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And also, I'd like to do the Pledge of Allegiance followed by Michael. Please all of you stand up.

Thank you.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Michael.
Please be seated.
Okay. Our secretary is getting water. Thank you so much.

Kathy, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, I can.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Present.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Malott is absent,
excused.
Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker is absent, excused.

Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Present.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And we have enough quorum?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, we do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And
let's move. All right. We have a board and a quorum
and roll call.
And Public Format and Rules of Conduct, you have seen in the back there is a format on everything, if you have any questions on those.

Coming to the approval of agenda on May and June. Somebody can make a motion?

MEMBER SANGHVI: What is that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Agenda. Meeting minutes.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I don't have any changes so
I move to approve the minutes for May and June.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any questions, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMAN: We do also need to make a motion to approve the agenda. There was an update on the other matters where we removed potential reconsideration of case PZ21-0011 as it was determined that they already had the chance to be reconsidered last month and it was not done so and that's the only update on the agenda. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want
to make an agenda to be added on this board? To be added for a proposal on that one?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to approve the agenda as amended.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All in favor?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Say "Aye" all in
favor.
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. All
right. We have an approval of the agenda.
(Cell phone ringing.)
Public remarks, any questions on the public remarks? Anyone have any questions?
(No response.)
Okay. Try to please turn off your phones.
And as well when you are here, please come to the podium and spell your first and last name very clearly for our court secretary. And also we have our projector and we can watch it.

Today we have almost six cases. Am I right, Katherine? Today is six cases we have?

MS. OPPERMAN: Correct, yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA. And, yeah, let's move to the first case. Before moving to the first case, any public hearing? Any remarks or any changes before I move to the first case? After that I cannot change anything, please.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Seeing none. Okay. Thank you.

Okay, today's first case is PZ21-0022, Dan and Wendi Williams, 1419 West Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive and south of West Pontiac Trail, parcel 50-22-03-204-021.
\{\{The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 for a side yard setback of five feet, 10 feet minimum required, a variance of five feet; an aggregate total side yard setback of 17.75 feet, 25 feet required, variance of 7.25 feet; and a proposed lot coverage of 32 percent, 25 percent maximum allowed, a variance of 7 percent.

Section 3.32-7 for a proposed deck 13.5 feet from the rear yard's property line, 17 feet minimum
required, a variance of 3.5 feet.
Section 4.19.1.E(i) for the construction of a 1157 square foot garage, maximum of 850 square feet allowed by code, a variance of 307 square feet.

Section 3.1.5 for a third story, 2.5 stories allowed by code.

These variances would accommodate the building of a new home and deck. The property is zoned single family residential, $R-4$. The case was postponed from the June 8, 2021 meeting.

Is the applicant present? Please come to the podium. Please spell your first and last name clearly and if anybody is representing you, now would be the time to join on your behalf. Thank you so much.

Katherine, can you take this?
Secretary?
MEMBER KRIEGER: If you could, just state your names and spell them for our court recorder.

MR. WILLIAMS: Dan Williams, D-a-n, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.

MS. WILLIAMS: And Wendi Williams, W-e-n-d-i, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And if you could raise your
right hand.
Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MS. WILLIAMS: I do.
MR. WILLIAMS: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Linda.

And thank you so much. You can proceed what we can help you with, where we can proceed on this case. Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Do you want us to restate the variances whatever you stated?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Whatever you want you can present where we can help you and how we can resolve your case. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, first of all, thank you for taking the time to hear our case. I appreciate that very much.

We're here because some people are concerned about, you know, the size of the house that we're proposing to build and obstructing their views from across the street. People who live in the back lots.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you please talk louder or pull your mics closer? Thank you so much.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. And we understand that people are concerned and that they have been enjoying views across our unimproved property for years, but now we do want to improve the property and build a contemporary home at this location.

While this does impact some of our neighbors' views, I just wanted to point out that I have met with each one of the neighbors separately and in all cases have made modifications to the design in an effort to accommodate the neighbors' requests and have re-emailed those. We're very close.

