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MEMBER SANKER: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the February 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

If we can all rise and stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance)
MEMBER SANKER: All right. Thank you.
And if the City Clerk could do the roll call, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker.
MEMBER SANKER: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Members Sanghvi, Verma and Peddiboyina are absent and excused.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you.

And now we're going to the public format and rules which is basically an explanation of how this meeting is going to work, but before that because we only have four people out of seven which is a quorum, you'll be required to have a unanimous vote of all of us to pass your variances, and if you'd like you have the right to table your case until the Board is full of seven people. And, so, if you want to do that, just step up to the podium and let us know.

And, so, just for the rules of conduct. Obviously please turn off your phones and any other devices that make noise during the meeting.

You'll be asked to state your name -- step up here to this podium, state your name, your address and be sworn in by our Secretary.

You'll be allowed 5 minutes to present your case and if you'd like an extension, you'll have to ask and it may or may not be granted. And, then, at that point after you're done anyone in the audience who wishes to address or make comments about your case can do so. You'll be asked to please raise your hand and be recognized and upon recognition you'll come up here and you'll have 3 minutes to say whatever you'd like
about the case.
And then you'll only -- if you're speaking from the audience you'll only be allowed to speak once unless a Board member specifically addresses you or asks you a question later on.

After that the Secretary will read the number of public hearing notices mailed, and any responses will be read into the record. And then after that we'll ask the City and the City attorney for any comments and then we'll turn it over to the Board members to make a decision and -- or ask questions, get additional information that they need and then we'll have a vote. So that's how it's going to work tonight.

And next we need to approve the agenda.
Any additions, comments, questions?
MS. OPPERMAN: There are no changes.
MEMBER SANKER: No changes?
MS. OPPERMAN: No.
MEMBER SANKER: Do I have a notion to approve?

MEMBER LONGO: I so move.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
MEMBER SANKER: And do we do a roll call vote
for this? No.
All in favor, aye.
(All indicate aye)
MEMBER SANKER: All opposed.
All right. We have an agenda.
And for the meeting minutes of December 2019, any additions, deletions?

MEMBER KRIEGER: On page 14, line 1, it was one objection where it was empty. That was it.

Do we have a motion to approve those changes?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Sure. Yes, I move.
MEMBER SANKER: And a second?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
MEMBER SANKER: All in favor.
(All indicate aye)
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Those meeting minutes are approved.

Okay. At this time, we're going to open it up to the public to make any public remarks. So if anyone would like to come up and comment, please do so.

Okay. Seeing none, we'll close the public remarks section and we'll move to the public hearing.

So we'll call the first case which is

PZ20-0001, Guernsey Farms at 23100 Novi Road, east of Novi Road and north of Eight Mile Road, parcel Number 50-22-35-301-001. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 5.3.12 for the absence of end island curbing. By code end islands landscaped with raised curbs are required at the end of all parking bays that abut traffic circulation aisles in off-street parking. This property is zoned General Business (B-3).

Is anyone from Guernsey Farms here?
MR. BONISLAWSKI: Just waiting for the
invite.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Come on up.
MEMBER SANKER: Step on up.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: Good evening. Roman Bonislawski.

Do you want me to spell that?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes, please.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: Yeah, I figured.
B-O-N-I-S-L-A-W-S-K-I. Ron \& Roman, 275 E. Frank
Street, Birmingham, Michigan 48009.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. BONISLAWSKI: No, I'm an architect.

MEMBER KRIEGER: That's okay.
Would you raise your right hand?
MR. BONISLAWSKI: I will.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. BONISLAWSKI: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. I appreciate it. MR. BONISLAWSKI: Thank you.

Well, it's a pleasure to be in front of this
Board. I would firstly hope that the Members of this Board have had the opportunity to review the wonderful set of Planning and City Commission meeting minutes that we've had regarding this project, the dialogue that's been had, and the fact that we've been working with the City for a very long time to finally get to this point in time. We're doing a very special thing, we think it's a very special thing in the City of Novi for a piece of property that's got a Northville mailing address but associates and images itself so strongly with Novi.

