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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good evening, everybody. Welcome to Novi Zoning Board of Appeals on December 8th. It's seven o'clock, Tuesday.

Okay, Katherine. Can you please call for the roll call.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, of course.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you to our acting secretary for tonight.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Present.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
(No response.)
MR. SANGHVI: He was there.

I do believe we're expecting him.
Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: I'm here, thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Present.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you, Katherine.
And do you have enough quorum?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Sounds good.
Thank you so much for your time.
Okay. And now go for the -- all right. We have a board and a quorum. And public hearing format and rules and conduct, if you can just, you know, please turn off -- put your phone on silent mode because we're in the Zoom meeting. And we have a public hearing where you can see each case called. Anyone can make remarks. It's on our television at home and people can come to, you know, anybody wants to talk or anything, it's a Zoom call so you can raise your hand and our acting secretary, Katherine, can see
and she can call your name at the time. And that will show up on the computers at home.

And coming to the -- once you come to the podium -- or, you know, the Zoom call, please tell us your first and last name clearly for our court record's purposes, you know, recording. So she can be clearly -- she can type, you know. That will be helpful to our staff.

Thank you.
And we have an agenda tonight. We have five cases.

Katherine, am I right?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: We have five cases.
Okay. Let's go to -- five cases. And let's go to the approval of the agenda. Is there any changes for the approval of agenda for tonight?

MS. OPPERMAN: There are no changes to the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. There is no changes. Thank you.

All right. So I'll move to the -- we have a motion and no changes for the agenda. Somebody can
make a motion to move for the agenda?
MEMBER SANGHVI: So moved.
MEMBER VERMA: Second.
MEMBER SANGHVI: So moved. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. And say "Aye" to everybody and anybody say no, we can ...

MEMBER KRIEGER: Move to approve.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay.
Minutes?
Okay. We have a motion and everything is done.

All right. Public remarks, anyone having any remarks or anything regarding other than the cases we have on the ZBA, you can come up. Raise your hand. Apart from the agenda, anybody wants to -- do we have any remark on the agenda, now is the time they can speak.

Anybody is there for the agenda, Katherine? Can you look into that? Anybody's adding any agenda on this public remarks.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Mr. Joe Huang is present for this case. He is the applicant. As well as

Katherine McNerney -- (audio dropped).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIOBOYINA: Katherine, your voice is breaking up.
(Court reporter clarification.)
MS. OPPERMAN: Joe, were you asking about if the applicants were present for the first case?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No. No. Any public remarks.

MS. OPPERMAN: Oh, no.
Wait, actually, it looks like someone has raised their hand. Give me just a moment.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Let's see if anybody is in the public remarks.

MS. OPPERMAN: It looks like a gentleman from Shawood. I believe he has a comment regarding the case, but I'll check to see if he has a comment not relating to the first case on the agenda also since he's raising his hand now.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please make a note, Katherine, on who all raised their hand for the comments on the public remarks. Thank you.

Apart from that, any other things before going to the first case?


MR. HUANG: My name is J-o-e. Last name H-u-a-n-g and I'm a Novi resident. I swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you. Was Ms. McNerney, the current owner, also going to speak on the case or was she only available for comment, if necessary?

MR. HUANG: I'm -- she's not with me. She may join separately. So I have no control. Maybe they're running into technical difficulties, but she intend to join.

MS. OPPERMAN: She is present. We can unmute her, if needed. I just want to make sure she's also sworn in if she's going to speak on the case.

MR. HUANG: Okay. Very good.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: She's there?
MS. OPPERMAN: I believe she's muted right now. She will unmute herself or perhaps one of our IT can unmute her. I'm not certain.
(Zoom participant's connection echoing.)
MR. HUANG: May I start?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Before you start, she wants to talk. She wants to also be part of this case or how you want. Do you want to talk by
yourself?
MR. HUANG: Oh, I can do it. I can start myself. I want to present some background information and then $I$ think I should take around 10 minutes. I prepare a presentation, visual aids for help members to understand and for easy to understand my case. And then we can have more like an open discussion, if that's okay with everybody.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good, Joe.

MR. HUANG: Very good. My name is Joe Huang, and my wife is going to join me.

Both my wife and I moved to Novi on 2007. We raised both of our kids. Graduate now from Novi High School. We're long-time residence for almost 15 years timewise. And we're at the point we're looking for -we currently live in Liberty Park. It's a two floor and we have -- I have a mother-in-law living with us. She has very severe arthritis and also my wife is kind of like nervous when she get her age she going to have the same problem. So she, basically, make me to look for a ranch, move to a ranch house. And so at this point we finalized a location in the vacant lot in

Sherwood, which I'll bring up in a minute. It will give everybody a rough idea where it is. I assume everybody is a Novi resident.
(Document displayed.)
MR. HUANG: Does everybody see that? The screen?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, Joe.
MR. HUANG: Of course. That's the Shawood
Lake.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Do you want my computer?
MEMBER SANGHVI: (To female speaker) Well,
I'm okay here now.
MR. HUANG: And this is a ranch house we plan to build --

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Mav, can you mute? I'm sorry.
(Pause in record.)
MR. HUANG: Yeah. This is the ranch house we plan to build. It's about, like, a 2,500 square feet. Like, not too big, not too small. That's kind of like our future retire home. The reason we want to do it
now is we try to accommodate our mother-in-law who has very severe arthritis. She has a very difficult time climbing stairs.

Okay. Next slide.
(Document displayed.)
MR. HUANG: We have two requests in the variance that we --

MEMBER SANGHVI: I don't know. I can't hear anything.

MR. HUANG: Do you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, we can hear you now. We can hear you.

MR. HUANG: Okay. Request one, we reduce the watercourse setback from 25 feet to 10 feet. Currently waiting full compliance in the rear setback of 35 feet. We're in --

MEMBER SANGHVI: I can't hear anything.
MR. HUANG: -- full compliance setback of 30
feet. And our basement, the current elevation, is 936.7 feet, which is above a couple feet -- almost three feet above FEMA's floodplain. So that's the request. One, we really want just a small adjustment for our variance from 25 feet to 10 feet.

Now, you may ask, "Hey, Joe, how can you comply with rear setback of 35 feet, but fail to meet 25 feet like watercourse setback?"

I will let you know in a minute. The building engineer, Chris Webber (ph) asked me the same question, "Joe, is your measurements right?" I say, "Yeah, it is right."

And I'll show you a map right next to it, the next page. The request to, of course, increase of a lot coverage from 25 percent to 27 percent. So I calculate that's about, like, 200 square footage, about the size of a single car garage. That's kind of the coverage we're talking about.

Okay. So those are two requests. Any questions before I move on?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Go ahead.
MR. HUANG: Okay. Next page is I explained why is my math is correct. So on the back, and the Lot 18, which is the orange part, that's a 35 setback. So we're in compliance. This is the house. The footprint of where we plan to build. Of course, this is the property. Okay? So we're in compliance of front, of rear, left, right. Everything is in compliance.

Now, there's a thing called waterfront.
Because the property is in the middle of the water, there's a little inlet. Okay?

Now, if you class inlet as a watercourse -that's not Shawood Lake. That's just a little pond right adjacent to the Shawood Lake. So we kind of like here on the portion (ph) side that we discussed with survey engineer. So as a result of it, we classify this as a watercourse, the whole edge of the watercourse and you go from there to 35 -- I mean, 25 feet. That's where it ended up. So as you can see, we are not in compliance with the watercourse setback. That's where the problem is.

So the watercourse is the green side. Is a green shade. So I hope -- this is the line -- this is the survey engineer drawing. Basically, it's like a actual watercourse. I mean, watercourse setback line. So we're talking about we want to change this to -- in this case is a yellow line. This is like -- this was the 35 feet -- 25 feet setback and this is 10 feet setback. And with this variance, this house is complied with the rest of the code.

This is like an exposed version and this is,
basically, I cut and paste from the actual survey drawing. Everything is up to the scale.

Okay. Any question?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Please go ahead. We'll ask you to discuss later. You can continue.

MR. HUANG: Very good.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. HUANG: So justification for this
variance. It's, of course, the lot is a very unique feature. The property line is in the middle of the water and the lot boundary is drawn probably well before the watercourse setback is in effect. So that's like a very, like the county couldn't find any drawing regarding this lot. So it's very, very old. The lot faces a lake inlet and it has a very little impact on the overall Shawood Lake itself because it's a little lake inside a lake.

And also, by strictly applying all these setback rules, this single family home it's like a very -- become uneconomical to built it. Just imagine the house you cannot build anything in the backyard, no patio, no nothing. So it is like it will be a very
hard to continue with the current restriction. Also, we -- it's only -- there's 15 feet, which we'll show you in the picture, there is nothing in that area. It's happen to be just wild bushes. The environmental impact is very minimal. It's very dense wood and the deer wouldn't even go near that. It's a very difficult place. Which I'll show you in a minute. Also, there's another thing I want to emphasize. This is a little outside this variance and we -- while we purchased Lot 18, we also purchased the next lot which is called Lot 17. We use, basically, for conservation purpose. And so we're -- as a result of it, we would like to increase the coverage slightly such that we have entire Lot 17 will stay vacant for preservation purpose.

