'm not an attorney. I'm the applicant.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And my acting secretary, Katherine, can you take this oath, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Of course.
Mr. Chekka, if you could please, state and spell your name for the court reporter and then swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MR. CHEKKA: Yes. I will tell the truth. This is Venkata Chekka here. I'm from Novi city, Oakland County, Michigan state and I tell the truth.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Spell your name, please.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Katherine. I appreciate it.

Mr. Venkata, how we can help on you this case and please present your case on this and our board members can hear you?

MR. CHEKKA: Yeah. Give me a minute.
This particular lot is lot number nine
in the subdivision of Pioneer Meadows. This is
opposite to the Bosco Fields on Beck Road. Basically, like, this is, you know, already RA zoning classification and the results the lot becomes nonconformed use, if I follow the RA zoning classification of the City of Novi. Because we have to -- like, it is being subject to the one acre size lot setback requirements.

This is a very rural subdivision. If I follow the setbacks, I will not be able to construct any building there. Basically, like all the subdivision lots are similar size and the variances for the Pioneer Meadows layout is what I'm requesting now.

So for the front yard reduction to 40 feet from the 45 feet. And the side yard reduction to aggregate 30 feet from the required 50 feet. And the rear yard reduction 40 feet from the required 50 feet. This allows to put a building of reasonable size, 70 by 40.

And it does not, basically, like create any problem to the existing houses. All the houses have the same kind of setbacks.

> And the Novi city -- (audio dropped.)

MEMBER KRIEGER: Lost you.
MR. CHEKKA: See, basically, like this kind of variance if we build, it will be, like, in sync with the existing surrounding properties. They have the same kind of setbacks. And, basically, like all this is like -- this hardship is not self-created.

So I request the board to consider my request and allow the setback variances.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other things you would like to add, Mr. Chekka?

MR. CHEKKA: I think that's it. Like I have submitted the drawings required and all that stuff, like, you know, with my application.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Are you the only one person that would like to present this case or any other people that would like to speak on behalf of you on this case?

MR. CHEKKA: I'm the only person.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much.

And let us see how things will move and let's talk about this with my board and move on to that one.

Coming to the City, Larry, are you
there?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any comment on this, Larry?

MR. BUTLER: I just wanted to mention that $I$ did review the drawings and that $I$ appreciate the fact that the gentleman did keep in old coordinates with similar and dissimilar as to the way the rest of the houses are looking on the lot. He pretty much mimics the same type of style, which is good.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much, Larry.

Okay. And correspondence. And acting secretary Katherine, can you see any correspondence on this?

MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly. There were 40 letters sent out for this. We returned two. We have one approval, no objections. The approval is from Travis Malott. He states, "I walked over to the listed property. The applicant's request seems very reasonable and I have no objection to his request".

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine.

Katherine, can you see anybody raising their hand on the public on this case? Anybody would like to comment on the public people?

 condition because he purchased the property under the
aforementioned situation. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the subdivision has these variances pretty consistently.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance because it permits the owner to build a nice home on his property. MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda and Member Sanghvi.

Before going to the, you know, everybody made a motion, any other discussion for this case, please?

Okay. Looks like seeing none.
Katherine, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so
much, Katherine. And Mr. Chekka, congratulations. Good luck.

MR. CHEKKA: Thank you. Thank you, all.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And coming to today's meeting and the third case, PZ21-0006, Robert Ledbetter, 26510 Taft Road, east of Taft Road and south of Grand River Avenue, parcel number 50-22-15-351-004. The applicant is requesting the variance from the city of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.11 to allow for the installation of a fence in the front yard setback. Fence shall not extend toward the front of the property nearer than the minimum front yard setback distance by code. This property is zoned light industrial, L-I.

Is the applicant present? Mr. Robert, are you there?
(No verbal response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Robert, can
you unmute? Can you speak?
MEMBER KRIEGER: There he goes.

MR. LEDBETTER: Sorry. Is that
better?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay,

Robert. I appreciate. Make sure you are unmuted all the time on your case.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You
can present your case and what we can help you on this And you can speak slowly. And if you are an attorney -- if you're not an attorney, our secretary Katherine can take care of your oath.

Katherine, can you please take it?

MS. OPPERMAN: Of course.