I'm kind of surprised that we actually have written objections still. I thought that we had concurrence in a couple of cases where we don't. In all candor, I'm a bit disappointed because of my architectural re-engineering with TK Design in South Lyon, Michigan. You know, just, basically, the expense and time to go through all that effort and find out that there's still, you know, objections. But I understand those objections and I would like to address those.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you have a -- you're going to put information up on the board?

MS. WILLIAMS: My understanding is that the members all have the packet.

MEMBER KRIEGER: We do. But for the viewers at home.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, sure. Yes. It's on this hard drive here. We can do that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WILLIAMS: I have a thumb drive.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Thank you, Linda.

MS. OPPERMAN: If I could, just so the board is aware, the over screen is not currently working. They only have laptop access. So possibly not all applicants will have that ability, but all of the materials are available online for anyone that wants to view them.

MS. WILLIAMS: Should I give this thumb drive to someone?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. You can try it.

MS. WILLIAMS: Just try to plug it in?

MS. OPPERMAN: Um-hmm.
(Pause.)
(Document displayed.)
MR. WILLIAMS: That's perfect. That's good. MRS. WILLIAMS: Can everyone see that? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, we can see it. MR. WILLIAMS: That's really good there.

So this is a really nice recap here where it shows lot coverage. Ordinance is 25 percent and we're looking for 30 percent. It would be a five percent variance. Front yard set back is 31 feet and we're going to be 30 feet. So there's no variance requested there.

The backyard setback for the house is 39 feet, 10-inches from the rear lot line. The ordinance is 35 feet. So there's no variance for the rear yard setback on the house.

But we are asking for a rear yard setback on the deck. Where the ordinance is 17 feet and we want to be 13 feet. And then the same variances would need to be granted, if I understand it correctly, for the deck. Where we're a five-foot side yard setback, you know, the deck would continue along that same path of
being five foot from the side yard.
There is an existing garage at the location now and it's about in the same spot where the new garage would go. So the overall footprint is quite similar; the new house compared to the old house. The difference being that the new house, you know, is taller, higher. The new house also would be further from the lot line. We're asking for a variance for that five-foot setback. The current home is two and a half feet from the lot line.

And then another -- so it would be an improvement. I know that it's not compliant with the code, you know, but the five foot would be further than what it is right now.

The other improvement would be with the size of the deck, where the current deck is -- and there's several objections about that and I can speak to those separately, is around 2400 square feet. The new deck is about a thousand square feet smaller than the existing deck.

One of the variances is the rear yard setback where the code is 17 feet. You know, the back of the deck is supposed to be 17 feet from the rear yard lot
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line and we're wanting to encroach upon that 17 feet by about --

MS. WILLIAMS: Three and a half.
MR. WILLIAMS: Three and a half.
So we would be asking for a variance on that.
I also would like to point out that the current deck completely goes to the rear yard. It literally touches the rear lot line. So kind of like on the other side of the house where it's two and a half feet, the five foot is what we're asking for. It's better on the back of the lot, but not compliant with the code and that's why we're here.

The back of the deck as it is right now is along the lot line and this would bring it back away from the lot line by about 13 and a half feet. So the new deck would be -- I'm just repeating myself a little bit there -- would be smaller and further from the rear yard lot line

And I don't know how much -- do you want me to speak to the objections of the neighbors or what would you like me to do?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Not at this time.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And I would like --

MS. WILLIAMS: I guess, Dan, I think the only other thing I would suggest that we point out in this point is this page where you talk about -- where we talked about --

MEMBER LONGO: Can you go over to the mic, please?

MS. WILLIAMS: Sorry. You may just want to speak to this page which talks about some of the accommodations we gave up. Really, I think the table at the bottom is a summary of what we have tried to summarize. You know, what has been approved on the lake and in most cases we're asking for less than what's been approved and we just thought we would point that out.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, yeah. That's a nice recap there. It just shows that the variances that we're asking for are consistent with the history of variances that have been granted over the years and we considered that when we designed the house.