Okay. No visual. I would say very minimal impact on the surrounding neighborhood because the front of the house is about 46 feet.

Next page, this is the one I took a picture of the variance. It's about 15 feet. I used the tape measure. Because you see two red lines, that's where -- 15 feet is about the size of a Civic, the length of a Honda Civic. Okay?

So this is all dense wood. There's no big tree, no nothing. Everything is there all the way grow until the neighbor's fence. There's a six foot fence in the neighbor next door. So there's really nothing there. It's very rough terrain. I mean, I don't think a wild animal would want to go there.

So this is -- to give you an idea, this is from the property line of 17 to 18 look up that way. Okay? That's the direction.

So this is the area, the area we're seeking relief. It's a 15 feet strip. It's about a total square footage of about 1,000 square feet.

And the last page $I$ have is here's the little map about 17. This is a little outside this variance, but I want -- the members know it. Again, understand I want to preserve the nature and also have the least impact on the neighbors. As a result of it, we decided that we going to purchase the second lot next and we gonna -- all the area that -- this is right adjacent to Lakeshore Park and this is the area we're talking about. The red line is corresponding to this red line. So all these swamp is going to stay as it is. We're not going to touch it, okay, forever.

And the Lot 17, we're going to keep as it is and we'll -- there is like a little area like this. This is, like -- how shall I say? This is almost show up as a Disney horror movie, a horror scene. It's like bare. I don't know what happened. I mean, the soil is bare. I think there's quite a few soil erosion. And we'll figure out -- I'm going to hire some land escape expert to figure out what is wrong with it. We're not going to plant just regular grass. That's not what I meant. We tried to see if we can do something.

It might cost a little more, but I think I understand. I'm willing to invest such that it's more native to Lakeshore Boulevard -- I mean, Lakeshore Park. So we're going to put some vegetation on it to try to restore its natural state. But currently
there's quite a few soil erosion right here in this area.

So this is the preservation we plan to do. That's part of in the submission. This presentation is -- I submit as part of in this variance request. And overall, just give you -- the bottom line is this: By factoring in 18 and 17, the coverage -- now I'm requesting the 27 percent coverage. If you take out the 27 and divide by half of that -- I mean, 17, 18 is about the same size. So the coverage really is 13.5 percent. Strictly speaking.

Because from that -- I mean, it's just one house sitting the other side of the lot. And also, the watercourse offset. I mean, I'm taking away 1,000 feet, but the entire Lot 17 is like more than -- it's a quarter acre. It's about more than 10,000 feet.

Those are wild -- like a nature woods. We're going to preserve it. So you take it out 1,000 feet. I help the neighborhood gain 10,000 feet. Simple math. So that's, basically, as a part of a variance request I want to present, basically, for your consideration.

And that conclude my -- the main part of presentation. Now, I guess I'm open for comment.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, thank you,
Joe. Anybody would like to talk on this case?
Can you hear me?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. If you're looking for the public comments. The first individual we have is Katherine McNerney.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, before that I want to ask you a quick question. Did we do the approval of last month's meeting?

Did we move the motion for the approval of the meeting minutes last month, November?

MS. OPPERMAN: I thought we did that at the beginning of the meeting.

MEMBER VERMA: Yeah. Linda proposed it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I want to make sure that November monthly meeting minutes are approved.

MEMBER VERMA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody have any comments?

Seeing none. And let's move on that. Thank you.

Okay. And Katherine, we can see anybody in the comments, public remarks or anything want to say
anything on this case?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. We have a few people that are waiting to remark on this case.

Let's see. I know Ms. McNerney was raising her hand a moment ago. It doesn't look like she is any longer. She is the current owner of the property.

Right now the only individual raising their hand is Karina Urm, if you could allow her to speak. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. Go ahead.

KARINA URM: (Garbled audio.)
(Court reporter interposing for clarification.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry. We are not able to hear you, Karina.

KARINA URM: (Garbled audio.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm not hearing you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you move to the next thing, Katherine? Anybody is there?

MS. OPPERMAN: I --

MR. URM: Can you hear me? Hello, can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, we can hear
you.
MR. URM: I'm sorry. The setup is -actually Karina is my daughter's name. I'm sorry. I'm using her school Zoom. My name is Calmer (ph) Urm and my wife here is next to me, Christi. And I'm trying to see. I was going to show you myself.

Can you see us or no?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No.
MEMBER SANGHVI: We can't see you.
MR. URM: Okay. So I don't know what is going on with that.

Okay. That's fine. So we are the neighbors across the street, a little bit to the right from this development and we lived here for five years. And we're really concerned because this house going to be really long going to the -- we're going to be looking at the extra feet on the side. It's going to be the biggest house in this neighborhood.

And it is in a corner, corner of a lake which is really quiet right now and there is nothing other than wildlife. And we realized when we moved there five years ago it's going to be a house built there. Right. And, you know, whatever the zoning laws on it,

I mean, it's fine, for the size of it.
I saw the presentation from Mr. Joe and it seems like he's very passionate and he wants to move to the neighborhood and, you know, it's good to hear. But I'm really concerned why he wants to build a house -he buys two lots and why he wants to move the house right --

CHRISTI URM: At the very edge.
MR. URM: At the very edge of two lots. And it's just next door to my neighbor John. Because that would make this corner really crowded and it's a huge house. So preservation is all nice, but, you know, this house, if he wants to build a bigger house, it should be positioned in the middle of these two lots and it would be much -- the neighborhood would be much better deserved because it is kind of in the wooded area and it would fit nicely in. Because this makes this corner very crowded.

And this lake, this is a nice lake. It is, you know, a little bit grown in and it's kind of natural preserve and there's a lot of wildlife there. It's just -- visually this house, talking to the neighbors, it's not a good fit here.

And I don't know, you know, I guess, you know, you have to kind of be here and see it because in the plans it's difficult to kind of explain it. Because, you know, on the lakeside all the houses are smaller. And especially kind of in our area, there is a brand new house got built in our street here by code and it fits nicely in. So we're really concerned about the size and the visual effect it has to this corner. Because a lot of people -- all our neighborhood uses that corner to enter to the park. That's also the entrance to the city park and that house is going to be right on the corner of that and it's going to look more of a city development with no greenery around it. Because that one corner is green already where he's talking about saving --

CHRISTI URM: The other tree is going to be cut down.

MR. URM: Yeah. The other tree is going to be cut down.

But I'd rather to have a compromise. If he wants to have a same size of a house, that should be moved to that other lot or closer to the other lot so this lot can really not be developed ever. Because
right now the promise is this lot is going to be saved by the nature preserve. We're going to have a next meeting when we're talking about the variance to build another big house on that lot and now the neighbor would be all for it. So we are kind of concerned about all the development here.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Katherine, can you see anybody raising their hand?

Yes. There is Mr. George Doulaveris, I believe.

MR. DOULAVERIS: Can you guys hear me? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIOBYINA: Yeah.

MR. DOULAVERIS: I'm sorry. I shut my phone off.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead.

MR. DOULAVERIS: Okay. My name is George Doulaveris. I live directly across from the property that's asking for the variance in that 2477 Shawood. For one, I don't know that it's that important, but all that area that has no grass and all that, it's all deer and all animals that are there. So if Mr. Huang is concerned about the animals, I'm thinking he probably
wouldn't even want to build over there because it's a trail that goes right through there.

But regardless of that, guys, I don't think that's a problem. I think the point is the house is, like Cal said, a little oversized. I don't know that he -- there is a hardship on him. I think he can meet the requirements of the ordinances if he either makes the house smaller and/or uses both lots to accommodate what he's trying to do.

So that's why I would think we would go ahead and I would ask -- I don't support this and I don't think anybody -- we submitted all our paperwork in the area. We all had concerns and we all sent in objections to this item for multiple reasons.

I mean, it's a self-induced hardship. He's the one that put the plan on. If he needs the square footage, it can go multiple floors and/or he can build on both lots like Cal said. I mean, that's -- it's probably worse for me because I'm directly in front and I've got a second floor living area and it's going to basically block -- I'll be looking at a roof either way.

But I'm more concerned that it's too big.

And in the reference in his application, he brings up one of the variances that was approved a while back, Warner house, and, you know, that place is an eyesore. It's just too big compared to everything else that's over there.

And all the other houses that are on that side have a lot smaller footprint. So it's definitely -- besides crowding out John, who was the neighbor on the -- I guess I want to say the north side. If I'm right, maybe I'm wrong.

But it's, basically, the only house on the same side of the lake. It's going to be, you know, blocking his view and if he moves it front toward more to me, I'm going to be looking at more of a house and it's going to block more of our views, too. So for that reason I'm thinking I would like to see him, you know, come across with something else.

I don't think anybody is objecting to the building. I just think we want him to meet the code that is there. And, you know, he's buying the lot. It's not like he had the lot and the lot was shrunk down where it is causing a hardship. This is something he's going into with it. So ...

If anything, if you guys feel the need to approve this as is, I'm thinking I would ask that maybe we table this thing and try to get a deed restriction put on the other lot so another house doesn't go in prior to approving it. But I guess I'll let everybody else go into it and get their opinions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, George.