Mr. Ledbetter, if you can, please, state and spell your name for our court reporter and then swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes. My name is
Robert Ledbetter. 26510 Taft Road, Novi, Michigan and I do swear to tell the truth.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Katherine.

And thank you so much, Robert. And let us see. You can present your case where we can help you. Please, go ahead.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes. I'm wanting to put a fence in my front yard. It's kind of to the left of my driveway and it's to block out the noise from the highway. I'm right off of Taft. I'm the third house off Grand River, south of Grand River. And we get a lot of noise from the highway all through the day and the night, especially during traffic hours. And then also Grand River quite a bit on the weekend from the traffic and the trucks and a lot of the racing.

And our house is really close to Taft Road and it helps people -- it keeps people from driving through our front lot because there's quite a bit of people swinging in and turning around quick. And one of our vehicles was hit over last summer. And since then we've installed cameras to kind of detour it and be able to see, you know, who goes through. But it's just been a big problem.

We've been there about 22 years and it's been pretty nice. Just to keep the noise down and also keep kind of quiet where our driveway is. So ...

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other thing you would like to add, Robert, or that's it?

MR. LEDBETTER: (No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Robert, are you there?

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes, I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Would you
like to add any other thing? Or no?
MEMBER KRIEGER: All set?
MR. LEDBETTER: I'm sorry. I'm not a speaker all the time. So it would just help out to have the fence and mainly those two things.

And I've talked with the neighbor next
door on my left. We have three houses that are -- I have two houses to my left and the first neighbor, she was fine with it. And I talked to the father on the left of me over the weekend. He had come over to my house in the garage and he said he had no problem with it either.

And the house to the right is Capella, Kim Capella. And they're quite a bit down. So they're really not effected by this fence. And there's nobody across the street from us. There's Delphina's on the corner of Grand River and Taft. There's condos. Andes Hills Condos is down on the right. So it's kind of a ways away from us.

And the structure is nice. It's
solid. It's, you know, painted and it's -- we're staying at the house. We've renovated the inside. Like I said, we've been there 22 years. We did the bathroom. So we try to keep the yard clean. The landscape's nice and we're trying to put a new driveway in hopefully this summer.

So our intentions are to stay
long-term in the house. We like Novi. We both work in Novi. So, you know, structuralwise it will always be taken care of as in, you know, painted, upkeep, nothing where it will be falling down and be an eyesore for the community.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank
you so much. I appreciate for your presentation, Robert, and the way you did and the way you explained and spoke to the neighbors. And let us see.

Okay. From the City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comment from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Larry.

And chairperson -- I'm sorry.
Correspondence, Secretary Katherine.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 21
letters sent out. No returns. No approvals. No
objections.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine. I appreciate.

And anything for the public remarks? Anybody is raising their hand on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: There is no one raising their hand for this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

And, yeah, Robert. I drove by your property. The way you presented and the reason why you are asking for this fence, you know, I have nothing to -- you know, any other thing. And let us see how the board members can see on this case. And we'll see.

And it's open to the board members.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. Go ahead, Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: The last picture that you posted, there's a bit of the fence. There's three boulders in the sign. Is that -- you're replacing it or that's already there or the intent? Because I saw somebody painting when I drove by today.

MR. LEDBETTER: Oh, that was my
nephew. He was painting my present fence against the house on the left and right.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then you want to extend out farther with the fence or just go through --

MR. LEDBETTER: No. The fence is on the left side of the driveway. And it comes out -it's in between the house on the left and my left side of my garage.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So it won't obstruct the view of Taft, though?

MR. LEDBETTER: No. The vehicles are able to get out. I talked to the neighbors. And the height of the fence is lower and it goes up and then -it's a little higher setback. So when you're pulling out of the driveways or pulling into the driveways, there's no obstruction when you're going on to Taft Road.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Line of sight, yes.
MR. LEDBETTER: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And the flowerpots in the summer, are those yours? Because I like those.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Cool. I
remember the fence being there and I agree noise -- I
mean, you're right next to -- the expressway is right
there. Plus Grand River, like you said, with the
Suburban Showplace having shows on weekends, that that
would also create an issue. So I have no problem with
you having the fence.

MR. LEDBETTER: All right. Thank you. MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda.

Any other board member would like to speak on this case, please?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. Yes, I would to, if I could.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please, Member Montague.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. So the fence is there now, correct?

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Because I
went by and looked today and my only concern was that visibility. So I took a look and I agree with you, that step down does leave the visibility good.

