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CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good evening and welcome to the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals for December 13th, 2022. And if you could all stand and raise your right -- or put your right hand on your heart and Mike will lead us with the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. And then for roll call, please, Anita.

MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina, absent, excused.

Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Here.

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?

MEMBER McLEOD: Here.

MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.

MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Here.

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

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Here.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. All present. We have a quorum.

This is public hearing format so the -- at the back, at the door, there's information, if you could have picked up on how like what the regards are to the phones, if you can put them on silent mode or vibrate mode; and the Rules of Conduct. And when your case is called, you can come up to the podium, spell your name for our court recorder (sic) and present your case.

And we'll go to approval of agenda. We have an agenda. Any changes?

MS. WAGNER: No changes.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Do we have
approval for a motion to approve our agenda as it is?
MEMBER COPES: I'll move to approve.
MEMBER LONGO: Second.


MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'll move.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. So moved. Any second?

MEMBER COPES: I'll second.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Second. All in favor?

Aye.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Aye.
MEMBER LONGO: Aye.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Aye.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Aye.
MEMBER COPES: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any denials?
No denials. Very good. Dr. Sanghvi is excused.

Public remarks. If anyone has anything to say regarding a case other than tonight's cases, you can come up to the podium at this time and have a -present your ideas.

Okay. Seeing none. Close the public remarks for now.

Public hearings. We have four cases tonight.
Our first case is PZ22-0057 for Moiseev Gordon Associates, Incorporated, on 48735 Grand River, Parcel Number 50-22-17-101-014. The applicant is requesting two variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.18 and 4.19 to erect an accessory structure and generator in the front yard; and for a front yard setback of 30 feet, 40 feet minimum required, a variance of 10 feet. The property is zoned Light Industrial, I-1.

Is the presenter here?
Okay. All three of you going to speak?
MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: Just him.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. MOISEEV: Just me. They're here --
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. MOISEEV: Pardon me?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. MOISEEV: No. I'm an architect.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. MOISEEV: And they're from 123Net.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Ah, 123. Okay.
MR. MOISEEV: If you have technical
questions, they can answer those.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. So I'll have you spell your name and then our secretary will swear you in.

MR. MOISEEV: Andrew Moiseev, M-o-i-s-e-e-v, as in Victor.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right. So you're not an attorney. Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. MOISEEV: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Please proceed with your presentation.

MR. MOISEEV: 123Net, my client, the owner of the property is looking to construct a fiber telecom hut in order to do splices and join fiber optics, fiber optic cables and provide power for them. It's replacing in the front setback because that is the closest location to the fiber optic cables, the best location to service those cables.

The site is behind an existing restaurant. The closest structure to the proposed site is a dumpster for that restaurant in the back of the
restaurant and the back of the Sam's Club. It's further shielded by existing fence and trees around the property, separating the $123 N e t$ property from the restaurant and the Sam's Club.

We hope you approve our application.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Do you have something you could put for the overhead for viewers at home to see?
(Document displayed.)
MR. MOISEEV: Can we zoom in that area?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The dial on the top that turns it to zoom it in.

MR. MOISEEV: This is it.
So this is Grand River up here. Sam's Club is in this location. This location is the strip center with the restaurant. This is a drive-thru. 123Net's property is this with just a drive accessing Grand River. We are looking to put it here on existing parking area. We won't be disturbing any -- well, we'll be disturbing only the parking lot, no grass area. This is stated in the engineering review, there's no issue with storm water retention or anything like that. There's a line of trees and bushes along
here and along here, both on our property and also planted by our neighbors when they did their site plan.

Got their site plan approval.
There's a requirement in the landscape ordinance for foundation planning around the structure at the recommendation of the landscape review department. We're going to have the landscape here along the drive where it's more visible to the neighbors rather than ripping up more pavement for that.