MR. DOULAVERIS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, the public remarks is the maximum a three-minute limit?

MS. OPPERMAN: Per person, I believe. But I'd have to confirm that with Beth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, Beth, can you answer that?

MS. SAARELA: You guys have that in your rules. I know City Council has that. I don't know if you guys have a three-minute time limit.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. We used to do three minutes on public remarks.

Am I right, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: You are correct, Joe. It is a three limit time frame.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, three
minutes. Anybody want remarks, you know, public, not more than three minutes. Please make a note, thank you.

Any other, Katherine, public remarks on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There's Shelley Stenger, I believe, is the next one.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you make a note on the timing also, Katherine? Please follow-up on that. Thank you.

MS. STENGER: Hello?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, Shelley. Please go ahead.

MS. STENGER: Hi. How are you? I'm Shelley Stenger. I'm the listing agent for the property and I have spoken to a handful of the neighbors since last May when I first listed the properties. They're the two lots. They are listed -- they're owned by two people, two separate people. And when I first put up my signs, I did speak with George, the gentleman that just spoke. And his home is actually several square feet larger than this ranch home they're preparing to
build on the lot.
George does have a large home. I know he's in construction, a very nice man. And he actually spoke with me about purchasing the lots initially for quite a low price. He wanted to pay 35,000 to buy the one lot that we're talking about this evening and so he could put a garage up and also park -- a parking area so can he park his construction vehicles and so forth and make a garage there.

I told him that we weren't going to sell it for 35,000 because that was really low and I didn't think a garage would be nice on the lake. I didn't think the neighbors would appreciate looking at a garage and a bunch of trucks.

So the fact that the buyers would like to put a custom ranch home on there that is smaller than George's home and some of the other homes on the street, $I$ think is a really -- I think it's a good idea to put a ranch because that is a much nicer profile for the lot and it doesn't obstruct a lot of the view and you can't -- the fact that they want to keep the second lot open.

I mean, they could put two houses on both
lots. That's their right if they're purchasing both lots, but they just want to put one house. And it's not a huge house. I don't know why everyone thinks under 2,500 square feet is a big house.

The other thing I did speak with John, who filed the initial complaint, and he was also interested in purchasing the lots as he spoke to me back in May, but he said he couldn't afford to buy them. I know that a lot of the neighbors are using the properties, from what $I$ have seen evidence of it -- I haven't seen people on the properties. But there are several boats that are parked there that the neighbors are using, apparently. And there is some trails on there from other people using the properties and also a trail going to John's property where there's a pile of yard waste, tree branches and so forth that it looks like he's been putting on my client's property as well, bird feeders and so forth.

So I think a lot of the neighbors use my client's property as they wish and they want to keep it that way. They don't want anyone to build a house there because then they won't be able to keep their boats there or use it as they wish. So I don't think
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that's right. And the fact that this is going to be a beautiful custom ranch home. And it's not that large, I don't see why people are complaining about that. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Anybody else can talk. Katherine, can you see anybody?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There's Mr. John Karakian. Again, forgive me if I've mispronunciated that last name.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Hi, John. Are you there?

MR. KARAKIAN: Yes. Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: John, yeah, we can hear you. You have three minutes to talk, please.

MR. KARAKIAN: Okay. First of all, there's a lot of mistaken comments going. Number one, Shelley just spoke. I never told her I wanted to buy that lot. I called her up one time. I asked her how much the lots were going for. She told me. She asked me if I wanted to buy 'em. I said no, I don't want to buy 'em. She asked me. I didn't ask her. That's number one. Number two, she talks about all those tree limbs in there. Those are falling from the branches in the lot onto my property and I throw them back on that
property. That's not no yard waste that the neighbors are throwing over there like we'd like to have that lot for our own personal yard waste area. That's another misnomer. So that's two misnomers she said right there.

Also, as far as Joe, the applicant, saying that he wants to buy this -- the lot that is a little pond connected to a lake or a little lake inside a lake, none of that's true. That's all part of Shawood Lake and I think all the zoning board members know that when he says that.

Also, how about he said it's a -- he said that property is a Disney horror show. Why would he want to buy a Disney horror show if it's that bad? Who would want to buy a Disney horror show? How could you sell a Disney horror show. He said there's no animals in there because it's a Disney horrow show. There's all kind of deer and sand cranes and ducks and geese and you name it. It's like a wildlife preserve there. It's not no Disney horror show.

Also, the area that he said is a -- Lot 17 soil erosion, it's not soil erosion. It's ground, regular ground over there. And so I -- it's just a lot
of misnomers that are being said. Apparently, out of a passion to, like, make a sell. And whatever the zoning members do is fine, but $I$ think you've got the 25-foot variance there.

And like George says, there's no hardship other than induced hardship that the applicant wants to make it 27. A hardship on him because he wants to make it 27 because it's 25. So I don't see any already existing hardship and I think he's going into it eyes wide open knowing it's a 25 -foot variance.

Also, he wants to set back closer to the lake is what I understand. Which would cut down on the privacy of my backyard because my deck is setback. And also my neighbor's backyard, his deck is setback. We're behind the tree line. And Joe would be closer to the lake past the tree line. He could look right in our backyards and all that. So we'd lose our privacy.

So me and my three minutes are about up. I hope you could hear me okay.

Are you there?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. KARAKIAN: Could you hear me okay so far?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, we can. We can hear you, John. So go ahead.

MR. KARAKIAN: That's about it. You heard me and I agree with the other comments said by Cal across the street and George next door to him. So I wanted to bring attention to the misnomers stated by Shelley and also embellishments by Joe and Shelley. Those are not correct comments they're making about Disney horror show and I called up and asked if I can buy. None of that is true. She asked me. I didn't ask her.

That's all. I'm done. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, John. Thanks for your time. And Katherine, anybody other than this gentleman?

MS. OPPERMAN: It does look like Shelley's raising her hand again. It's up to the board's discretion if they want to call her back now that she's already had her three minutes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No. Apart from Shelley, any other?

MS. OPPERMAN: No one else is raising their hand.

Oh. Again, there's someone that has spoken again.

No their hand has gone down. No one else has raised their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine. I appreciate your time on this.

Okay. Thank you so much for Joe and your presentation. And the remaining members on what they say, we are going to look into that.

And let me see. Apart from that, I would like to ask Larry, any comments from the City, please?

MR. BUTLER: (No audio response.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Larry?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Larry, can you unmute?

MR. BUTLER: (No audio response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Larry, we can't hear you, Larry.

MR. BUTLER: (No audio response.)
MR. PETERSON: Hello, can you hear me now? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yup.

MR. PETERSON: This is Jerry Peterson.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no. I'm asking

Larry.
MR. PETERSON: Larry. Are you not hearing me, Jerry Peterson? Because my red mute has finally come off.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Where are you from, Jerry?
MR. PETERSON: I am the owner of the
property, number 17. And I'm at Katie's house right now. She is not able to get the Zoom working, but she can talk on my space right here.

MR. HUANG: Just for the members, the two lots owned by two different people.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: One second. No, no. One at a time. No, don't talk, please, anybody. Just going back with Jerry. Jerry?

MR. PETERSON: Yes. My comments are, you know, there's a bunch of rowboats and stuff on the property and there is a number of yard waste things that's dumped on the property from I don't know who else is taking it back there, I would imagine it would be from neighbors. I don't think people are going out of their way to look for that property to dump on. I
know we're not putting things on the property. Katie and I know each other. We're neigh- -- we each own one of the lots.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So you own Lot 17, Jerry?
MR. PETERSON: Yes.
MR. KRIEGER: And you're selling it?
MR. PETERSON: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.
MS. McNERNEY: I'm here, too. I'm Katie. I own the Lot 18.

MR. PETERSON: And she can't get the Zoom to work.

MS. McNERNEY: But I couldn't get my Zoom to work so I'm using Jerry's.

MEMBER KRIEGER: That's fine. We can hear you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, Kate.
MS. McNERNEY: So I guess there was
complaints that our property is the way they get on to the park property, but there's a trail just on the road that I've gone on many times. So they don't need to access our property to go on to the park. I mean, it
is a beautiful corner, but, you know, it's a property that needs a home. And John -- Joe's building a beautiful home there. And, you know, maybe these people are not happy to not be able to use that property as their own anymore but, you know, we have the right to sell it and we need to. You know, it's hard times so let someone enjoy that property. It's beautiful.

I can't think of what else really needs to be said about that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. MCNERNEY: Okay. Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Katherine, there's no more comments. We don't allow anymore and we're closing the public remarks, am I right?

Katherine?
MS. McNERNEY: Me?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I can't hear you, Katherine.

MS. McNERNEY: Me? Are you talking to me, Katherine?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You're all set. No,

Katherine from the City.
MS. McNERNEY: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Katherine, thank you.

And all right. We have -- what about the City? Larry, can you hear me? Larry?

MR. BUTLER: (No audio response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Larry?
MEMBER KRIEGER: We can't hear you, Larry.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So we can see if there's correspondence and then let Larry come back to us.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes. Go ahead.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Larry? Okay, Larry, we can't hear you. We're moving to the correspondence.