Guernsey Farms is coming up on their 80th anniversary and the boys themselves so dislike the fact that they had to go somewhere else to have a dinner and
enjoy a beer with their dinner that they saw this as an opportunity to completely redo the facility, keep it as a simple less than 100 -seat restaurant as it is now, not lose the favor or patronage of those people that exist for that place as it is, introduce a small bar component, redo the ice cream, a new soda fountain, redo the exterior of the building, set themselves up for a big 80th anniversary party this coming April; and then also to try to make this all happen very realistically.

We've been working with the City and the Planning Department for many, many months and with what started as a huge array of issues that we were trying to work around we managed to resolve every single item that was involved with the project but for the one that we're kind of insistent or hopeful that other people would recognize what we see as a big value in the imaging of the front of that property by taking that area where they have their rock garden where the kids play on and the 100-year-old, 100-plus-year old oak tree where it is and just on the surrounding area for that island of land, which is also identified, by the way, if you've had the opportunity to review the site
plan, even the crosswalk area that we're creating internally on the site from the restaurant entry for the kids and families to go out and enjoy the rocks and the big old oak tree out there is being defined by means of a big spilt milk pattern that we're doing on the paving there.

We've managed to work our way through
Planning and City with glowing reviews and approvals with the one dangling piece that we're here in front of you today, and that is for this Board to consider that the character of that road as it stands right now is an uncurbed situation.

We have now brought the balance of the site to the development standards that any new project would have on the site and that by and with this one allowance we would then retain a specific character which resembles one of an undeveloped roadside park almost in an area where we're not setting precedent because there is no other development that will happen to the south towards Eight Mile Road, that's all built out, and to the north already exists the way it is.

If you'd have that consideration we believe that there's very unique circumstances associated with
this project which would warrant a favorable response from this Board.

Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Any comments from the public?

MR. MIKE DUCHESNEAU: Mike Duchesneau, D-U-C-H-E-S-N-E-A-U, 1191 South Lake Drive. And that was a very nice speech, by the way.

But the project deviation should be supported, the deviation support this recommendation. The main reason that the architects and planners are here is because they wanted to save a tree, and I don't know how often we get a developer that's asking for variances to save trees in Novi, but this is one case where that should happen.

And the applicant, as he stated, which I was in attendance at the Planning Board when this came up, was very impressed with the cow architecture in the driveway, so I say this project should be supported with the variances being requested. Thank you.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: Anyone else from the public?

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

MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
Now Secretary.
MEMBER KRIEGER: In this case 38 were sent out, zero returned, zero approval, zero objections. MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you.

And now it's open to the Board for any questions or clarifications or a motion?

MEMBER LONGO: The only comment I'd make is that we all know that there's been several accidents right near there. My grandkids play in that area, too, so I understand where you're coming from, but it's a little scary because $I$ don't know why there are accidents there at that $T$ but that was the only thought that I had.

I don't -- having said that $I$ don't know that, you know, putting that around it would stop -certainly wouldn't stop the accidents and I don't know if it would provide any more safety. That was the only concern I had with safety.

Yes, of course.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: Thank you. It was
interesting that you said that because one of our bases for improvements at the site circulation was that we're closing off that center entrance/exit way. Now at the south end it's entrance only. It's one way through the only lot and the only exits back at the northern end of the parking lot and we've done away with that center --

MEMBER LONGO: Well, that will help.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: And the curbing would have only related to the interior side of the parking lot, not the street side which has the culvert and the ditch in it right now.

MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
That's all I have.
MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
Anybody else?
Go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I appreciate your speeches, it was very good. And I've known Guernsey forever as well and to save an oak tree I appreciate that and the rocks. The atmosphere to have ice cream in the middle of the summer under the heat and go sit under the tree
is traditional of Northville and Novi. So I'm in support of this motion -- of this case.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Ready for a motion?
MEMBER SANKER: Sure.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right. I would move that we grant the variance in case Number PZ-220-001 sought by Guernsey Farms for Novi Code Section 5.3.12, the absence of island curbs.

The property is unique because it has a historic significance in terms of its layout and its tree. The Petitioner didn't create -- obviously the tree was there a long, long time ago, so it did not create it and it would not unreasonably interfere with any adjacent property and, therefore, $I$ feel it's consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank.
City Clerk, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker.
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Congratulations.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Looking forward to it.
MEMBER SANKER: Let's get it open.
MR. BONISLAWSKI: If you have not noticed it's well under way. Thank you very much.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Next case is
PZ20-0002, Allied Signs and Chick-Fil-A at the address of 27750 Novi Road east of Novi Road and south of Twelve Mile Road, parcel Number 50-22-14-100-050. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinances Section 28-5(d) (14) for the addition of two proposed signs, three sign maximum allowed by code. The property is zoned Regional Center (RC) .