It's a small structure. A prefab structure that's just put on a foundation on the site. There will be no rooftop equipment. There -- at some point we'll have a generator to provide power in case of a power failure so that neighboring businesses and homes can still have Internet service.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All set?

MR. MOISEEV: All set.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good.
Anyone in the audience have any comments regarding this case?

Okay. Seeing none. From the City, Larry? MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at
this time.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. From our correspondence.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: There were 16 letters mailed, two returned. No objections, and no approvals. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okey dokey.

Then I'll open up to the board.
Yes, Mav.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
Good evening, sir.
MR. MOISEEV: Good evening.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I came and visited your property last week and I think I've come there before once more, too. And I drove around everywhere. And I had some questions but you already answered them now and you showed it on the map here where you are putting it and how it's going to look.

MR. MOISEEV: Okay. Good.
MEMBER SANGHVI: And so I have no problem supporting your application. Thank you.

MR. MOISEEV: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MEMBER COPES: You made mention of a
generator. Is the building that you showed us, is that going to house the generator?

MR. MOISEEV: At this location here would be a ground mounted generator. More like a residential type generator.

MEMBER COPES: So it is exterior to the building, not in the building?

MR. MOISEEV: Correct.
MEMBER COPES: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is the generator going to be housed inside the building that you've showed us? And then what about sound, is it going to -- does it go once a month to function or --

MR. MOISEEV: Yes. All generators do that. And, no, it'll be separate on ground mounted. It's -residential type?

MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: Yes.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. MOISEEV: Yeah. It's a residential type. So it'll meet the requirements of the City as far as, you know, 30 -- I think it's 30 decibels at the property line.

MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: And it'll only be turned
on --
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, I'm sorry. If you're -- you need to either come up and swear in or he can tell you.

MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: First name is Robert, last name is Andrzejewsk, A-n-d-r-z-e-j-e-w-s-k-i.

I am a permit coordinator for 123Net. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney? MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: No. I'm an employee. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: Yes, I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: For the generator it would -- due to fiber optic cable, we need a light signal to travel to push packets through to bring Internet to people. So that would only turn on if there was a power failure due to DTE. So if we had a big storm and it knocked trees out, that's the only time that would flick on. Or if there was power outage.

MR. MOISEEV: Well, every once in a while it has to come on anyways. Just to -- so it will come on
when it's an emergency. Just the nature of them. MR. ANDRZEJEWSKI: Yes. For emergencies. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good. I went by your area and I can see how you're surrounded so the -- and the fencing and the trees and shrubs assist and makes your location complicated. So I can approve your request.

MR. MOISEEV: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anyone else?
Seeing none, is there a motion, please?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I motion that we grant the variance in case PZ22-0057 sought by Moiseev and Gordon Associates for the 30 foot setback, because the petitioner has shown difficulty requiring installing a small building with a 40 foot setback.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented order limited with respect to use due to the property because the property is industrial and tucked back offer Grand River behind some cover.

The property is unique again because it's tucked back off Grand River and not seen by anyone unless they're on the site, the industrial site.

The petitioner did not create the condition because of the location of the fiber cables. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, more or less because it is out of site which puts it out of mind. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance for a small structure on an industrial piece of property tucked away.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a second. Any other comments?

MEMBER SANGHVI: I second it.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yeah. Seeing none. Anita, it you could call the roll.

MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

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

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?

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

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Best wishes.
All right. Very good. That comes to our next case, PZ22-0058, AZD Associates, Incorporated, on 1607 East Lake Drive, Parcel Number 50-22-02-357-020. Applicant is requesting variances from the City Zoning Ordinance 3.1 .5 for a front yard setback of 9.17 feet, 30 feet minimum required, variance of 20.83 feet; a rear yard setback of 10.3 feet, 35 feet required, variance of 24.7 feet; a side yard setback of three feet, 10 feet required, variance of seven feet; a side yard setback of 2.75 feet, 15 feet required, variance of 12.25 feet; aggregate together side yard setback of 5.75 feet, 25 feet required, variance of 19.25 feet; and a proposed lot coverage of 47.4 percent, 25 percent max allowed, variance of 22.4 percent. These variances would accommodate the building of a new home. Property is zoned Single Family Residential.