Katherine, acting secretary for today's meeting, any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. In this case there were 19 letters mailed out. There were none that were returned. We had 12 objections. Of those, five were not included in the original mailing. They were other neighbors that weren't within the 300 foot buffer, and there were no approvals.

Let's see. So we had a letter from Mr. John Karakian. I apologize for any mispronunciation of names. He had spoken.

His letter is quite long so I'm going to summarize it briefly. Essentially, he's concerned that the dwelling will be too large. He believes that the zoning code should be strictly followed. So, you know, 25 percent without the setback.

He's concerned about the new home overwhelming the property and about the current maple (ph) state and about it potentially devaluing other homes due to it being larger scale than them.

Let's see. There's a second one. This is also from a gentleman who spoke, Mr. Urm. His statement is, "The proposed house is too big for the location and will negatively effect the surrounding area."

There's one again from Mr. George, who is at 2477, who spoke. His objection as written is: "The footprint is too large and out of place for the location."

We have a -- Mr. and Mrs. Minis (ph) at 240 Pleasant Cove they say they object and recommend
following the current zoning regulations.
Mr. Damon Brown, he objects because it will disrupt the wildlife, view of the woods and the lake, interfere with his privacy, will reduce the light and overshadow the home. That there will be additional noise and disturbance, loss of trees and potentially more traffic and roadblocks.

Mr. Ethan Fuller, his objection is that the structure may be too large for the lot and cluttered for the street.

Mr. Tom Krom at 2320 Crowne Drive. His objection is the proposed home is a little large. Reduce the size for neighbor's visibility of the lake.

Patricia Gibson, her objection is the building would be way too big, blocking the view of the lake. Too much building and the wildlife will have no place to go.

Mr. and Mrs. Kean, the lot is too small to support such a large house.

Troy Grappin (ph) the objection is the codes are put into effect for a reason. If you change one, there will always be someone else wanting the same treatment. It is not a large lot and it's on the water
so the codes need to be followed.
Cory Caucus (ph) simply circled objection and did not write any comments.

And then the last one is from Marc Adams. He believes the vacant land should be put into a conservation easement and he has some concerns regarding the soil condition and the builder is aware of what is going to be required for building the foundation on the lot.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine.

And coming back to the City. Larry, any comments from the City, please?

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

MEMBER KRIEGER: Good to hear you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Larry. I appreciate it.

MR. HUANG: Mr. Chairman, can I make a comment before we go any further? There's a few neighbors, my future neighbor's comment I do want to have an opportunity to respond to that, if I may? Five minutes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No. We can't right now. We already took enough time and we are late enough for so many people. I put it on the board and the board can decide it.

MR. HUANG: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Joe, for your presentation at today's meeting. And, you know, due to the COVID, you know, personally we're not able to meet in person at all the meetings.

And all the remaining neighbors and all the people and the realtor and the homeowners, thank you for your joining the call. I seen all those things and I'll keep this case in front of the board members, their comments, and we can move from there.

I'm open to the board. They can talk. Thank you.

Any comments from the board, please?
Michael?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Does it seem like moving the house over to the left would cure a lot of the problems?

MR. HUANG: You're asking me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Joe, you have
to answer this question for Mike, for the board member.

MR. HUANG: As a matter of fact, there was original like a proposal from the architect. We merge like 17 and 18 together and then we build a -- you think about just current house and you rotate it like a 90 degree and then, as a matter of fact, we did not adopt it just for the very reason we concerned impact the neighbors. That's one primary reason.

Because when you do that, the house looks much bigger than today because right now it's about 46 feet of the front. If you rotate that and add all the three-car garage and all these nicety, then it become almost like double the size. So we think it's like enormous. And the other thing is a concern about environment. I mean, we're thinking, hey, if we rotate that it's gorgeous. The house going to be gorgeous, don't get me wrong. We're going to love it. The problem is I think the backyard is going to be all -the lake is going to be all to ourself, which we don't have a problem. The wildlife can still come here. That's not a problem. It's just like a human activity in us we kind of like intrude to animals like a
territory, their existing feeding ground. So that's why we come up with this idea. Just the very reason we try to be friendly to the neighbors, friendly to the environment and friendly to the wildlife.

To the neighbor, the house looks smaller. I hear a lot of complaining about oversized. Right now it's about -- I mean, 46 feet and then if you rotate it to take up two lots, it's going to be a lot bigger. I'm probably going to have a much bigger complaint.

But, again, this is fully compliant with the zoning law when we combine the lot together and we do it. And it's just like we feel -- I mean, we want -- I mean, the animal -- I mean, if we would put the Lot 17 vacant on the side, nobody going to interfere with it. I mean, there's one member saying are you going to do anything with that? I say, well, you have my sworn testimony for this board, we're not going to build anything most likely in our lifetime and we also have a fully submitted site plan already have this Lot 17 included. We're going to leave as a -- like a weld (ph).

And also to -- again, $I$ feel sorry like if $I$ say it's a Disney horror movie. It's just like a very
little portion of it. I would say like less than one fifth it's pretty bad.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael?
MR. HUANG: And we went to restore the vegetation. I mean, it's like it become nice and we're --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Excuse me. Through the Chair, I'm sorry, sir, but you're repeating and it's distracting from our ability to participate.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Member
Thompson, do --
MR. HUANG: I apologize.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Thompson, do you have any other questions on this?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Well, the first one wasn't really answered. I didn't say rotate it. I just said move it over to the left.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I think that would be a question for Larry in the City, if those two things would be -- if the two lots would be merged together. Otherwise, it's one lot and we're interfering with side lots. So I think that would be a Larry question.

MR. HUANG: If why move it? I mean, I will
violate of a side setback. The lot line is through there, right? Right now I'm in perfect compliance of Lot 18. I mean, it's like right now it's like -- I think combined it's like 25 feet. I'm in perfect compliance. If $I$ move in the middle, then I'm in violation of the side setback then $I$ can come to this board again.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Larry, could I ask
something?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Well, one second --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: There's a process by which he can combine the lots, right?

MR. BUTLER: Who is asking the question?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I am, Clift. Clift is asking the question.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: He can combine those lots, which would mean -- one of the concerns I heard was we approve this, somebody builds there, he sells off the one lot and he says he's not going to, but they'd build another. If he combines the lots, then it's tied to this one development. And you can look at other
options, obviously, but what would he have to do to combine the lots.

MR. BUTLER: He would have to go back to the City with that and first he would have to see if he can combine the lots and build the property on both lots. Normally, the property is on one lot. So if he's going to combine it into one lot, he's going to have to go back and start all over again at the drawing board, basically.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Let me talk to the members one second, everybody. Before finishing one board member, let's go to the other board member as we should. I request of everybody.

Member Thompson, are you done with talking or do you have any other questions, going back to you?

MEMBER THOMPSON: That would be my only question.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. What about Member Krieger. Do you have any other question?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, please.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm concerned about when you're building in the back that the water -- you spoke nothing of the foundation. I'm not familiar with foundations. I am familiar with water and flooding and how that changes the foundation. That it might cause cracks and what impact that would be for us to allow such a thing. And then also the height, I can't understand the height of the building. So would it be the height of a two-story house or -- because I can't find it.

So those two are my concerns, two beginning concerns. And then the third one is the question about Lot 17, if he owns that lot, that -- and he's saying that he won't, but as time goes by people change and things happen, what would be done regarding that. And so I have -- I guess, too many concerns and I don't know if the neighbors were all participating. So I'd -- if those things can be addressed or table it, but I have too many concerns to approve anything tonight.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

And going back to Member Montague, do you
have any other question, please?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: No. No. I was following up on their talk about moving it on the lot is why $I$ put it in. I apologize, but that was my question. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Thank you, Member Montague. Thank you so much.

Any other -- okay. Member Mav, okay, you're raising your hand. Please go ahead, Member Sanghvi. MEMBER SANGHVI: Hi. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, sir. Thank you so much. Go ahead.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Well, I went and visited this area the other day and it's always difficult when the lots have been vacant for so long and when you build on it, it's not a very popular thing to do when you see new people coming in. But every lot, whenever they build anything in this area or renovate anything, they always require quite a lot of variances because these variances were -- these ordinances were developed long after these lots were made. So you cannot build anything without variances at all.

And so I know there are a lot of questions
about it. But looking at the size of the plot, I think they cannot build anything without variances and we have been granting variances in the entire in this near the Walled Lake for many, many years. I have been on the board here for almost 20 years and this is going to be a problem every time anybody wants to build a new thing or renovate anything. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to speak tonight, please?

Okay, Member Verma, please go ahead.
MEMBER VERMA: My question is in the back, there's a -- the owner says it's a pond and one of the person on the other side said it's a part of the lake. Is it a lake or is it a small pond?

MR. HUANG: It's called inlet. I can pull up the Google map, if that's what you want.

MEMBER KRIEGER: There's Shawood Lake and Walled Lake.

MR. HUANG: It's Shawood Lake. Just hold on a second it's very simple.