So I think I can support this variance.

MR. LEDBETTER: All right. Thank you.

Yeah, that was the biggest thing was we made sure that the neighbors wouldn't have a problem with it and we weren't trying to, like, intimidate them and say, hey, you know, we're going to block this off or anything. That way everybody can come in and out safely.

And they're able to, you know, if there's a lot of traffic, use my driveway. You know, the first two houses. That way they can get in and out. We just didn't want everybody that was trying to turn around everywhere, you know, shooting through our driveways.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Member Montague.

Any other board member would like to speak?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member

Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I just have one question. How long have you had that fence there?

MR. LEDBETTER: It's been about seven weeks. Six, seven weeks.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Six, seven weeks.
Okay, thank you.

pretty close. And it's been there since I can remember. And those fences have also been there.

The petitioner did not create the condition because the homes were already there plus fencing has been there. So it's an improvement.

The relief granted will not
unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the neighboring property, four houses together, have fencing so it will match.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it does not interfere with line of sight either.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Member Linda.

Okay. And somebody can make a second. MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Okay. Any other discussions before roll call? Any other board member, any comments on this?

Seeing none.
Okay. Katherine, can you please roll call, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Member Thompson?


Luzod Reporting Service, Inc.
variance from the Novi Ordinance Code Section
28-5(b) (1)a and 28-5(d) (7) for the installation of two 165 square foot wall signs. Each sign is 100 square feet larger than allowed by code. This property is zoned Regional Center, RC.

Is the applicant present?
MR. ECKRICH: Yes, I am.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, thank
you. Please go ahead and spell your first and last name for the court record and secretary.

And, Katherine, can you please take here. Thank you.

MR. ECKRICH: Good evening, everybody. My name is Tony Eckrich, Tony, T-o-n-y, Eckrich, E-c-k-r-i-c-h. I work with the owners at Full Throttle Adrenaline Park who have taken over the former J.D. Racing indoor go-cart facility there in Twelve Oaks Mall.

MS. OPPERMAN: Okay. And could you please swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. ECKRICH: I confirm I will tell the truth this evening about all the issues related.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. ECKRICH: But we took over the
facility January 1st and purchased the assets, not the business. Had we purchased the business, I think the prior signage request would have stayed. But since we did not purchase the business, the name will actually be changing and after some dialogues with Maureen Underhill there at the office, city code, sign code, learned that I needed to come back and request the larger sign permit for the same facility there at Twelve Oaks 44 -- what was it? 44225 West Twelve Mile. And similar signs that you see in the neighborhood, Powerhouse Gym, Dick's Sporting Goods. Those are my neighbors. Those folks all have the larger sign. We're requesting the variance to go up to 165 square feet for the east facing, which faces Donnelson and then the north face is the Twelve Mile access road. And we're, basically, between Dick's Sporting Goods and Chuck E. Cheese.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other things you would like to add on this tonight?

MR. ECKRICH: There was one discovery by my sign contractor that is bidding on the work. Actually, he was the original sign installer and based on the initial install up there on the wall at 25 feet up in the air, the facade is a material called EIFS, E-i-f-s, or dry bit material. It's like a foam board
and then they stucco over the top to give it texture and colorization. It looks really good, but it really doesn't have a lot of guts. So the sign installer was discussing with Maureen Underhill about the recommendation of, like, a giant, large pan.

If you can imagine a giant cookie
sheet. Like a two-inch lip and then the letters would be fastened to the pan that would be painted the same color as the facade, thus, hanging up one giant piece with less wall penetrations to reduce the likelihood of rain. Because it does face east and we already do have some water coming in. Nor'east storms are common in this area. So it's the recommendation of that pan application is another couple of thousand bucks, but it's to insure the integrity of the installation and, bottom line, to reduce the amount of the penetrations. Rather than per letter being fashioned into the wall, you've got this giant sheet that would be hung up and everything is incorporated into one mounting structure. So that was the recommendation by the sign installer who actually did the work. But effectively no change in the building. The signage up there right now $I$ think is right in that 150, 155 square foot range. I think the 165 was granted, but their artwork ended up being a little bit less. They
were also granted the same permission to do an east sign and a north sign; however, they only put up an east facing sign. We do plan to put up east and north. The amount of traffic that is on Twelve Mile is beneficial to be attractive, too.