Very good. Welcome.
MR. VIRGA: Hi. My name is Anthony Virga. It's V as Victor i-r-g-a. I'm the owner of the home. And with me I have Brad from AZD Architects.

MR. BALKWILL: So Brad Balkwill, B-a-l-k-w-i-l-l, from AZD. And I'm the architect and designer of the home.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are either one of you attorneys?

MR. BALKWILL: No.
MR. VIRGA: No.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. VIRGA: Yes.
MR. BALKWILL: Yes.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Proceed with your case.

MR. VIRGA: We're currently living at 1607
East Lake Drive. I've lived in the city of Novi for 21 years and I love the city and I've chosen to make it my and my wife's forever home at this location. I know
it's a privilege to have the opportunity to build your own home which not many people get the chance to do and we're very excited to move forward with this project.

We'd love nothing more than to build our dream home here in the city of Novi. Our home is roughly 916 square feet as it is right now and it was built in 1930. It's a cozy little home, but our family is growing and we would like something bigger and we've dreamt of something bigger working with AZD Architect here.

Our home sits on a lot 110 feet by 45 feet which makes it very narrow. Like many of the lots on the lake, we didn't obtain -- if we didn't get a variance, our house would be smaller than the current house we live in now.

It would probably be about 10 by 10 because it's such a small lot. We're asking for some similar variances that happened and that has already been approved in the city.

I'm sorry. I don't like talking up here. I get nervous. This is one of the homes that was very recent that we're kind of comparing it to. We're asking for a little less than what they've gotten on
their variances so we kind of played it off of this location and how close their lot lines are as well. The house we're proposing is an average size family home of roughly 3,800 square feet.

Show you -- just for visually here, to show you because it sounds like we're asking for a whole lot, but if you look at this picture here.
(Document displayed.)
So our current house and driveway and garage sit where this red -- the red is and the new house will sit where the red is and the green is what we're adding. So our setback we've been talking and working with the city already with AZD and we've moved a couple of setbacks already. One was for the garage. There was something about the overhang and we brought that back. And there was something about the property line between the two houses. And we set that back two to three feet to allow for partial windows on that side of the house and we do understand that has to be fire rated.

We've reduced the square footage where we thought was best. Like the garage is one and a half car garage as it sits. And the driveway that we
currently have will be in the same location. Sorry. I would like to show this one last drawing here to show the setback that we currently have right here is where the new house setback will be in the same location, but just to show that the entire street has the same setback. And you can go down Enwell (ph) Street and you can see every house is pretty much in the same spot. And we're lined up with all our neighbors and every one in line if we could keep our front setback how it is.

I think that's it.
MS. VAN PELT: My name is Lauren Van Pelt. My last name V-a-n P-e-l-t. I'm his wife. Really, the only --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Wait a minute. You got to swear in. Are you an attorney?

MS. VAN PELT: Oh, I'm so sorry. Yes, I
swear to tell the truth.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you.
MS. VAN PELT: The only extra thing is like this one $I$ know did confuse a couple of you with this variance. This was just the approved variance, word by word, that was approved for the house that is five
houses down from us. So it just got built, like, last year. Newly built. They did ask for like 15 -- 51 percent max lot. We are asking for a little bit less so we are thinking this is pretty comparable to what we're asking compared to, like, how setback they are from their neighbors and from the road, it will be pretty similar. So that's just -- I didn't mean to confuse you with that variance. It's just a very similar variance.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: The architect have anything -- do you want to add anything?