It's hard to describe it. I can zoom in very
closely. I get into the satellite thanks for the modern technology.

And I'm going to share that picture. That's a classic case of a picture is worth a thousand words. Let me share this.
(Document displayed.)
MR. HUANG: Okay. See, everybody? So this is where the vacant lot. So this is called an inlet. And this is a little land, as little like a stream. This is the entire Shawood. So this is a little pond. This is the proposed like the construction.

Does that make sense?
MEMBER VERMA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Thank you, Joe.

And any other board member who would like to speak tonight on this case, please?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I just have a real quick question.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead.
MEMBER SANKER: I appreciate the comments and
I appreciate the presentation. That was very helpful.

So thank you.
So have you tried to build -- I know you can combine the two lots and build it sideways or turn it 90 degrees and fit without any variances, but when you try to build it with the 25 -foot minimum setback from the water side, I guess, have you attempted to draw out a house that you can use within the variance of Lot 18?

MR. HUANG: We try it. None of them is -- I guess it's like satisfactory. Because the waterfront, I mean, I read -- there's a strict interpretation. Basically, you cannot do anything with the backyard, not even a deck. So a house without a deck, that's a -- and a patio, anything like this. Basically, nothing in there, according to the code. So that's kind of like where the hardship is. Does that make sense?

MR. SANKER: It does make sense. And I tend to agree with Member Mav and his sentiments that that area is tough because of the lake. And, you know, the two percent increase on the square footage, you know, isn't that huge? And because of the, you know, lot's configuration, you know, it's hard to fit anything that is adequate in this day and age on a lot like that.

And so I tend to approve it.
MR. HUANG: Yeah, there's a precedent in 2006, if you may, and that's in the same street on Austin. I believe it's this zoning board approved the variance. You guess where the 27 percent coming from. That's where I got it. I say, "Hey, I'm not asking anything like extraordinary."

There's a precedent in 2006. This particular zoning board approved a front setback as well as a 27 percent like increase coverage from 25 percent coverage. So ...

MEMBER SANKER: Thanks. I appreciate that. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanker.

And anybody would like to speak on this? Member Krieger, you're saying something? MEMBER KRIEGER: Through the chair, the precedent in every case is reviewed uniquely. So to say that we're setting a precedent is like a rubber stamp and that's not true. We look at each individual case and that -- I guess to go back to the 100 year flood. I have a stream in my background. I know all about water and worrying water about coming in the
house. So, yes, that area needs variances. I just have a --

MR. HUANG: As a matter of fact, if I may, the builder going to put some structure sand in there. He told me you don't even need to put a sump pump in there. You know why, because the low land. So we going to put the sand and raise the floor up a bit. So because the sand will serve a very nice drain. So you never going to see -- the sump pump never going to work. That's according to -- my builder told me that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So you're increasing your -you're changing the topography. So what's your height going to be?

MR. HUANG: I have on the presentation -I'll give you the exact figure.

It's 9 -- (audio dropped) -- feet elevation.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: We can't hear you. Can you speak one more time?

MR. HUANG: Yeah. It's nine 936.7 feet above
the sea level.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. Above sea level.

MR. HUANG: The water -- I mean, the FEMA is 934. So, in other words, we're three feet above the flooding. One hundred year FEMA flooding, the actual water level going to be even a couple foot lower than that. It's going to be probably 933 or 932, something like that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So to the City, what does -I mean, in comparison to the rest of the area of the street, across the street, where does that -- does it all come to 934?

MR. HUANG: 934 is the FEMA. I mean, basically, the --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right. Right. I understand that. I'm talking about if $I$ have a house across the street and I look across the street --

MS. SAARELA: Let me.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Beth, you can go ahead.

MS. SAARELA: We're getting in to flood plain regulations here. That's governed by the building code.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right.
MS. SAARELA: Yeah. The building plans are going to be reviewed as a separate issue by the building department. It's going to have to meet code as far as foundation requirements for that area and also as far as what kind of construction would need to be done in the floodplain.

Larry, I would assume at this point if there is any height variances needed, we would have looked at that already.

MR. BUTLER: Yes, we would.
MS. SAARELA: I think this might not be relevant to the variances that are in front of the board today. Two of them, the potential for flooding, foundation and the construction that needs to be done as far as a floodplain, that's all building related.

MR. BUTLER: It's, basically, if he hasn't really had a chance to look at the soil, he's going to have other options where he may have to put in pylons or whatever. But that's something he has to come back to the City for with his design and stuff later down the road. Instead of putting sand, you're going to have to put pylons in or something just to keep the
house from sinking and allow water to go through. But that would be at another meeting at another time.

But you're correct, Beth. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry. Linda, are you done?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes, thank you, Joe.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And Mr. Sanghvi? Member Sanghvi, you're raising your hand?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. I just wanted to point out that in this area the water table will be very high and sometimes you find water getting up to five or seven feet underneath.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member before I close this up on members speaking?

And other than that, $I$ can call for a motion. For Michael, Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes. Thank you. I move that we grant the variance for the case for the things that we need to look at here for the PZ20-0053 sought by Mr. Joe Z. Huang for the -- for the coverage issue as
well as the watercourse.
Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring fitting a home on those lots, which is pretty typical. Without the variance the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with the respect to the use of the property because the size of the house would have to be much smaller.

The property is unique because of the water. The water line that comes and cuts, frankly, at an angle. So it really makes it a much smaller depth that he has. The petitioner did not create the condition, because he's purchasing a predefined lot or parcel.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because it fits in very nicely. I drove by there. It fits in very nicely with the neighborhood. It's narrow so it doesn't cut down the view of the lake.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. And Katherine, can you please call for the roll call.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Give me just one moment. I just have to finish my note real fast.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
(A brief pause.)
MS. OPPERMAN: Calling roll. Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: That is ...
Beth?
MS. SAARELA: Yup.
MS. OPPERMAN: My apologies. I've got four
yesses and five (sic) noes of the full eight-person board. I know it takes four to pass, but seeing that there's five noes, is that a fail?

MS. SAARELA: Yes. That's going to fail. So we probably should have a motion to deny, then.

MR. SANKER: Someone who said no should make a motion to deny.

MS. SAARELA: Correct. And what the basis is for the denial.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Joe?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I move that we deny the variance to case number PZ20-0054 sought by the petitioner because of not showing a practical difficulty regarding the setback to the rear. The circumstances and features of the property, including the topography, location, are not unique. They exist through the city -- or a lot of areas that have water issues and percent of distances, that the percent increase have not shown practical difficulties. The circumstances and features of the property relating to the variance request are self-created because they were -- the house could be built within the ordinance
as designed.
The failure to grant relief will result in mere inconvenience or inability to obtain a higher income or financial return based on the petitioner's statements that the -- that they would be able to with the lesser -- without the variance and as done by ordinance.

The variance would result in interference with adjacent and surrounding properties because of the increase in the percentage. And granting the variance would be inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it would be different to the neighboring properties.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And somebody can make a second.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I would second that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Katherine, any other things you want to on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: We would have to take a vote again on the motion, correct, Beth?

MS. SAARELA: Yes. You would have to call a roll on the motion to deny.

MS. SAARELA: That still fails and the motion to deny is still necessary.

MS. OPPERMAN: All right. So Chairperson Peddiboyina?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
(No audio response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're on mute.
Can you unmute, please?
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: I didn't catch your response, Member Longo. Could you please repeat it?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes. In favor of the denial.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?

MEMBER VERMA: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: That is a five to four vote, five to three vote for denial. The motion passes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

MR. HUANG: Thank you everybody for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
All right. That brings us to -- I know this case took a long time. And let's move to the next case for tonight.

PZ20-0054, C-o-y Construction, Coy
Construction, 23403 Mystic Forest Drive, west of Novi Road and a south of Ten Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-27-429-006. The applicant is requesting a variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 for a proposed 30 -foot rear yard setback, 35 feet required, a variance of five feet.

This variance will accommodate the building of a new deck and sunroom. This property is zoned
single family residential, R-4.
Is the applicant present, sir?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: The applicant is
present?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: Pardon me just a moment.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you see the applicant? Maybe he's on mute.

MS. OPPERMAN: I'm happy to check.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Coy Construction.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Coy Construction.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: If he's not there, I'll move to the second case and we'll bring back if he's available in the final. Is it okay, Board?

THE BOARD: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Going to case number three, PZ20-0055, Cambridge of Novi, LLC 49305 Villa Drive, west of Beck Road and north of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-29-326-040. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance,

Section 28-5(a) footnote 3, for a proposed 51 square foot, eight-feet-tall neighborhood entryway ground sign. The sign is oversized by 31.57 square feet and over height by three feet. This property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Is the applicant present, Cambridge of Novi, LLC?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Mr. Guidobono?
MS. OPPERMAN: It looks like there's a Mr. Jeff Wild, who $I$ know is the designer for that sign. And, yes, Mr. Guidobono is also present.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes. I am present. Can you hear me?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, you are there? Okay. You are the Cambridge of Novi, LLC?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Sorry for keeping you long day. I know for the first case, it took me a long time. I'm watching you, you're going and coming back in your house. Thank you so much and now you can proceed to what you want to say and what we can help on the board.