And that's about.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. From the City, Larry?

MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much .

Correspondence, our acting secretary, Katherine. Any correspondence in this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: There were 42 letters
sent. One returned. One approval. No objections. The approval is from Michael Zimmerman who owns the property and says he supports the sign being put up.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so
much, Katherine. I appreciate.
Any other public people that are raising their hand on this Zoom call?

MS. OPPERMAN: There is no one raising their hand for this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Excellent.

Thank you so much, Katherine, once again.
Okay. Yeah, nice presentation and let us see how the board members react on this case.

It's open to the board.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Member Mav Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I went and visited this site here in part of the Fountain Walk and they are quite a ways away from Twelve Mile Road and this site is partially blocked by the trees.

And they will be just changing the name of the sign that used to be there before. And I have no difficulty recommending that they can have their variances as requested. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to speak?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question. Did the sign company recommend doing a mockup sign?

MR. ECKRICH: That was submitted in the paperwork, yeah. There's a mockup in the submission. With the new artwork, you mean, of the name?
$\square$

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah, it's there.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then it'll be the -- if I -- it'll be same size as what was there before?

MR. ECKRICH: Asking for up to 165 is the maximum. It's probably going to be 165 or less, I'll guarantee you that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Larry, is that, like, Air Time on the other side or do you know offhand?

MR. BUTLER: I think that is Air Time on the other side.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right. Is it the same or bigger?

MR. BUTLER: I never compared the signs. It's been there for awhile.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I can't remember.

MR. ECKRICH: The artwork was framed
in. I'm not real good at sharing my information. I can -- I'd be better off holding up a picture. Basically, there's some of the new artwork. That's what the image would be up on the facade and then here's --

MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm thinking proportions.

MR. ECKRICH: Proportionately, it's on
probably the eighth or ninth page. You know, that's going to be more proportional how it would look.

The building is quite large. I think it's 270 by 150. So, you know, proportionally it's up there.

After they put up lettering. You know, after talking with Maureen, you know, they're going to put lettering and they're going to draw a frame around it and then all the artwork has to stay within that frame, correct?

It can't add up to anything more than 165. So how the sign man is going to do it, he can't go more than that big. Everything is going to be less than that as far as how it will look on the building. There are some dimensionals in there that gives you square footage. You know, a foot measurements on the facade.

The top of the sign would be no more than 39 and a half feet. The bottom of the sign would be 32 and 25 feet from the bottom to the top. Same thing on the east elevation.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda. Thank you, Tony.


Member Longo, please go ahead and make one, Linda, or am I?

MEMBER KRIEGER: No, you are.
MEMBER THOMPSON: I said I was.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay, well, then go for it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael, sorry. Yeah, go ahead.

Member Longo, sorry about that.
Member Michael, please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER LONGO: So the recommendation of the zoning, I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0007, sought by Full Throttle Adrenaline Park for a sign variance because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring a sign variance.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of some old sign zoning sizes. The property is unique being in a commercial park like that with similar signs, similar signs of that size in the park.

The petitioner did not create the condition as they purchased an existing business with the same size signs that he is asking for.

The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding
properties because they're a similar size to what he is asking for. The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance. So customers are able to find and locate the Adrenaline Park.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,

Michael. Member Michael, thank you so much. And somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi. Are there any other discussions before moving to the roll call? Any other boards member, any discussion on this case, please?

Seeing none. Okay, Katherine, can you please roll call?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson

Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
so much, Katherine.
And, Tony, congratulations and good luck for the business.

MR. ECKRICH: Thank you very much. We'll let you know when we have an open house for the grand opening.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

MR. ECKRICH: All right. Bye-bye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All right.
Coming to today's fifth case. PZ21-0008, Amar Abro, 47133 Nine Mile Road, east of Beck Road and south of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-33-100-009. The applicant is requesting the variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 4.19.E.iii for a proposed 2,400 square foot barn, 1,500 square feet maximum allowed by code, a variance of 900 square feet.

Section 4.19(I) for a two-story barn height of 18 feet, one story or 14 feet maximum allowed
by code, the variance of four feet. This variance will accommodate the rebuilding of a recently burnt down barn. This property is zoned single family residential, R-1.

Is the applicant present, please?
MR. ABRO: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You are not on the video call. We don't see that.