MR. BALKWILL: Not a lot. I'm here mostly to help answer questions if the board has any. But just very quickly just wanted to reinforce something that Anthony said. As you can see, this red box, that is the allowed building envelope for the property. So talking about the variance requests and their need as an expanding family. You know, we took a lot of different looks at how we can add to the house and try to minimize our variance request. But you can see that with that building envelope as it sits, it's very difficult to -- it's really almost non-buildable. We tried to match the front setback as it exists as well
as on the one side we actually pulled in a little bit from what exists now to get away from the property line a little bit to allow for windows as Mr. Virga said. And did our best to work with the existing conditions and try to minimize our variance request, but still accommodate their needs for their growing family. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you. All set, then, till questions? MR. BALKWILL: Yes. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Anyone else in the audience have a comment regarding this case? Okay. Seeing none. From the City? MR. BUTLER: No comments. Standing by. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you. From correspondence?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: 48 letters mailed, seven returned. No objections and no approvals.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. And I'll open up to the board. Yes, Mav.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. Good evening. I came and visited your lot a couple of days ago, actually. And I have been familiar with East Lake Drive since 1974. Those homes were designed for a
weekend just cottages, you see, and they were not designed for a permanent residence like what we are doing now. And all these ordinances didn't exist in those days. So I can understand your problem. And when I came there and I looked at your application, I couldn't figure out how you are going to put all these things you want to do on a tiny little thing. It is almost the size of a postage stamp, your lot is. But now I see your new pictures and I understand how you are going to do it.

I know that you cannot build anything worthwhile on that lot without variances. And you do require lot coverage a lot larger than most allowed by these newer ordinances.

So I have no problem recommending your variances and approving them. Thank you.

MR. VIRGA: Thank you. Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Anyone else with comments?

Okay. Seeing none.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Comment.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, go ahead.
MEMBER THOMPSON: This is going to make sense
at some point.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Very good.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I guess I'd like to at least ask a question or so.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Sure.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: My concerns are always with the lot coverage. This is like huge. We're getting to where there's no lots left out there. So I guess my question is, have you looked at this in terms of minimizing the coverage for what they need in terms of the dimensions of the facility inside?

MR. BALKWILL: We did go back and forth with them on, you know, how do we get just what we need or what they need. You know, and, you know, the garage itself as mentioned is really it's not even a two-car garage. You know, it's kind of substandard. And, you know, it's really only like a three bedroom house, which is not expansive for a growing family this day and age.

So we were very conscious that we were really, you know, over the coverage but, you know, we felt like we were squeezed into that by the dimensions of the lot. So we did try to minimize it. But, you
know, this is where we ended up to make sure we still satisfied their needs for the house itself. And when we looked at the neighborhood, it wasn't out of character with some of the newer homes that were being built there.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I realize that. It doesn't mean that character is proper in terms of lot coverage and all. I know that it is a tough lot, I give you that. You've kept -- basically kept the setbacks sort of as they are now on the sides and the front.

MR. BALKWILL: For the most part the one side we came in a little bit and it was more of a code issue with windows. It had to be at least three feet from the property line. The original was two and a half feet or two foot nine maybe. So a few inches we came back and that allowed us to have some daylight windows for the proposed house on that side line.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER THOMPSON: So ...
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Go ahead.

MEMBER THOMPSON: It might not make sense.
Just in the line on the sheet as we're going through, the stuff -- the petitioner did not create the
condition. The lot is -- the lot is there and that's -- to me that's what was purchased.

MS. SAARELA: I'd make a clarification on that.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. SAARELA: They didn't create the lot. So what that means is that let's say they had a big three times the lot that size and they decided to divide it into four and they made four lots that were no longer conforming. That's what it means to create the condition when you're talking about the lot size. They did not create this lot size. It existed. It preexisted the zoning ordinance. So when we have a lot that preexisted the zoning ordinance, our zoning ordinance requires us to allow it to be buildable. So there is a zoning ordinance provision that says we cannot deny a building permit to a lot just because it doesn't meet our zoning ordinance requirements now. As long as it did at one time.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Got it.
MS. SAARELA: Okay.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. I was just going to go on, it's great that there was that many sent out
without any rejections sent back because that's kind of been a hotspot. So I can tell you guys have definitely put the effort into making that neighbor friendly as possible.