MS. HAMILTON: Good evening. I'm Kristin Hamilton. I'm here for Chick-Fil-A, 5200 Buffington Road, Atlanta, Georgia.

As you maybe know or don't know, Chick-Fil-A
is certainly new to your area and this is one of the first locations we'll be opening. We have had a few openings in the Detroit area and hope to continue with our growth in your state and surrounding --

MEMBER SANKER: Just to cut you off real quick. Are you an attorney? MS. HAMILTON: No. MEMBER SANKER: Let the secretary swear you in.

MS. HAMILTON: Oh, I'm sorry.
MEMBER SANKER: That's okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: In this case do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. HAMILTON: Yes, ma'am.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MS. HAMILTON: Okay. We are not a well-known brand here and it's important for us to get our name out there, and in this particular location we do show two wall signs and a small monument sign positioned on a fairly large lot with visibility on all sides. We are out in front of a shopping center and would like visibility from all standpoints.

The two additional signs that we are
requesting with what we've already gotten permits on we are asking for a total of 253.37 square feet, and your ordinance allows for 250. So with the additional signage we're only over by 3.37 square feet. And the two additional wall signs, one of them would be for traffic exiting the highway where our building would be on the right side of the cars. There will be no visibility to our name from that location.

Same as the other side which is really the parking lot side. There are two different sign types that we're requesting. The one that is on the parking lot side we refer to as our chicken icon or see icon sign. It's a square, just the chicken with feathers and beak over the front door and it's certainly a branding element for us but it's also -- it's almost just kind of a picture over the building. If you see the building without that, it looks rather plain.

And the sign that we're requesting on the highway side is what we call our script logo so it says Chick-Fil-A in script which is a little bit more known.

There's no -- you know, it's -- we're trying to make sure that people see us and come to the location. It's not going to really deter from anything
out there. I did drive the location today and we're, you know, we're pretty open and have visibility to all four sides so we feel like it's important for certainly our immediate success in this area is to get our name out there and make sure people see all of our signage. And, again, we're, with the additional signs we're only over by just over 3 square feet.

MEMBER SANKER: Did you bring any pictures or anything that you have -MS. HAMILTON: I do have pictures. MEMBER SANKER: -- you can put up on that little --

MS. HAMILTON: Oh, I don't know how to do that.

MS. OPPERMAN: If you just set them on that little overhead projector it will come on the screen. MS. HAMILTON: Set them -- they're on my iPod.

MEMBER KRIEGER: That's fine. It will show up, too.

MS. HAMILTON: I'm sorry.
MEMBER SANKER: Perfect.
MS. HAMILTON: So here you see we've shadowed
it out right here. That's the see icon, that will be red, an illuminate red with the white copy coming through. And then this is our script logo here which we are requesting to add in this area on the elevation. This is the rear of the building which you can see from back in the shopping mall and this is the front of the building which you can see from Twelve Oaks.

So the side of the building on the highway side, you know, we have that brick portion built out to hold the logo. So the building is under construction.

I was by there today so we're moving quite along so we made the decision to leave that spot there. Normally if we're not granted a sign on that side we would have taken -- we would have taken this little area out and just made that, you know, the dark brick meeting up with the light brick in a straight line. MEMBER SANKER: Is that it? MS. HAMILTON: Yes. MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you. Anyone from the public wish to speak about this?

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, Allied Signs, 33650

Giftos Drive, Clinton Township. I'm actually the applicant on these.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
MEMBER SANKER: Please raise your hand.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case? MR. FIELDS: I do. MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. MR. FIELDS: So, in essence, the zoning allows for two signs, in addition we allow for the three. The max square footage would be 250 square feet. The frontage of the building is actually 398 square feet which would meet the 250 . Would be under 4 square foot in overage would be in the max allowed to allow for the two wall signs.

In her print when she showed it if you look at here, you can actually see the detail of the building where you have the southwest corner and then the small box logo goes here. So we already have approvals here and we have approvals here.