Okay. Let us see, you can speak your first and last name for the secretary for the court record and she can take the oath.

Acting secretary, Katherine, can you please take on this?

MR. ABRO: Sure, I'm Amar Abro, $A-m-a-r, A-b-r-o$.

MS. OPPERMAN: And, Mr. Abro, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. ABRO: Yes, I swear to tell the truth in the case.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Before going, your name is Amar?

MR. ABRO: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. If
you can speak slowly and present your case the way you want where we can help you on this case, please.

MR. ABRO: Sure. So I had a 2,400 square foot barn on my property. It's been here for 180 years and there was a fire about two months ago on December 30th. I'm just looking for a variance to rebuild the same sized barn and the same shape and same appearance to replace the barn that burned down. The only difference is I would like to move it a little bit to the west of where the last barn was on my property. The property is five acres in size. So the barn is not abnormally large for the property.

Um, that's my case.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other person would like to speak on behalf of your case or you're the only person tonight?

MR. ABRO: I'm the only one speaking.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank
you.
I appreciate for your presentation and let's see how the board members react on this case and it's open to the board members.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Any correspondence?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry.
Before that I want -- yeah, thank you Member Sanghvi.

call for the public? Anybody in the Zoom call can raise their hand and speak up and say anything before we go to business.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Looks like none.

And coming to our board members, we can open to the board. They can speak on this case, please.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member
Sanghvi, please proceed.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I went and visited this site a couple of days ago. It's a pretty large farm and this barn is going to be located quite further back and is not going to obstruct anybody's views or make any difference. And this is really a replacement of a previously granted barn, which has been present for many, many years. And I have no difficulty in supporting his application.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member, please?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member

Linda, go ahead.

MEMBER KRIEGER: When you purchased the property, did they tell you that the front facade of the house was similar to Abraham Lincoln's?

MR. ABRO: Yeah. That's why there was
a sign that said "Lincoln Place" that said it was the same model home as Lincoln's home in Springfield, Illinois.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.

MR. ABRO: There was a sign and during the debris removal of the barn that burned down, the demo company hit my sign so I have to put it back up. MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Cool. I
appreciate that. And then the barn that you're building will be similar to the one that was there before?

MR. ABRO: Yeah. Nearly identical. MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Cool.

Appreciate it. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Member Linda.
Any other board member, please?
Okay. Looks like none and it's my
time. And, yeah, I saw your property. And also you mentioned, as you said, five acres of property and the
barn is no objection for any of the views or anything. And also you're making it identical and no changes hopefully. I have no objection.

All right. And it's motion time and I would like to call Member Sanghvi to make a motion. MEMBER SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're welcome, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: All right. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0008 sought by Amar Abro for 47133 Nine Mile Road. The petitioner is requesting to rebuild the burned down barn and he needs the variances to redo this.

Previously, this barn was built many years ago and he's trying to reconstruct the same thing at a slightly different sight in the same property, which is a 180-year-old farm and five acres in size.

The petitioner -- this property is unique and he did not create the condition for him to need the variance. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or surrounding properties and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,

Member Sanghvi. I appreciate if somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER LONGO: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
member Longo.
Any other discussion before roll call?
Seeing none. I would like to call
Katherine, please, roll call.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so
much, Katherine.
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Amar, congratulations and good luck for your new project.

MR. ABRO: Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Moving to the final case for tonight. PZ21-0010, Kensington Family Homes, 24847 Dinser Drive, east of Wixom Road and north of Ten Mile Road, Parcel number 50-22-20-301-023. The applicant is requesting the variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a proposed aggregate side yard setback of 45 feet, 50 feet required, a variance of five feet. The variance will accommodate the building of a new home.

This property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Is the applicant present?
MS. LONGO: Yes, we are.
MR. NOLES: Yes, we are.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. You can speak slowly and spell your first and last name for my court record and my secretary will take your oath.

And, Katherine, could you please take it?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. If you could each
individually spell your names and then, of course, swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MS. LONGO: My name is Julie Longo, J-u-l-i-e, L-o-n-g-o. And yes, I swear to tell the truth.

MR. NOLES: Good evening. My name is Mike Noles, M-i-k-e, N-o-l-e-s. And I swear to tell the truth.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine.

Okay. It's your turn and both of you can speak one after one and slowly and clearly and what we can help you on this case. We really appreciate.