So thank you for that.
MR. VIRGA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
I have a question regarding the back.
There's the fence with the neighbor in the rear so it's going to be three feet, the footprint from the garage; is that correct?

MR. BALKWILL: The garage on the side -well, on the rear property line, no, it's going to be I think we have it --

MR. VIRGA: Ten feet.
MR. BALKWILL: Ten feet.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. BALKWILL: But it's on the side where it was three feet.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Three feet. Okay. Very good.

Considering every lot on -- around Walled Lake is unique and so that's why you end up with the
variance requirements. And what the homes going -people wanting to stay and upgrade the area, is a great thing. So because you've done due diligence and desire to stay and have had like a minimum request, you probably could have build more if you wanted to, but then you would have the neighbors having impact. So I would be able to approve your request.

MR. VIRGA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yeah. Mike?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes. Following on to what you
said, I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ22-0058 sought by AZD Associates, Incorporated, for four setback variances and a lot coverage variance because the petitioner has shown the practical difficulty requiring the variances to fit this -- to fit a house, current house on the prop -- on the lot. Without the variances, petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because the lot is far too small to meet the standard variances that we have today. Standard ordinances we have today. Excuse me.

The property is unique because it was zoned many, many years ago and is quite small. The relief
granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is common for the homes in that area to require ordinance variances similar to the ones you have requested.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance because of homes typically cover more space than the ordinances permit.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I have a motion and a
second. Any other discussion?
Seeing none. Anita, if you can call the roll.

MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?

MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: No.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Best wishes.

MR. VIRGA: Thank you, very much.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. That brings us to our next case. PZ22-0060, Michael -- how do you say the last name, Jocz?

MR. JOCZ: Jocz.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Jocz. Very good.
45144 Nine Mile Road, Parcel Number 50-22-27-355-031. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance 4.19.1.E(i) for 1,688 square feet of garage space, maximum of 850 square feet allowed by code, variance of 838 feet. Variance would accommodate the building of a garage addition. The property is zoned Single Family Residential.

Welcome. Are either of you attorneys?
MR. JOCZ: No.

MR. MYERS: No.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. If you can spell your names for our court reporter and then our
secretary will swear you in.
MR. MYERS: My name is Frank Myers, $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}$ M-y-e-r-s. I'm working with the Joczs on design and build of their protect.

MR. JOCZ: Michael Jocz. Last name J-o-c-z.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you all swear to tell
the truth in this case?
MR. JOCZ: Yes.
MR. MYERS: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you, very much.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Proceed. And then if you want to use the overhead, that's fine as well.

MR. MYERS: Yeah. We don't have too much to show. We were before the board back in July, a year ago there.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: A year ago.
MR. MYERS: This is Nine Mile Road as it sits out here and there's a detached pole barn in the back, back over in this area. And right over here is where the proposed garage addition is right in there. And it's, you know, a 30 by 30 garage. And we had zoning approval back, I think, in July a year ago and we were
approved, but we -- it's only good for one year and we had a delay in getting the plans all organized and everything so we're back before the board asking for the same variance again for the garage structure.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: May I ask, is it from the -- the one before was behind the house and then this one is to the --

MR. MYERS: No. It's the same one.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Same one. Okay. Very good.

MR. MYERS: Yeah. Same plot plan. Everything is still the same. We just had some design changes a little bit on the existing home.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And that's it?
MR. MYERS: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. For questions?

Okay. For -- are there anyone in the audience that would like to make a comment regarding this case?

Okay. Seeing none. From the City?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And correspondence?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: There were 51 letters mailed, zero returned, zero objections and zero approvals.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. Open it up to the board. Mav.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you for leading.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I came and visited your
place. All of the appearances on the application are pretty misguiding. When you come and look at your property, it's a pretty large property. Quite isolated property. And I don't think by increasing your garage size or whatever you are going to cause any trouble to anybody. So I have no problem supporting your application. Thank you.