MS. OPPERMAN: I'll need him to state his name and be sworn in.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes. My name is Mark Guidobono. I live at 47765 Bellagio Drive in Novi. I'm the owner of Cambridge Homes and I'd be happy to make this presentation to the ZBA today.

MS. OPPERMAN: Pardon. My apologies. Do you swear or affirm to the tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. GUIDOBONO: I do.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Katherine. I appreciate your time of reminding me on sworn.

And Mark, please go ahead. What do you want to do the presentation or whatever. You have a couple minutes and move on that and where we can help you on the board.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Thank you. I'm going to share the screen here.

So let's see where I want to start on this. And hit share.
(Document displayed.)

MR. GUIDOBONO: Okay. The location of the wall -- and I don't even know if $I$ want to start there. I think I'd like to start here. Can everybody see the sign here?

I feel there is community value to adding our name or developer and builder of Bellagio and Tuscany Reserve. Terra was just -- won the award for development of the year in Southeastern Michigan. I think this is a value to the community and in reality, we're only asking for five square feet to be able to have our name right there on this sign.

The second thing that $I$ would like to point out is the height of the sign is the second thing we're asking for on the variance the -- of the wall, I should say. Not the sign.

Our wall here at this point is eight foot. At this point it's four feet. At this point it's three feet. And what we've done is -- I'm going to go to this document here.

We're almost 70 feet to the center line of the wall with this wall. We put in a lot of landscaping including a bunch of evergreens to screen this from the neighbor to the west, and I can show you
a photograph here. Let's find it.
(Document displayed.)
MR. GUIDOBONO: The wall is in already. We were going to put either cedar or what is called longboard in this location with our sign. We're using natural materials to blend in with the community. To blend in with the theme of this community, which is taking a -- using a Frank Lloyd Wright designs. So we're trying to blend this wall in with the types of houses that are going on in this community.

So here is our model. The wall is designed after our model and it just blends in with the natural surroundings. We're using a lot of natural materials and we believe this would be a benefit. We didn't realize at the time when we designed this, that there was an eight-foot requirement. And we put in the masonry portion of the wall already.

We respectfully request your approval, but this development will be an asset to the city of Novi.

MR. WILD: I don't believe they can see the photo, Mark.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Can you see the -- yeah, you
can't see the photo with the wall and the landscaping behind it?

MR. WILD: That is correct.
MR. GUIDOBONO: Yeah, so that -- and there's going to be indirect lighting on this wall. It's actually going to have rope lighting. Underneath this edge of the limestone, there will be rope lighting which will be shining a mood type lighting along this whole wall to make it kind of glow at night, this little stone wall area right here.

I'm happy to answer any questions that any of you may have, but you can notice all the landscaping that we put in here in the wintertime. We still have blockage from the neighbor to the west.

MR. WILD: Do you mind resharing that photo that everybody can see?

MR. GUIDOBONO: People can't see this photo?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Just the diagram with the circle of the trees.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Okay. I got to figure out how to do this, then.

Let's see, new share.
Can you see it now?

MEMBER VERMA: No.
MR. GUIDOBONO: Could you see the model?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Just in our own computers.
MR. GUIDOBONO: Okay. So let's go to the model and see if this works.
(Document displayed.)
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, we can see.
MR. GUIDOBONO: Here's the materials that we're using on the sign to blend in with the community. This is all tied in to blend in with nature. When we develop this site, we put in smaller sites to preserve 50 percent of the trees on the site. This is something the City of Novi approved and it's all styled under the Frank Lloyd Wright blend-in-with-nature type of feel. These are ranch homes. This is geared towards empty nesters. The name of the community is called Terra.

And the other thing I wanted to show you was the ...

Here it is. This is the actual wall that's already built. It's the same stone that you saw in that last house and we're going to put some cedar in this area with the Scienterra that I showed you. We'll
either be using cedar or longboard, which gives us the exact same look. So it will be a cedar look right here in stone that will match what we have going on in the community. These are columns that host the gate here. And at the time we put this doggone wall in, we didn't realize, but with this distance from the wall scale is important. We feel this is appropriate for this location and for this size. It's not overpowering and it will blend right in with nature.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other things before you conclude?
MR. GUIDOBONO: I would be happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

And, Katherine, is there any in the audience would like to speak on this case or anybody raising any hand or anything? Can you watch on the Zoom?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. It does looks like there's one person. They're listed only as Zoom User.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Can you take off your screen, please, the sharing one? MR. GUIDOBONO: Oh, okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Hello, audience. Anybody would like to speak on this case before we move? Can you unmute yourself? Thank you.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay. Our acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence for this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: For this case there were 12 letters mailed. No letters returned. No objections. There were six approvals mailed and five of those were not in the mailing list but I believe they're future homeowners of the properties, and have no comments.

First approval is from Jessica Shehab. She
says she is in favor of the new entrance sign to Terra. She will be building a home in the subdivision and the sign is classy and aesthetically pleasing in its current size.

And there Howard and Jean Bleiwas. They approve the proposed signage at the entrance of Terra. They have purchased lot number six in the subdivision.

Ann Richards, she and her husband are also going to be future homeowners in the development. They heartily approve of and endorse the proposed signage in the entryway.

Dave and Annette Mullett, they are building a home in the subdivision. The sign Cambridge Homes is proposing to build will be beautiful and fit in appropriately with the surrounding environment and will further enhance the plan to make this subdivision one of the premier developments in the area.

Andy and Diane Denny. "As future residents and current lot owners, we support the proposed design of the Terra Development entrance sign."

And last one is from I believe a Mr. Valente. It says they support the request of a sign variance by Cambridge Homes. They have observed the progress of
the development and know the signage will be in keeping with beautifying the area.

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

And thank you, Mark. You did a wonderful presentation. I saw the beautiful, you know, layout and everything and all this. And also I visited your property and I thank you so much. Other than that, I nothing to say and I will open for my board for any comments on my board members.

Member Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I went and visited this site. It's not very easy to find, but eventually $I$ did find it. And it's a beautiful neighborhood it's going to be and this sign looks quite aesthetically beautiful and $I$ have no problem in granting their variance. They need to put this particular sign up. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Okay. Mr. Verma, Member Verma, please go ahead.

MEMBER VERMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question is do we need that big sign there? This is first question; and secondly, what type of landscaping they're proposing around this sign?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mark, can you answer to my Member Verma?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes. We are using a lot of ornamental grasses with which fits the prairie style. This is prairie style architectural and the ornamental grasses will be coming out of the ground and they can get -- there's different types. Some are 12 inches and some are two feet. And they -- and you cut them at the end of the year. But they're these ornamental grasses that come up. They're almost like bushes, but they're tall grass that grow straight and they're like bushes or a couple of feet apart and they add a little interest in front of the sign and throughout the neighborhood.

We're also planning a bunch of birch trees. Most of them are planted. The rest of them are not in yet.

MEMBER VERMA: First question was do you need this big 40 feet wide sign there?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Well, the sign is not 40
feet. The sign is a lot less than that. Now, the wall itself that the -- the masonary wall that the sign sits on is prob- -- I'm not sure if it's 40 feet or a little less than that. I'll have to check. I think we might have shrunk it a little bit. So I don't know if that's an updated drawing. Jeff is here with me. He's the designer of the sign and he can talk to that maybe a little bit and answer your question, if we can get him on. He's one of the participants here. He designed it and he'll explain why this size sign is appropriate for this location.

MEMBER VERMA: Okay. Is he there?
MR. WILD: Yes. Good evening, everyone.
MS. OPPERMAN: If I could, very briefly, Mr. Wild, I'll just need you to state your name and swear or affirm to the tell the truth in the case.

MR. WILD: My name is Jeff Wild. I am the graphic designer on this project and I swear to tell the truth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead. Please proceed on that.

Thank you, Katherine.
MR. WILD: In proportion to the -- if you're
driving down Garfield Road and approaching Nine Mile where that intersection of where the entrance of the sub is, it is pertinent to have a wall and a sign of that size. The sign itself does fit within the parameters, outside of the exception of the Cambridge Homes community. But the wall itself does need to have some sustenance to it to be able to see it from a distance. And if I'm not mistaken, one of the board members did mention that location was a bit hard to find and that's why it is important to have something of that scale. But it does blend in nicely with its natural backdrop, including all the materials it will be built with.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: I still feel that 40 feet on that masonry work and then the 24 feet, eight inches is the sign. Under the Terra, you can put the Cambridge under the Terra thing. You can bring it smaller. Why you have to spread so much?

MR. WILD: Part of that is the architectural -- the architectural style. If you look at the architecture of the homes that are being built there, prairie home, Frank Lloyd Wright style are very
linear and that lends itself with the architectural style of the homes that are being built.

If you do something against that and were to bring that lettering underneath it and shorten that, that's conducive to the architectural style.

MEMBER VERMA: Thank you.
MR. WILD: Thank you for the question.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jeff, and thank you, Member Verma.

And any other board member would like to speak on this case tonight?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes, question. So the -- I drove by and I couldn't perceive that the -- the longer end is three feet high and then the shorter of the masonry is four feet; is that correct?