MR. NOLES: Thank you very much. I have some slides to show you. Some of them are in your packets and there's a little bit of additional information. So I'm going to share my screen now as I go through the five conditions that you consider to grant your variances. So stand by momentarily as I share the screen and start the PowerPoint.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
(PowerPoint displayed.)

MR. NOLES: Again, my name is Mike
Noles. I am with the Umlor Group and I am representing Kensington Family Homes tonight. The property that we're looking at -- I have appreciated listening to all the other applicants and you are very thorough in going through your standards. So I'd like to try to make your job as easy as possible tonight by going through those standards and how it applies to this particular lot.

First, standard number one, the circumstances or physical conditions. The need for the variance is because of the unique circumstances of this particular property that creates an unnecessary hardship. The existing lot size does not conform to the RA district minimum lot size of one acre. It measures . 71 acres.

You can see in the upper left-hand corner of this particular size that requirement within this zoning district. The minimum lot width is 150 feet yet this lot only measures 100 feet wide.

So what that means is that the lot itself is 33 percent smaller in width than normally under a RA lot. But we are not asking for a 33 percent variance in the side yard setback, we're only asking for a 10 percent variance in the side yard setback to
request the minimum variance required to make this property work.

So the unusual, physical circumstances of this property in that it is smaller than a RA size lot and the surrounding properties also share similar circumstances. If you look at the slide, you'll see there are 21 lots identified in blue along the Delmont and Dinser Drive streets that also don't fit the zoning district lot size. And also, there are 33 of them that have variances in the side yard setbacks.

So this creates a unique circumstance for this property because it is surrounded by lots that are similarly impaired from meeting the residential acreage requirements in the city of Novi zoning district.

Next slide. Here you see a rendering of a similar house to what is being built. This is -Kensington Family Homes builds beautiful homes and you can see this is one of them. This is the actual floor plan. The elevation may vary somewhat from here. Certainly, the garage handing will vary on this particular lot, but you can see these are handsome houses that will be similar to houses in the neighborhood.

Standard number two is that it was not
self-created. The applicant's problem is definitely not self-created. The applicant did not have a hand in creating the multiple lots on Delmont and Dinser that are nonconforming in both size and setback. The intent of the ordinance was to create similar lot sizes within the district to ensure compatibility with one another. We are seeking similar treatment to the precedent that has been set on these two streets and the applicant had no hand in creating that situation.

Your third standard, of course, is strict compliance. Strict compliance will unreasonably prevent this property owner from using the property, and it's unnecessarily burdensome. So the property owner would be unreasonably prevented from using it for the intended purpose, which is to provide similar homes on similar lot configurations. Strict compliance with the 20 -foot side setback requirement would reduce the property to an unusually narrow house or prevent a side entry garage which would be out of character for this area. This would be contrary to the intent of the ordinance.

Moving on. Number four: Minimum variance necessary. This slide was created to show you that we are requesting the minimum variance necessary. You can see in the upper left-hand corner the snapshot
from your zoning ordinance. Normally, a side yard setback in this $R A$ district requires a 50-foot combined side yard setback; 20 on one side, 30 on the other. What we are requesting is a five-foot variance that will have 20 on one side and 25 on the other.

We're going to meet all of the other required setbacks and what $I$ have done is I've created a slide of the actual plan. You can see here's an aerial photograph of the plan. I've created a building box to show you to scale what we're proposing to do. So the 20 -foot side yard setback on the left or the south side of the lot will allow the trees that are existing on the lot to be preserved. The side where we're requesting a variance is the opposite side and we're able to add a standard side-entry garage apron of 22 feet so that you're able to make the turn in and out of the garage. And we will also be maintaining the three-foot minimum requirement for the city of Novi from the lot line to the edge of the driveway, very similar to the other homes that you see. That leaves a building envelope of 55 by 49 , which the plan that $I$ just showed you on the last slide fits comfortably within so we will be able to build a beautiful home on a lot very similar to the
neighbors' lots.
So this is why standard number four, strict compliance, would restrict the lot in a manner that would not allow these things to happen. And that it is the minimum variance necessary to move this forward.

Minimum variance necessary. We're asking for a 10 percent reduction. So from 50 foot side yard combined down to 45 side yard combined when the lot itself is already 33 percent less wide than it should be under the zoning district. So, again, this is the minimum variance necessary to achieve this.