MR. MYERS: Thank you.
MR. JOCZ: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is the addition going to match the house?

MR. JOCZ: Yes. The exterior will match the existing house.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good. Anyone else from the board have a question? Yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Will there be anything in there from the city that it would just be for like -are you using it to store your stuff?

MR. JOCZ: The garage itself?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah.

MR. JOCZ: Yeah. Two car garage and then some of the lawn equipment will be in there.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Your stuff?
MR. JOCZ: Yes.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. Does the city need to put anything in there that it's never going to be for industrial use?

MS. SAARELA: No.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Member Clift.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ22-0060 sought by Michael Jocz. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited in the use of his property because he's got a garage need and he
has a very large property. The property is unique because it's a large area of property that's isolated. There's some good plantings around it. We saw that. And so it will be pretty much contained to his view. The petitioner did not create the condition. It's an existing lot that he's building his garage on.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is on a large lot. It's isolated. It's very screened from view some other places. And it is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance for people to have the best use of their property. MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. I have a motion and a second.

All right. Anita, if you can call the roll. MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?

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

MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
MR. JOCZ: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Best wishes. It's good
to have a garage.
Come to our final case. PZ22-0061, Ron
Morelli for Benito's Pizza, on 24270 Novi Road, Parcel
Number 50-22-23-351-064. Applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.2.12 to allow for a reduction of a 30 square -- 30 required parking spaces for proposed restaurant expansion in an existing multi-tenant development. 89 parking spaces are provide, 119 are required. The property is zoned General Business.

Welcome.
MR. MORELLI: Hi. My name is Ron Morelli, M-o-r-e-l-l-i. And I run operations for Benito's Pizza

Corporation.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. MORELLI: I am not an attorney.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the
truth in this case?

MR. MORELLI: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. MORELLI: I'm here -- we're actually
asking for the same variance that was approved a few years ago. Pre-COVID we were here for our expansion of the -- of our Benito's restaurant on Ten Mile and Novi Road there behind -- in the complex behind the Speedway.

We had a traffic study done back then. We were told by your community development department we did not have to do that again. The conclusion that they came up with then -- and I'll read it verbatim of what they had. That like you said, we had 89 parking spaces in the development and the data collected from the company that did it had existing peak weekday parking demand was only 41 spaces and we only had -there was only the -- about the same amount on the
weekdays.
So there was -- again, back then you guys did approve it.

They did have back then -- I can show you the counts. This was the study that was done back then and they had -- I don't know if you can read that or in not. But of the four times, the four sections of the parking that they had on the totals -- and these were the times that -- the studies on these particular days. There was never more at the highest part which was lunch time, was only 41 parking spaces that were used at the time of the 89 .

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Does the City have a copy of that? I'm sorry.

MR. MORELLI: I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Does the City have a copy of that?

MR. MORELLI: Yes. It's in your packet. It should be in your -- in fact, this is a copy of the packet you guys got. I printed offline. So all of that is in your packet.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right.
MR. MORELLI: The plan that is in your
packet, though, because they included the packet from the last time we got approved was the old plan. The old plan was a complete redo of the entire restaurant. And then now post-COVID changes a lot of how we outfit these things. So this is the plan we're looking at now. We took over the cleaners next to it. This part over there is the existing -- our existing store which everything there is staying the same. The kitchen is there. Everything is the same. In fact, I had a -let me show you what that one is. This is the existing kitchen staying where it's at. This is the existing seating that we have right now to the existing outdoor seating that we have. And then this is the new -- is going into the cleaners next door. And so the only seating that we're adding there is this little bit here, this little bit here. We are moving our cooler over here and we're moving a little bit of our equipment over here to make room -- make more room in the kitchen area that we have.