MEMBER VERMA: Yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. So from a distance it was hard to tell. And then the wood that you want to use, the cedar, is that treated? Because wasps really like cedar.

MR. GUIDOBONO: We're going back and forth between cedar and longboard. Cedar, it will be stained on all four sides and it has to be. Because any
moisture that gets into it, it will rot over time.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, yeah. And then, of course, by approving the part -- the Terra and then the Cambridge, according to the new sign, if I believe from what Beth told us previously, you put what you like, then we're just approving the size.

Is that right, Beth?
MS. SAARELA: So, yeah. You're not only looking at the content of what the sign says, you're looking at the dimensions.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, the word "Terra" meets the ordinance. So the size of the Terra sign meets the ordinance. It's adding the Cambridge Homes Community, which adds another five square feet, that does not.

So that's what we're asking for on the one-half of the ...

MEMBER KRIEGER: From a distance, how far back can -- how tall are the letters "Cambridge Community?"

MR. GUIDOBONO: Jeff, that's your question. I don't know.

MR. WILD: They are five and a quarter inches tall.

MEMBER SANGHVI: They're not very big.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Right. So it seems that the majority of the sign is the architecture and the wood versus actual lettering. And it blends in with the area and you said you're going to have flowers and you have the landscaping around it. So it would be a good blend. Even though it's approved for a larger size, it's not going to appear -- it will be an illusion. It'll blend.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Right. It will blend in with the landscaping very nicely.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member would like to speak? MEMBER SANKER: I just want to make a quick comment.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER SANKER: No questions. But I think because this is far out west and in a less populated area, the zoning may not be as important here regarding the square footage and the height. Because if this was on, like, Meadowbrook Road between Nine and Ten Mile, a
size this big would be a monster and just unsightly.
And then the other thing is I think they're doing a good job of blending in. So it will be huge, but it won't be obnoxious because of the way it's designed.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, thank you, Member Sanker.

Any other board member?
Okay. Looks like seeing none.
And, Member Krieger, can you make a motion on this, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I move that we grant their request to case number PZ20-0055 sought by the petitioner for the practical difficulty requiring their size. That the proportion and the blend will assist them with the nature of the subdivision.

That without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect to the use of their property because of its junction with Nine Mile and Garfield and its position with that area. The property is unique because of its being on the west side of Novi still on a dirt road, which is fine with me.

Petitioner did not create the condition because of its location and where it's positioned on the property. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of its position, landscaping, the proposed dimensions of it, that it will blend correctly. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of the approval of the neighbors and the and the blend with the area.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Who did second?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

Katherine, can you please call roll call?

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?

MEMBER VERMA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. MS. OPPERMAN: All in favor. Motion passes.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Thank you everyone. MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
MR. GUIDOBONO: Happy holidays, everyone. MEMBER KRIEGER: You, too.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Let's go to the fourth case, PZ20-0057, LaVanway -- LaVanway Sign Company, 43043 Grand River Avenue, east of Novi Road and south of Grand River Avenue, parcel number 50-22-23-104-010. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 28-5 (b) (1) (A) for a proposed 39.5 square foot
wall sign, based on the setback from the centerline of Grand River Avenue. The sign is oversized by two square feet. The property is zoned Town Center one, TC-1.

Is the applicant here?
MR. DILLON DENHA: Yes. I'm here. Dillon Denha and my brother, Landon Denha.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, both of you. How are you?

MR. DILLON DENHA: Okay. How are you?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Before I proceed, I want to ask Katherine, my acting secretary, to take your first name and last name.

Go ahead, Kathy.
MS. OPPERMAN: Will both you and your brother be speaking?

MR. DILLON DENHA: Yes. And I believe Mike Kean is here. He'll be speaking.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, from LaVanway Sign. So I'll need each of you to state your name and swear or affirm to tell the truth.

MR. DILLON DENHA: Dillon Denha, I swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth.

MR. LANDON DENHA: And Landon Denha, I swear to tell the truth.

MR. KEAN: My name is Michael Kean representing LaVanway Sign company in this case and I swear to tell the truth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Thank you, Katherine. I appreciate your time.

And Michael and Dillon Denha and Denha again. You may proceed. And talk slowly and proceed. Thank you.

MR. KEAN: Dillon, would you like me to speak first?

MR. DILLON DENHA: Yeah. You can speak first.

MR. KEAN: Okay. Very good. Again, my name is Mike Kean. I represent LaVanway Sign Company. Dillon and his brother had approached us to install a sign from a previous location that they were vacating. We proceeded to secure the proper permits and were denied because we were over on square footage by just barely two square feet, about five and a half, a little less percent of the total sign area.

We're here to seek relief from that. It's been pretty tough times for small businesses and I believe Dillon would like to reuse this sign. It's in good continue. It's a UL listed sign. The size of it for the building is commiserate and it's to scale. It's appropriate. I don't feel there would be any negative impact to the surrounding businesses. Rather, it would provide a nice varied mix of retail there in that small strip along Grand River. And we hope that you agree with us.

Dillon, would you like to add any?
MR. DILLON DENHA: Yeah. So just a little back story.

My name is Dillon Denha, by the way. So just a little back story about it. So May 1st, 2020, we purchased the existing location, which was the Pod Drop. We relocated that sign from Southfield. And initially we were working with Radiant Sign Company to get the sign up. It was his responsibility to get the permits and everything. They sent out a guy in July to hang the sign. It was stopped in the process by Maureen, who works for the City. And she at that point let us know there was no permit. We were not aware of
that, but she measured the sign. And I know it wasn't like, you know, black or white or anything like that, it wasn't a final answer, but she did do a quick measurement and she let us know that it looks good. Just go ahead and get your permits passed.

So we went back and forth with our Radiant Sign Company. He never ended up getting the permit. That's when we hired LaVanway and LaVanway applied in September and then it got denied because of the two square feet, which, you know, we're hoping is not an issue. We would like to reuse the sign.

And currently we have the store open. The store has been open, but we don't have a sign up. I don't know if anybody has passed by. We're open until seven o'clock at night. The sign that's up there right now has no light on it. So, like, four or five o'clock it's getting dark out. There's no way of anybody knowing that we're open. And our sign is still -- the current sign that we picked up from our last location is still sitting inside of our store.

So we're hoping that you guys can grant us the permission to hang the sign and just, you know, move on from this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Your brother wants to talk, too, on this case?

MR. LANDON DENHA: My name is Landon Denha. He pretty much covered everything. It's not much of a difference in the sign. The sign is -- our stores are pretty nice stores. So I think for the City it'll, you know, bring some light in that area. And, you know, it's not asking for too much and, hopefully, you guys will be able to side with us on this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Before moving and before I conclude, the three of you, anything you want to add or this is the final one?

MR. KEAN: Well, as someone mentioned earlier, a picture is a worth a thousand words. If I may share my screen, I've got a rendering that shows the whole store front of all four businesses side by side just to get a size and sense of, you know, how it will look when it's completed, if that's all right? MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please, go ahead. You want to share any screen or you have any other thing, Michael?
(Photo displayed.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please go ahead and explain, Michael. I see the picture for the city, you know, Novi Party Store.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Your building -- or store is on the far right?

MR. DILLON DENHA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael, you can move it and you can explain on this.
(Video momentarily frozen.)
MR. KEAN: Is that better?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Go ahead.
MR. KEAN: Okay. I might be running into a little lag here.

So everybody can see the screen, correct, with the proposed sign to the right?

MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MR. KEAN: Yeah. If you look at the -you've got a nice variety of businesses there and the existing sign, the sign that Dillon and his brother currently have in their position, like the previous
case, there's some what we call dead space or empty space in the layout. And the way the ordinance calculates square footage, it includes that dead space. It's making one single geometric shape around the whole sign and encompasses all the elements.

If we were to apply an alternate method like the previous board, you would see that we're really not using 39.5 square feet, because the far upper right corner, and then the upper left and right corner -- I'm sorry. The bottom left and top left corners are also empty space because of the design.

So, you know, we hope that the board agrees with us. It fits the space really quite nicely and balances out those four businesses along that frontage very well along Grand River. Good sight lines for clients to see the business in enough time and, you know, make the appropriate turn whether they're coming from the east or west.

Okay. Dillon, do you have anymore to add? MR. DILLON DENHA: No. I think we covered everything.

MR. KEAN: Okay. Would you guys like me to stop sharing the screen?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
Okay. Thank you so much and nice presentation. Let me move to the City.

Larry, are you there?
MR. BUTLER: There are no comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.
And acting secretary, any correspondence,
Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. In this case there were 22 letters mailed, two letters returned, no objections and no approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And Dillon and Michael, you made a good presentation. I live in Novi, too. I see these stores and very good presentation and let me put it on the board and what they decide and we can move from there.

And I'll open to the board and anybody can speak one at time, I really appreciate it.

Mr. Sanghvi, you're raising your hand. You can go ahead and move on that, please.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I visited -- we all visited this place. It is a busy one
in a small strip mall and they are moving from the other side of the -- into this new evidence location, which is across from the Steve and Rocky's restaurant. Considering the size of the store front, this sign doesn't look too big at all and I have no difficulty supporting the request for the variance. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to speak, please?