Since the flow of the traffic to get them in -- and I don't know if you've been to one of these locations, it's a very, very heavy traffic orientation
for the cars, so the branding getting them into and around the building helps with the inflow and the outflow of the traffic, so there would be branding on all four sides of the building. Especially with the way the lot is shaped coming off 96 it will help getting people in and around this lot. So it's really a 4-square-foot overage but it is for just the two additional signs.

So, even with the ground signs and all four, you're still almost at the square footage max allowed, it's just the two different elevation positions. And with the shape of the building instead of being just a square lot where we're dealing with 90-degree angles, we're dealing with these 33- and 35-degree pitches which, of course, changes everything, the visibility, so ....

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else from the public wish to comment?
Okay. Then we'll hand it over to the City. Any comments?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Just wanted it to be noted that they did express a hardship due to the fact that the amount of traffic that comes through that area and
with the additional signs it would allow people to safely see where they're going and make their adjustments in that traffic to get into the area without at the last minute adjustments which would be pretty much be a hazard in that area. So they have done a really good job of showing how they're trying to get the traffic there safely and see the signs ahead of time without having to make rapid adjustments.

MEMBER SANKER: Thanks, Larry.
And from the Secretary?
MEMBER KRIEGER: 16 notices were sent, zero returned, zero approval, zero objections.

MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
And open it up to the Board.
Motion, anybody?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes. I move that we grant the variance in the case of PZ20-0002, sought by Allied Signs/Chick-Fil-A, Parcel Number 50-22-14-100-050 for two additional signs because the Petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring additional signage. Without variance the Petitioner would be unreasonably prevented, or limited in respect to the use of the property because all sides are exposed to
the public and to traffic. The property is unique because it sits on an entrance to the mall, it sits on Novi Road and it sits on a very busy exit ramp of I-96. Petitioner did not create the condition because the property is surrounded by this aforementioned traffic pattern.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the area is commercial and without any -- and it doesn't cause any difficulties for the surrounding businesses.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it does not impair the public nor the general appearance of the area in any way.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Katherine, call the role, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Congratulations.
MEMBER SANKER: Thank you very much.
MEMBER LONGO: Get it open. We do know about you up here, by the way.

MS. HAMILTON: Good. The man that checked me into my hotel had never heard of us.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. And the last case is PZ20-0003, Joann and Ned Aloe at 1529 W. Lake Drive east of West Park Drive and south of W. Pontiac Trail, Parcel Number 50-22-03-131-004.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 4.19(1)(b) to allow the proposed building of an accessory structure in the front yard. By code accessory buildings shall not be erected in the front yard or in any required exterior side yard. This property is zoned Single Family Residential (R-4).

MR. PALMER: I'm John Palmer. I am Joann's brother. They live in -- they're snowbirds. MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?

MR. PALMER: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. PALMER: I do. But that may be a be moot point because I think I'm going to delay.

With all due respect I heard all four have to agree, and while $I$ don't think this is a big deal because there are so many -- it's on the lake and there is no -- they have no option, if they're going to build a garage it has to be the road side, it can't be on the other side.

But, nonetheless, not knowing the community, not living in the community $I$ don't know if this is a hot potato or not and I would not want to take the risk of losing one of you from an affirmative vote so I think it's wise for me to delay. Unless you're going to tell me you're going to say yes.

MEMBER SANKER: You have to present your case.

MR. PALMER: So -- and I'm not -- if I were to present, I lose my option; is that correct?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah, you would -- right, unless we chose to table it. I suppose we could choose
to table it if we need more information.
MR. PALMER: I guess I'm almost asking for your direction if you're able.

MEMBER LONGO: You would lose your option to table to another night.

MR. PALMER: Yeah, I think it's wise. As much as I don't want to delay the process, they're not here and I don't want no speak for them.

MS. SAARELA: I just want to add, you know, he's free to put it on but then he would have to redo it again when we have the rest of the members here so it might not be --

MR. PALMER: I don't mind doing it twice if that's what you're asking.

MS. SAARELA: Doing it twice, that's all I'm saying.

MR. PALMER: Yeah, I don't mind doing that. Do you want me to move forward?

MS. SAARELA: It's up to you whether you want to hear it and table it or table it and then hear it.

MEMBER LONGO: Can we hear it and vote?
MEMBER SANKER: I think we should hear it and if we feel we're comfortable to vote on it we can do
that.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I'm comfortable listening.