We did apply for a liquor license so all of the bar equipment and all of that stuff is going to be in this area over here. And there's not going to be any seating at the bar anymore like we did in the old
plan and that kind of thing.
So what we're requesting is just the same variance that you approved the last time that we were here.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good.
Does anyone in the audience have any comment regarding this case?

All right. Seeing none. From the City?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Correspondence?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: 19 letters were mailed, zero returned, no objections and no approvals.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Open up to the board. Mav?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your place. I've been there umpteen times actually. So which store are you taking over?

MR. MORELLI: We're taking over the cleaners.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Oh, you're taking over --
MR. MORELLI: It was the cleaners next door and they vacated now going on four years ago and unfortunately we've been paying rent on it --

MEMBER SANGHVI: I know. I noticed that --
you see the traffic * mentioned doesn't exist anymore.

MR. MORELLI: Correct.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Our traffic volume now is much greater than it was then in '89, you said?

MR. MORELLI: No. The traffic -- well, 89 parking spaces --

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. So there is no comparison about the traffic volume. But I understand your problem. There is nowhere to put more parking spaces out in that area.

MR. MORELLI: Right. Right.
MEMBER SANGHVI: And I am very happy that you are doing good -- business well and you're expanding your business.

MR. MORELLI: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I would be very happy to support your application. Thank you.

MR. MORELLI: Thank you, very much. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Jay?
MEMBER McLEOD: The question is, and it may actually end up being for the City. Do you know how
the 119 was calculated?
MR. MORELLI: I do. It was calculated on -in fact, I have it here.

That also was in your packet. It was calculated based on the -- the packing that was there. And going down the fitness center requires 15, Penn Station requires -- required 27. The cleaners which we took over now is going to require none. The bank required 27. That's really where they kicked up a lot because banks are based off -- the parking requirements are based on square footage instead of for us it's based on seats.

And with online banking and stuff like that, I mean, I don't know any bank that would need 27 parking spots is a lot so that's kind of where the traffic study picked up a lot of spaces. For us, existing with the seats that we had or the proposed seats, we had 60 which required 35 seats and then they told us when we talked to the City that we also needed for weighting and out door.

So we needed 12 spots for outdoor, three spots for waiting parking spaces which brought us up to 50. So the 50 to 27, the 15 and the 27 then came up to

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So the 89, I was there also and there's a -- it wraps around the side of the bank there, right?

MR. MORELLI: Correct.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Does the 89 include those spaces --

MR. MORELLI: Yeah.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: -- by the bank?
MR. MORELLI: It includes all the parking on the site.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay.
MR. MORELLI: And the site plan -- I don't know if you'll be able to read it. I do have it here.

It may be easier to see.
It's also in you're packet, but it's from -that's what it looks like. And so, you know, we're over here and, yeah, it includes all this parking for the entire site.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. And you're adding 11 seats for customers in your addition, if I counted right; is that correct?

MR. MORELLI: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: And you had how many seats to begin with?

MR. MORELLI: I didn't count them. But the -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, 11, 12 -- 12 four tops plus the outdoor seating.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: So you had 40 --
MR. MORELLI: We had --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: 48 inside and you're adding 11 --

MR. MORELLI: And then one, two, three, four, five -- we have five four tops outside. Is what the plan shows.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: And when you did the traffic study, that included traffic for your restaurant at the time?

MR. MORELLI: Oh, yes, absolutely.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. So that was everybody that was --

MR. MORELLI: For everybody -- yeah. They did the traffic study for the entire site, for the bank, Penn Station, us, and the physical therapy place.

When they did -- in fact, when they did the traffic study, the cleaners was still open.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: May I add one more question?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Sure.
MEMBER SANGHVI: You have Huntington Bank next door. Have you talked to them that you can use their parking lot in the after hours?

MR. MORELLI: Well, it's actually not their parking lot. It is the -- all of the parking is the parking for the complex.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Because there is a lot of parking there which is not used in that. Because your business hours busy time is later in the evening rather than during the whole day.