And then the other thing is -- it's not in
writing anywhere. But if $I$ was in your position thinking oh, this guy's crazy. He's building a huge house or something like that, it's not that big of a house. What makes it seem kind of big is we want to have a first floor master suite. So as soon as you put the master bedroom on the first floor, you know, then that creates a bigger footprint like that. I don't know if I'll ever go upstairs. You know, I didn't go upstairs in my last house. I hardly go upstairs in the house I have right now.

We need that for guests, for resale and other
factors. I'm planning on living on the first floor of this house which is not, you know, real big. It's whatever it is, 1800 square feet or something like that. I just want to point that out. It's a first floor master suite. Each time we get into crunching the house smaller in the one case we made it narrower and it's always the master suite that is kind of the constraint on the design, the first floor master suite. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much. Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case?

Please come to the podium.

couldn't agree on everything.
But, anyway. I've lived in Novi for over 30 years and I've built three houses on Walled Lake. So I know there is challenges, okay, and I did have to request the variance on one of them. And I was talking to some neighbors that have not came here over the course of the last couple of years and they've live to regret it. So that's kind of what brings me here. I want to kind of keep on planning with what our city planners had planned.

On the application that $I$ had got off the internet, it said the circumstances for hardship to request a variance, it said the shape of the lot and it says on there that it's 45 foot wide at the roadside. And it is 45 foot wide at the roadside, but the key is it's 90 foot wide at the lake. Which actually makes it one of the biggest lots in the neighborhood. It's so big, matter of fact, at one time it used to be a duplex back in the old days, okay?

And when I look at the site plan, okay, I guess I just look at this and I see house and garage and concrete and a deck and it's just not typical with what is in the neighborhood. And in going through it I
got confused because on one of the things it says proposed residence 2122 square feet. That's per floor is what I saw online, okay? And by the time you add that up to three floors and a full living area -- or a full gym or whatever over the garage, you're like 7400 square foot of house, which is pretty big for our neighborhood and nobody has a four-car garage that's being requested and nobody has a 1500 square foot deck. We all moved on the lake for the view of the lake. And if you're going to put a deck with railings on it, while I appreciate some of the modifications they made for the deck with the railings, it's still just way too much. And when you live on a lake, your backyard is kind of really your front yard. And by allowing the deck to go out that far, it's really going to start blocking the view and it's going to set a bad precedent on what is allowed on the lake.

So the other big key is they're requesting seven variances. Yes, you can look at each one and say, well, it was given here. It was given here. But on one house, seven variances, it seems pretty excessive for what is already one of the largest lots, if not the largest, in the neighborhood.

And it's just going to totally -- I think it's going to look like a multi-family apartment building there. It's just so big that -- you know, that's why I'm here saying I think seven variances is too much. I don't think that's what the city planners when they came up with the ordinances had in mind that a Zoning Board would give leeway on. So I ask you on that, you know, to stay with what was the intentions of the planners, historically. Because I think it's blocking a lot of view in a lot of places and it's just too big for what's in the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
MR. CONDON: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you for staying in your time of three minutes. Thank you so much.

Any other in the audience would like to speak before I move?

Looks like seeing none.
From the City?
MR. BUTLER: Only thing I had to say was there is no limit to the amount of variances that anybody could ask for their property. So they're
within their rights to ask for their variances, which is up to the ZBA Board to determine whether they're going to give them to them or not.

And as to the square footage of the home, square footage is what's sitting on the property. It doesn't matter what size the other floors are. It's still just that square footage sitting on the property. That's all I have. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry. Correspondence, Member Linda?

MS. OPPERMAN: It'll be on the folder itself underneath all of the attachments.

MEMBER KRIEGER: The sent 32; returns, zero; approvals, three; objections, six?

MS. OPPERMAN: Um-hmm.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Very good.
First one is objection: "This is not a hardship case. The Williams moved to this house from a new house down the same street. I see no reason to push the limits this far," from Bruce Bernard.