MR. PALMER: Okay. I'm not sure what I heard.

MS. SAARELA: It sounds like they're going to hear you out and see what the consensus is, and if they're not comfortable that they have everybody, they'll wait to get extra --

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. We'll elect to table.
MR. PALMER: Again, I don't want to waste your time.

MEMBER KRIEGER: No.
MR. PALMER: And, again, I live on a lake as well and I understand, you know, you don't have a front and a backyard, you've got water. So I have paperwork, handouts. Is that okay if $I$ bring them to you or no?

MS. SAARELA: Yes. Give them to the --
MR. PALMER: It's just a little map, if you will.

MEMBER SANKER: Sure.
MR. PALMER: Now, I think it's laid out clearly for you and there are reasons for this.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Can you put this on the overhead.

MR. PALMER: Well, if I -- sure. You're talking to an old man here that -- is that close?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You're fine. Give it a shot.

MR. PALMER: There it is. I mean, it's pretty clear and cut. It's nothing fancy. The garage, you see there's a gap here between the house and the garage and that's because, again, they're getting older and they need to keep their options open, if they need to come back here to be closer to family and et cetera and they do have plans should that happen to extend the home. And they need -- this is 10 -foot here. The contractor, which is Father \& Son, needs -- they need, they want 12 -foot of separation. She's going to give them 10-foot and they'll have to make due just for all their equipment to come in and the workers to be safe.

On this side, the reason it's offset to the right, on this side is where the I guess main water is and, so, they can't disturb that and they also need to come in with the equipment so they can work on the house.

Again, being the lake over here, when you live on a lake, $I$ don't know who does or who doesn't, but the front yard is the lake. So she can't build a garage in the front yard or what's traditionally known as a backyard so she has to come on the other side.

It would give 22 -foot off the road. I know you ask for 30 but 22 -foot is more than enough for a car to park safely.

And I guess other than that I'll answer any questions that $I$ can answer for you.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you.
Anyone from the public wish to speak on this?
Please come up.
MR. PALMER: Shall I leave this up here?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, please.
MS. DOROTHY DUCHESNEAU: My is Dorothy Duchesneau. I own a home at 125 Henning in Novi and we do live on the lake. I fully support allowing the building of a garage in the front yard with the requested setback from the road. This is totally typical for homes on the Walled Lake, especially those on narrow 40-foot lots.

In looking through the packet as it showed on
the City website I did have questions regarding the reduction on the side yard setback going down to less than the required 6-foot for a garage, and I also noticed that there were comments made about the phase 2 of the proposed remodel which the applicant has explained a little bit further on only from the standpoint of, you know, are you going to approve one thing without knowing what the second thing is and does one basically affect the other.

Also, based on what $I$ found on the City plans it showed a 20 by 24 . A 14 by 24 would be considered a single garage. I would call a 20 by 24 a 2 -car garage which, again, is pretty stand in the area but $I$ can understand about the water mains and lines. But if possible they could stay with the 6 -foot we, drove past the home this evening and the neighbor to the right is closer than he looks.

Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
Anyone else?
Please come up.
MR. WEINGER: Hello. My name is Justin
Weinger.

Do I need to do the swearing in?
MS. OPPERMAN: You'll need to state and spell your last name.

MR. WEINGER: Justin Weinger, last name is spelled $W-E-I-N-G-E-R$.

I am the Aloes' next door neighbor, so the one on the right-hand side if you're facing opposite the water.

Anyways, I know Ned and Joann, like them very much, and they had asked ahead of time if I supported this and I do fully. Being on a 40 wide plot of land I understand the limitations.

And I have, the neighbors -- excuse me -- the neighbors to the right of me and two to the right both have similar structures and I'm sure at some point in time they had similar variances approved, too, by the City. So we deal with it on the one side, I see no problem with letting them on the other side have the same right.

That's really all I have.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: And anyone else?
Please come up.

MR. GARDNER: I'm Rob Gardner, 1533 W. Lake Drive. I'm the neighbor directly to the south. I don't have any comments other than $I$ entered a written agreement. I'm here in case there's questions. Those are my comments.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
MR. PALMER: May I address the variances?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, go ahead, come on up.
MR. PALMER: You want me to come back up?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
MR. PALMER: It is. It is a little bit of variance on the side and it says 4 foot, but it's really 5 because you got the overhang. So, really, it's going to go from 6 to 5, because the overhang is 10-12 foot in the air. That's not going to impede anything if that makes it more clearer.

MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
Okay. And anything from the City?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City. MEMBER SANKER: Thanks, Larry. And the Secretary. MEMBER KRIEGER: Thirty-seven were sent, zero
returned, one approval, one objection. One approval is we approve, Timothy Richardson, 1511 W. Lake Drive.

And then the next one is I'm Rob Gardner from 1533 W. Lake Drive. I own the home directly south of the rental home requesting this variance. Our neighborhood has undergone significant improvements over the last 20 years including many new homes, updated homes and a paved street. I am fully supportive of continued improvements by my neighbors for all of the obvious reasons.

However, I cannot support this variance requested for two reasons: The variance does not appear to contain all the information required to fully evaluate it. It only contains the structure's footprint but no other details regarding its construction. A plan that shows height, overhang and other structural details would be valuable to ensure it does not create issues. It seems as though we should all have more data in order to make an informed decision.

As you are aware, Number 2 , the lots on
Walled Lake are narrow and dimensional variances are
common. However, it appears that the accepted practice when possible is to maintain a 6-foot distance from the property line for any structures. In this case the distance could (see Number 1) be as little as 3 feet 11 inches. Not only is that not acceptable but it's unnecessary.

The simple plan put forth shows the structure significantly offset to the south. An easy correction could be to move it north and potentially center it on the property. Additionally, this could set a dangerous precedent. This rental home will eventually be rebuilt. Naturally, one would want to align the edge of the home with that of the existing garage. This creates a full home/garage combination. Just 3 feet 11 inches away from the property line not acceptable. I'm asking you deny this request until acceptable plans and setbacks are established. Thank you.

That's it.
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you. And we'll open it up to the Board for comments, questions and discussion.

MEMBER LONGO: I visited the property. And
as mentioned in here front yard and backyard gets a little confusing on lakefront property, and virtually all your neighbors have garages on the backyard or -frankly, the only place you could put it unless you're going to stick it in front where you sit out and look at the lake, and I wouldn't want that. So then you couldn't get to it because it wouldn't be wide enough.

So in that sense I don't think you have a lot of choice. There are some issues that have been brought up about 3 inches or 1 foot or here and that kind of thing and we would want to look at that but I think otherwise it's a good idea. It's a good appeal. MEMBER SANKER: Anybody else?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Just kind of wondering where exactly -- there's a water line in the way which could be a real obstruction to building for the foundations under it but we don't have anything that's showing where that water line is so I don't know whether that thing could be shoved a foot or two or not to conform with the side yard.

MEMBER SANKER: Yes, City attorney. MS. SAARELA: I think it does comply with all the setback requirements. They're not asking for
setback variances, there's simply asking for placement. MEMBER SANKER: Okay. So we should limit our decision to that. Thank you. MR. GARDNER: Excuse me. MEMBER SANKER: Yes. MR. GARDNER: Can I comment. MEMBER SANKER: Sure.

MR. GARDNER: I've been through this process before I rebuilt the home directly. And my understanding is that if you go specifically by the codes that the setbacks on the side are supposed to be 15 feet for properties in Novi, and, obviously that's completely impractical when it's a 40 -foot wide lot. So my understanding is anytime a structure gets built on these 40 -foot wide lots it has to come here and it has to -- and the discussion is around whether it -how much less than 15 feet can it be.

And my point was is that standard practice in that area is 6 feet because otherwise you get two houses that potentially could be 6 feet apart from each other or something along those lines. So that's the concern.

> You can imagine from my standpoint that if,
in fact, that structure goes up and ultimately the house gets aligned with that, then there's -- then there's a house overhang potentially as close as 3 feet 11 from the property line and then I'm only 6 feet away, so now we're encroaching on what $I$ think is unreasonable when clearly we can make it 6 feet which is, again, standard practice at least according to my understanding.

MEMBER SANKER: Thank you.
From the City.
MR. BUTLER: For the setbacks, we work within parameters. We have a minimum and maximum. Also what we take into consideration whether the structures are close enough where if they have windows in the portion that's facing the additional house which would be a fire hazard where the fire could be from side to side, but basically they still meet all the requirements within those parameters. They don't have to meet the maximum.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thanks, Larry.
So, then, the only issue in front of us is can the property owners put that in the front of their house.