MR. MORELLI: Right. Well, I --
MEMBER SANGHVI: And I just -- I just
wondering if you try to talk to them so that will solve your problem about this variance also.

MR. MORELLI: Right.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Anyway. This is just a thought. Thank you.

MR. MORELLI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I had a question --
MEMBER McLEOD: Sorry. One more question. This might be my misunderstanding when I do the case officially, today right now there are 89 seats -- I'm sorry, 89 parking spots?

MR. MORELLI: Yes.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay.
MR. MORELLI: There's 89 parking spots on the site.

MEMBER McLEOD: Got it. When I read through the first time I thought there was 119 and you were looking to expand and reduce the parking spots by 20 slots.

MR. MORELLI: No. In fact, when $I$ was talking to Anita at community development, she kept using reduction. I said we really don't want a reduction in the -- we're not reducing the lots. How many lots there are is how many spaces there are. And there's 89 spaces. And the requirement based on city ordinance on how many parking spaces we need per seats and with the bank and everything else, like I say they're based on square footage, was 119 required by ordinance. But like the traffic study, even at peak
hours, only 41 were actually used at the time.
MEMBER MCLEOD: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: How long have you -has Benito's been in that corner now?

MR. MORELLI: What time did you guys -October 2008.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: 2008? So a good long time.

MR. MORELLI: A long time.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You have a vested
interested. And then the expansion is kind of a bonus and you're in a unique location. And then, yes, every time I drive through there, the back parking lot isn't full so I can understand how it would be easier to accommodate. And then also the access points, you have egress from Novi Road and Ten Mile, if needed.

MR. MORELLI: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: So I can understand the need and the investment it just -- I would be able to support your request.

MR. MORELLI: Thank you, very much. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yeah. Jay? MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. So I move that we
grant the variance in case number PZ22-0061 sought by Ron Morelli/Benito's Pizza for having the requirement of 89 spaces in lieu of 119 because the petitioner has shown the practical difficulty in requiring -- I'll say business expansion, but in reality you only have 89 today and expanding that to 119 would be a destruction of business. Without the variance, petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of property because he -- they will be unable to use the buildings properly and use -- run the businesses.

The property is unique because there is current parking of 89 spaces. The buildings already exists and the parking lot already exists. And the utilization is barely 50 percent and even in peak hours.

Petitioner did not create the condition because this is the situation today and has been for years.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because this is commercial property and this has been the situation for a number of years and there's no --
nothing changing.
The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because there is still ample parking for customers.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I have a motion and second. Any other discussion?

Seeing none. Anita, if you can call the roll.

MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
MR. MORELLI: Thank you, very. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Best wishes. Yep. Looking forward to having the seating open again too.

MR. MORELLI: Thank you. Us too.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Guys, and thank you for your support of Novi Athletics. We get to go to the high school and you guys -- you guys are there for them and we appreciate that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Mav. Yes.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I just had a question for Mr. Butler. What will it take to make this area one-way road instead of having two and getting out at this place? If we get out near the traffic light, it is a lot safer than getting out at this exit here where I do.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, I thought you were talking about pizza. Okay.

MEMBER SANGHVI: So I am just curious, what is -- what's the -- how do we get this to become a
one-way?
MR. BUTLER: Have to go through a traffic study.

MEMBER McLEOD: Please no. I disagree.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Another light? No.
MEMBER McLEOD: I don't like waiting at the
red light --
MR. BUTLER: You talking about our --
MEMBER SANGHVI: Because -- it comes so fast
on Ten Mile Road from the west side. You can't even see them before they come and hit you. A little worrisome to me every time I come at night. I just wondered whether there is any way we can -- it used to be a one-way traffic before * became the --

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: One-way traffic?
(Court reporter interposes.)
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Motion to adjourn. We're adjourned.

> (At 7:50 p.m., meeting concluded.)
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