Objection: "See attached letter, from
Raymond Aught (ph). Note the side yard setback on the garage on the south side could remain --"

Is it two sides?
"To Zoning Board, I am Williams' neighbor that is located to the southwest of the residence. On July 8, '92, I purchased my home at 1425 West Lake Drive. I purchased it for two reasons; one, view, usage of the lake; two, future increase in real estate value. Twenty-nine years later these still remain my top concerns. I'm writing to the zoning board to protect these two concerns.
"View, usage of the lake: One of my concerns with the Williams' house plans is the effect it will have on my views of the lake. I am not asking for any better views than I had when I bought my house, but I don't feel that my views should be any worse either. All I am asking is that the views be kept as close to the same as possible. The following are two options that I dam propose to ensure that my lake views remain close to what I have now.
"Option one: Build the new house at the existing house setback from the lake. In 2017, '18, the Williams shared several versions of their house plans with me. One of the plans had their new house being built closer to the lake than their existing
house resulting in my views of the lake being blocked, reduced. I shared with them I would like it if they would keep the new setback from the lake the same as the existing house, build the lakeside wall of the new house in the same location as the old house. The Williams pointed out that even building at the current setback, my views were going to be obstructed because the current house's second floor roof line is slanted away from the lake giving me a broad view of the lake whereas the Williams' new design would be a straight up wall blocking part of my view.
"I indicated that if they built at the setback of the existing house, I would accept the obstructions caused by the new wall design. The Williams seemed very understanding of my concerns and indicated they would have the plans redrawn. I have reviewed the Williams' new plans. I appreciate that the Williams have increased the house setback from the lake from 44 feet in the original plan to 47 feet; however, this still results in the new house being built two feet closer to the lake than the current house limiting the views out of my side windows on both the main floor and second floor. I know that two feet
does not seem like a lot but it is when it is a three-story wall that has been moved forward towards the lake in front of my windows.
"Option two: Build the new house with equal split of north and south side yard setback. Another option could be to reposition the house deck on the lot. If the Williams kept their 47 -foot setback on the south corner and simply moved their home toward the north lot line, it might keep some of my view. This would be -- could be accomplished a number of different ways, including the Williams have proposed building 12 feet nine inches from the north lot line to improve the view for my neighbors.
"For neighbors who do not live on the lake, the Williams are requesting a five foot setback variance so they can build five feet from the south lot line. Perhaps we could split the side yard setbacks and build eight, feet 11 inches from each lot line, thus centering the house on the lot.
"Note, the side yard setback for the garage on the south side could remain at five feet to accommodate the property size at the street. This option has many advantages. It satisfies the Williams'
desire to keep the 47 -foot setback on the corner, reduces total side yard setback variance required, maintains much of the lake view for the non-lakefront neighbors, keep some of my lake view.
"Real estate values: Real estate values is a little bit more difficult to address. The question is how do you determine the future real estate value of your home? There are so many factors that affect real estate values. In this case, I think we can consider how do we think the Williams' design will affect my property values. A three-story house with a two-story, four-car garage, a structure covering 30 percent of the lot, built five feet from south property line, $I$ think it raises a number of questions. Will the effect be positive? Will the effect be negative or will it be a combination of both? Would anyone want to live in my home directly next to a home that size? What would someone be willing to pay for my property?"

And then it goes on and he summarizes. And keep reading it verbatim?

MS. SAARELA: You can just summarize these letters. You don't have to read them word for word. So you can just indicate it's a denial and pick the
high points without having to read the whole letter. MEMBER KRIEGER: So real estate values and a view of the lake. And that was the summary of those issues and then more detail.