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MEMBER SANKER: And that's all we're to decide?

MR. BUTLER: When they build the structure they have to bring the drawings for the structure which we will look at.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right, right.
Petitioner, you can stay up here.
MR. PALMER: So as far as --
MEMBER KRIEGER: You need to go to the microphone.

MEMBER SANKER: To the podium, yeah.
MR. PALMER: As far as the side variance, that's not a discussion point? Because I had answers and reasons, but no sense. Okay.

MEMBER SANKER: That is not before us.
MR. GARDNER: Excuses me, one more question.
MEMBER SANKER: Sure.
MR. GARDNER: So I guess now I'm a little confused. The gentleman just said well, if there's windows then it is a consideration, but I don't think we know whether there's windows or not. We don't know what the structure looks like, we don't know what's the
overhang is going to be. We don't know how high it's going to be.

MS. SAARELA: I think the reason is because this is not the principal structure. This is a detached accessory structure. If you're talking about a principal residence then you're talking about the 15-foot variance setbacks. Here we're not talking about a principal residence. When they submit, if they submit for a remodel of the house, that's when the 15-foot side setbacks actually come into play.

MR. GARDNER: So does that mean the garage could be put on the property line?

MS. SAARELA: What are the setback requirements relating to accessary structures?

MR. BUTLER: Yeah, 6 feet.
MS. SAARELA: Six feet.
MR. GARDNER: Okay. Then I think the setback is a question, is it not? Because that says it's going to be less than 6 feet and my point was is that $I$ think that it should be 6 feet.

I want to go to the first paragraph that I wrote and that is that $I$ think it's great that there's improvements in the neighborhood and, you know, it's
good for all of us. But given that it's that close to my home, that's my concern, and I think if we're going to adhere to the rules, we should adhere to the rules. Thank you.

MEMBER LONGO: I have a question. What he put up there shows 6 feet and then there's some writing down here that talks about it being different. So what the zoning -- the zoning has already been approved, is the 6 foot, that's what this drawing is. Are they moving it different than what's on the drawing?

MR. PALMER: I think I can speak to that if you want me to.

MEMBER LONGO: Okay. Please do.
MR. PALMER: And I guess Father \& Son has a reputation as being quality work and they asked for as much space on the left as possible to get their equipment in, otherwise it's going to destroy the other neighbor's yard with their going in and out with their equipment. They've got safety issues that they're concerned about, they've got logistic issues, maneuverability issues that's why, again, on the ground looking at a 5-foot spread, not a 6, a 5. The overhang is going to be up here, I get it, but that's not going
to be the egress.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So can you speak to a front yard accessary structure that's going to be 6 -- can you speak for your brother saying it's going to be 6 feet?

MR. PALMER: The structure is going to be 5. The overhang is 8 to 12 inches, so my understanding is from the overhang, that matters, but from an egress point of view it's going to be five.

MEMBER SANKER: But the picture here says 6 feet.

MEMBER KRIEGER: But the footprint --
MR. PALMER: Yeah, I don't know why -- that I can't speak to.

MEMBER KRIEGER: The concrete footprint is
6 feet.
MR. PALMER: I think initially that's what they had hoped for but then Father \& Son explained that that's going to be very difficult down the road.

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we table this one to next month because I'm confused about the 6 feet and overhang 1 foot and it's really 5 feet, and the question is where is the structure. When I looked at
this in my office it looked like 6 feet and now we're saying it's not 6 feet.

MR. BUTLER: I did not see the drawings for the garage. The distance is 5 feet -- is 6 feet but what he's saying because of the overhang it's a foot out. That does extend -- that is part of that setback, it would be 6 feet but it's 5 feet because of that overhang.

MEMBER SANKER: You're saying the actual garage pad --

MS. SAARELA: So it has no additional bearing on this?

MR. BUTLER: Yeah.
MS. SAARELA: So if that's the case, if they actually are going to make -- if it's actually different from what that drawing says it actually is and it is 5 feet, you'll have to renotice for the additional variance.