MEMBER SANKER: I'll say something real quick. I agree with what was just said and also the fact that it is not a completely filled out sign like with the background, white and the entire space was filled with white and then that blue wording in there, that would be a little different. So for that reason it should be okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanker.

And Member Montague, please go ahead. And unmute your phone.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. Got it. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, sir.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: (Audio garbled.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Montague, your voice is breaking. Sorry. Can you speak clearly, please? Your network is lagging.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: It is on Grand River, which is a fast-moving street, so, again, I support it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Montague. I appreciate it.

Any other board member?
Okay. And coming to my conclusion. I know this, you know, business. I know the location. And thank you so much for your presentations. I have no objection.

And anybody move -- do you have anything?
Apart from that, I'm calling for the motion. Linda? Member Krieger?

MS. OPPERMAN: If I could interrupt briefly.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.

MS. OPPERMAN: I don't think you asked for the public comment on this. I do see a Zoom User raising their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Katherine. Anybody in the public comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIOBOYINA: Nobody is raising their hand?

MS. OPPERMAN: Again, like last time, it looks like they've been added but they've not unmuted.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody in the public can you unmute your phone and can you please speak what you would like to on this case.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
And I can move for the motion, Member Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: In case number PZ20-0057 for
LaVanway Signs, I move we grant the request. The petitioner has shown practical difficulty. Requiring the request for the sign the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of its setback from the road and the speed of the road and location. And that is also it's unique in that way as well.

The petitioner didn't -- bought the store where it's at, which is setback. And the petitioner
did not create the condition because of the location and speed.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because the sign is similar to the other signs on the neighboring property. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of the times and being able to use the sign over. And it's matching with its neighbors.

That's it.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

And a second, Mav. Thank you.
Katherine, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMAN: Whoever seconded, could you repeat it. I didn't quite catch it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Mav.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?


Collins Construction, 319 Elm Court, west of old Novi Road and south of South Lake Drive, parcel number 50-22-03-481-002. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 for a side yard setback of seven feet, 10 feet required, a variance of three feet; an aggregate total side yard setback of 20 feet and 25 feet, required variance of five feet.

These variances would accommodate building a new home. This property is zoned single family residence, R-4.

Is the applicant present?
MR. COLLINS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, Jeffrey.
MR. COLLINS: Yes, I'm here. Jeffrey Collins.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIOBOYINA: Okay. Please tell
your first and last name clearly to my acting secretary, Katherine.

Katherine, can you please take it.
MR. COLLINS: Yes. This is Jeffrey Collins
and I swear to tell the truth.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You may proceed, Jeffrey.

MR. COLLINS: Hi. Yes, this case, I believe, is pretty simple. My customer has a home that exceeds the current variance by feet five feet. With our front setbacks and rear setbacks, we have no problem with. We're easily within those. He just needs an extra five feet for the side setbacks.

The home -- the home we just took out was a two-story. The new home is a one-story and we're just hoping to get it in a dead-end street. We're not blocking any views. We're not blocking any view of any lakes, any neighbors. There's only one house next door and that one is vacant. The other side is empty.

Any questions?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Jeffrey. Do you want to show any presentation at this moment before I move to ...

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I did send -- I did send in drawings so hopefully somebody has a drawing of what I propose to do. This is my first Zoom call. I'm sitting in my truck on the side the road trying to get it to work. So I'm not able to pull anything up on my
phone at the moment. As you can see, I'm in my vehicle.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jeffrey.
And coming to the public audience, anybody is raising in the Zoom, Katherine? Can you please look into that?

MS. OPPERMAN: Again, Zoom User is raising their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Audience, anybody would like to speak on this case, please, at this time. You can unmute your phones and speak out.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Looks like none. Thank you so much.

From the City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: There are no comments from the City at this time. Standing by for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Larry.

And, Katherine, can you please tell the correspondence, our acting secretary?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Of course. There were 31 letters mailed for this. There was one letter
returned and one objection. The objection is from someone on 1498 North Pontiac Trail. I can't quite make out their name. But it's 319 Elm Court is a double lot. The lot is narrow and they have concerns with water drainage and saturation.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Katherine.

Okay. Jeffrey, and thank you and you're in a truck and I can see you and let us see and put it on to the board and what they can speak tonight about your case and then we can move from there. And this is open for the board members can speak on this case. Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Sanghvi, please go ahead.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Sure. I went and visited this site and like all the places around that neighborhood, it's always a very small plot, almost the size of a postage stamp. And whether they need to do any renovation or rebuilding, they always require variances and the variances requested by the applicant
are reasonable and minimal to create this property. So I have no objection to it. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to speak? MEMBER KRIEGER: A question.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member
Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Why is it on one side 13
feet and the other side seven feet and your decision to put it on the property that way?

MR. COLLINS: Well, we only needed five feet. So I was just trying to center it between the two. We do not have to go with seven and 13. I can go with five and 15, if the City requires that.

I was just trying to center it on the lot. Borrowing a little bit from each side. That was my only attempt. We are not married to that location. If we need to shift it right or left, we can.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member Krieger, any other question?

MEMBER KRIEGER: So you can do 10 feet on the one side and 10 feet on the other?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Absolutely.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. All right. So, wait, does that then still need a variance?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, it does. We still need the five.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Both sides would need it?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you require 25 feet.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: For the aggregate.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?
MS. SAARELA: So if you're going to grant a different variance, though, if you're going to make him recenter it, if it increases the variance on one side, it will have to - (audio dropped.)

I just want to put that out there. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Beth. Any other board member would like to speak? MEMBER SANKER: A real quick question about the house size. If it was -- if you met the five foot variance and didn't need it, what would the house look
like?
MR. COLLINS: Well, the house is a 28 by 64 ranch, five-twelve pitch, one story.

MEMBER SANKER: No, I know. But if you
shrunk it to fit the 25 --
MR. COLLINS: The house is a modular home. MEMBER SANKER: What's that?

MR. COLLINS: The house is a modular home. MEMBER SANKER: Oh.

MR. COLLINGS: It's prebuilt. It's not a manufactured, not a trailer, modular.

Right. I know you know the difference. So it's prebuilt and the homeowner already owns the home.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Laughter) Weird.
MR. COLLINS: I heard that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member Sanker, any other question tonight?

MEMBER SANKER: No. That's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Any other board member, final call?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. It's time
for the motion.
Member Sanker, can you make a motion on this case, please?

MR. SANKER: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ20-0060 sought by the petitioner for the three-foot side variance setback and the five-foot aggregate side variance -- side yard setback. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring these variances. Without them they won't be able to -- they will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because it will not be able to fit their house on the lot. The property is unique because it is narrow in size and surrounded by water, it looks like, on one of the drawings.

The petitioner did not create the condition because the lot shape and condition existed prior to purchasing the lot, and the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it's a relatively small house and it fits nicely on the property. The relief is consistent
with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the petitioner can put the home of an adequate size on the lot with a minimum variance at the same time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanker.

Any other would like to make a second on this case, please?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, can you please roll call.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations,
Jeffrey. Drive safe. Thank you.
MR. COLLINS: Thank you very much, everybody.
Have a good evening.
MEMBER KRIEGER: You too.
MS. OPPERMAN: You also.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Coming back to the case number -- you know, today's case number two. Is the applicant is present, Katherine? I can go ahead and see?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Maybe leave it for next time.

MS. OPPERMAN: No. I don't see that anyone from either Coy Construction or the homeowner is present.

read the number again?
MS. SAARELA: Somebody should move to table it to the January -- what is the date of the January meeting?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Okay. Somebody can make a motion on that and table it or something.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I move to table the meeting until January, but what's the date.

MS. OPPERMAN: January 12th, 2021.
MEMBER KRIEGER: January 12th, 2021 for the Mystic Forest Drive petition.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I second it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger and Member Sanghvi, for both of you.

Okay. That's all for today's business and any other things before $I$ go -- you know, call for the adjournment?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. There is no matters. The meeting is adjourned. All say "Aye." THE BOARD: Aye.

MEMBER KRIEGER: In favor to adjourn, yes.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: So the meeting
is --
MEMBER THOMPSON: I have a question.
MEMBER KRIEGER: What's your question?
MS. SAARELA: Do you want to email the question to somebody or is it something to do with the meeting?

MEMBER THOMPSON: No. It would be just a question to, like, what happens to the homeowner with the two lots. Like, what happens from here? What are his choices?

MS. SAARELA: I think that you could call Larry and he can --

MR. BUTLER: Yeah. They can reapply again and they could change up the plans, relook at it and come back with a different plan and go before the ZBA again.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Good. So I think he was close. He was just missing it by a little bit.

MS. SAARELA: Okay. We can't continue to talk about this. It's on the record. If you have some questions for Larry, you can give him a call.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I will do that. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

And, Beth, I appreciate for your time and everybody. And stay safe and happy holidays. Okay. Apart from that, meeting adjourned.

THE BOARD: Aye.
(At 9:14 p.m., meeting adjourned.)
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