And the last one, of course, is does the standard adversely impact the surrounding area? This variance would not alter the character of the area. The residential lots on Delmont and Dinser are smaller than the RA district requires and contain significantly more and significantly greater setback variances than that of being requested by the applicant tonight.

Approving the variance would allow a similar home to be built on the parcel providing substantial justice to the petitioner and to the surrounding property owners. The variance will certainly not cause an adverse impact on surrounding
parcels.
And the last slide. The petitioner has met all five of the requirements set forth in your ordinance to grant the variance. All the elements of practical difficulties exist here. We respectfully request your support.

And I will stop the screen share so that you can see mine and Ms. Longo's smiling faces.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Michael. Any other applicant would like to speak on this case or you're the only one?

MS. LONGO: I'm the only one.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Thank you so much. I appreciate the way you presented the PowerPoint. And let us see how we can move on this.

And from the City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City. Good presentation.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, so much. Thank you so much, Larry.

Our acting secretary, correspondence?
Any other thing, Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 26
letters sent out for this case. One returned. One
approval. One objection.
The objection is from Denise Tiso, T-i-s-o, states: "My objection is that the property line adjacent share with our property. This does not appear consistent with the previous JCK measurement that was provided when the Toll Brothers Development was put in. The JCK analysis and middle stakes we put in are just centered of the tree line. We have been maintaining this property for over 20 years based on that valuation."

And the approval is from John and Laurel Foley, F-o-l-e-y. They say: "Hello, ZBA members. We approve the requested variance five-foot side yard setback for this parcel." And they will be glad to have a new neighbor.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine. Any public is raising in the Zoom call?

MS. OPPERMAN: There is no one raising their hand at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much and appreciate.

Yeah, Mike, the way you presented is very excellent. And thank you so much. I saw your property and let us see how things will go from my
board members.
And it's open to the board members.
You can speak.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Okay. You go, Linda.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Just real short.
Excellent presentation and I approve
your request.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda.

And Member Sanghvi, please go ahead.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I had one question
which you already answered and I'm very happy that you are saving the trees in front there.

And the second thing was I was surprised to find that you have a septic tank there. I thought the city should have city sewer by now in that area and hopefully the City will take note of it and do something about it. Because we are now in this new century, we should have city sewer everywhere. It is supposed be one of the best cities in the state of Michigan and we still have city sewers, which is a real surprise to me. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to
speak, please?
Okay. Looks like none. Member Longo, please, can you make a motion on this case, please?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes, I will. First of all, it was a great presentation. And second of all, the young lady named Longo, I've never met, don't know her so there's no conflict here of any kind.

MS. LONGO: We look so similar.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
MEMBER LONGO: I'm not that good
looking.
All right. So I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0010 requested by Kensington Family Homes, 24847 Dinser Drive, for the aggregate side setback of 45 feet, which is five feet less than the ordinance.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented from the -- limited in respect to building a property that is similar to the rest of the neighborhood and fitting it on that property. The property is unique because it is smaller than was originally designed to have lot sizes and the biggest problem there is how narrow it is.

The petitioner did not create the condition because the lot was predesigned when they
purchased the lot. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent and surrounding areas because there are a lot of similar situations in homes on lots in that very neighborhood.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it permits the owner to build a home on their lot.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
both of you. Thank you so much, Member Longo; and thank you so much, Member Sanghvi.

Okay, before roll call any other discussion on this case, please?

Looks like none.
Katherine, can you please roll call? MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Member Thompson? MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Member Sanker is absent.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you so
much, Katherine.
Thank you, both of you, Mike and other person. And appreciate it. And good luck.

MR. NOLES: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.

Okay. And no further case today.
Katherine, I have a quick question.
Do you know when we are planning to meet in person on the ZBA cases? Do you have any plan on the City?

MS. OPPERMAN: So currently there's still some last things being decided on the current Open Meetings Act. I know Beth is keeping abase on that and is informing me of any changes as they come. Right now we are planning on being in person in April most likely, but that still is subject to change for the time being.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Sounds good. Thank you so much. I have some folks that had asked me tonight. I said I don't know. Let me ask in the meeting and they said okay.

And I saw your cat. A nice one.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Okay.
Make a motion to adjourn, Member Sanghvi. Thank you.
And every other person say --
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
in favor. Thank you so much.
(At 8:30 p.m., meeting adjourned.)
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