MR. PALMER: So if this --
MS. SAARELA: For another forum.
MR. PALMER: On the drawing where it says -MS. SAARELA: Or it will have to be moved. MR. PALMER: On the drawing where it says

6 feet, are you wanting that from the pad or from the overhang?

MS. SAARELA: Overhang.
MR. PALMER: And other than that are we good to go or is it all tabled?

MEMBER SANKER: You have to resubmit, right, or can we --

MS. SAARELA: You'll to have change the plan so it's compliant, then.

MS. OPPERMAN: Revised plans, yes.
MR. BUTLER: So come back with that variance with the overhang of 5 feet versus 6 because his drawing is showing 6 feet.

MEMBER SANKER: Could we still vote on the issue whether he can put it in the front yard, is it an acceptable variance at this point, or should we wait? Or I guess -- is that option available to us?

MS. SAARELA: So you could grant a front yard variance but the question then is is he going to have come back for another variance if he's wanting something less than 6 feet.

MR. PALMER: Which I'm fine to do.
MS. SAARELA: If they're going to move the
structure to be compliant -- if they're going to confirm that it's 6 feet they will be able to prove that administratively with this front yard approval. So we're not looking at a variance for side yard setbacks today.

MEMBER SANKER: Right.
MS. SAARELA: If they view that as a separate issue they'll have to come back for another variance. If they can revise the plans to be compliant or confirm the plan is going to be compliant, they will just approve that and you don't need a vote.

So, yes, the answer is yes, you can approve the one variance today and they'll have to address the issue one way or the other with Community Development separately.

MEMBER SANKER: And it may come back if -here if necessary.

MS. SAARELA: They may. If they really want it to be 5 feet.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. So not to speak for anybody, but just so I understand. We're going to discuss or you're going to discuss about the front yard issue, and should that be approved then the side issue
if it's anything different than what that drawing says they need to come back and if it's what that drawing says administratively you can say yes and not have to come back.

MS. SAARELA: Correct. If you're going to complete the 6 feet that's shown on that drawing --

MR. PALMER: We're done.
MS. SAARELA: -- you can get your approval administratively the rest of the way.

MR. PALMER: Okay. All right. Thank you.
MEMBER LONGO: Then I withdraw my motion to table it?

MEMBER SANKER: Is there a motion for this?
MR. GARDNER: Excuse me. I do have one more comment.

MEMBER SANKER: Well, I think at this point we've heard what we need to hear and --

MR. GARDNER: I'm not sure. Please.
MR. BUTLER: It's actually closed to the public.

MEMBER SANKER: He made the motion. She's about to --

MR. PALMER: So step down?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. The Board has heard enough and is ready to make a motion.

MS. SAARELA: So it's closed to public hearing at this point because you moved on from that portion of the meeting but if there's any questions that the members of the public have that are still unanswered they're always free to call Larry at his office.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. So in Case Number PZ20-0003 for Joann and Ned Aloe on 1529 W. Lake Drive, the applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section $4.19(1)(\mathrm{b})$ to allow the proposed building of an accessory structure to be in the front yard. By code accessory building shall not be erected in the front yard or in any required exterior side yard. Property is zoned Single Family Residential (R-4).

I move to grant the request by the Petitioner for the -- it is unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because it's on -it has technically two fronts, the one front is the backyard which is the lake, so the accessory structure
can be in the front yard.
The property is unique because of its
location being around this lake. Petitioner did not create the condition because of previously developed homes around this area. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the structure being in the front yard is similar to neighboring and will be -- be contiguous to that. The relief would not be consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a minimum request and it is subject to what has been given before us the 6-foot footprint and to progress with the City regarding further building.

MEMBER SANKER: Any second?
MEMBER LONGO: Second.
MEMBER SANKER: Katherine, please call the role.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker.
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Thank you.
Congratulations.
MR. PALMER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: That's it. So no other
orders of business on the agenda tonight.
Motion to adjourn.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question first.
MEMBER SANKER: Oh, question.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I notice for the said items
there's like zero returned, so they're just -- does that go out through the City mail?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, it just goes out through
the U.S. Postal Service. Sometimes we get returns.
Sometimes we get them a lot later.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
I'll move to adjourn.
MEMBER LONGO: Second.
MEMBER SANKER: All in favor.
(Aye)
MEMBER SANKER: All opposed.
We're adjourned.
(The meeting concluded at 7:53 p.m.)
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