The next one is from Mike and Georgie Batalucco on West Lake.
(Court reporter spelling clarification.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup. Mike and Georgie is G-e-o-r-g-i-e; and then Batalucco, B-a-t-a-l-u-c-c-o.
"We are the owners of 117 Recston, which is a back lot situated behind the Williams' address and is afforded a view of the lake. Due in large part to the current size of the Williams' residence, Dan and Wendi Williams' openness and communication about their planned new construction of the home needing multiple zonings has been much appreciated. We personally voiced our concerns in regards to the variances the Williams seek that will obstruct the view of the lake as other back lot owners like us.
"Additionally, we often see neighbors walk down West Lake Drive enjoying the openness and occasional view of the lake. Although we do understand the Williams owned the lakefront property, the scope
and scale of the proposed new home will further diminish any already dwindling lake atmosphere that the community offers. In addition, we believe we paid a premium for our home due to their being views allowing to sit on their patio in the backyard and enjoy the already obstructed view of the lake and lake-like atmosphere created by the lake views."

It goes on similarly.
"Given, we did not receive a copy of the proposed home plans with Zooming meeting. As we did in the prior adjourned meeting, we did not know the additional variance --"

Okay. And thank you for their consideration.
Another one from Michelle Wood. "First, I want it on the record that $I$ did not approve the plans. I had a brief conversation with the applicant and expressed my concerns. I never saw the plot plan. I did not realize how much of the real estate the proposed home took up. For once again, it is my opinion the proposed structure is excessive for the lot size and should be limited to the existing footprint and not exceed the height of the adjacent homes.
"Finally, I would appreciate the council
members or the zoning members to keep in mind that the neighborhood common lake lot that was maintained by the neighborhood for decades was taken away several years ago left with a small view of the lake. Please do not allow the view to be reduced any further," from Michelle Wood.

Objection from S. Zanotti, Z-a-n-o-t-t-i, on Recston.
"What are building codes for? In fact, what are zoning boards for if the builders are able to bypass constantly the codes that are in place? The codes were established for a reason. Remodel should be restricted to original footprint of the building and structures on the property. To call this a single family structure is ridiculous and now they want more variances. Either upload the codes or put a motion out to change the zoning codes to the people in Novi and let them decide."

Approval from Tim Richardson on 1511 West Lake. "I approve provided the neighbor on the south side approves the five-foot setback."
"Hi, I've lived at 1430 West Lake for 21 years, the proposed new home on 1419 West Lake Drive
looks gorgeous and $I$ am in support of the variances, thank you." Jennifer Sinkevics, S-i-n-k-e-v-i-c-s.

Objection from James Seabold, 1405 West Lake, "Neither the size or shape, reason given in their request, justifying a variance allowing construction of a deck closer to the lake than current zoning requirements. It's a nice-sized lot, quite deep and vary at the lake, although narrower at the street. Although building plans were altered to accommodate the neighbors, $I$ believe the current deck plans could still interfere with the neighbors' view and subsequent enjoyment of the lake. Please note the current deck, which is closer to the lake than the proposed deck, was installed without a permit and at that time was an empty lot to the north. The new deck will be significantly higher in elevation than the current deck and that combined with any type of railing will significantly impair the view of the lake despite diagrams and proposal to the contrary.
"The proposed deck is extremely large. If the variance is not granted the resulting deck will still be quite large. The request also states the variance is needed to accommodate a new covered deck.

I'm not sure what is meant by a covered deck, but that should be clarified. There is no cover noted in the plans. Certainly a large deck can be accommodated without the variance. These are good neighbors and it looks like it will be a beautiful home. I just don't think this rear yard variance is needed or justified.
"The standard setback will not unreasonably prevent building on the property. The proposed rear setback is not the minimum variance necessary for a construction of a home and deck and could have adverse effect on the neighbors and surroundings."

Approval from Daniel and Justin Weinger, W-e-i-n-g-e-r, on 1523 West Lake. "Home improvements are good for the neighborhood and increase home values."

And that's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much Member, Secretary, Krieger. I Appreciate your time. Thank you so much.

Okay. Dan and Wendi, I appreciate for your presentation and also there is the people on the neighbors. I hear you. And, yeah, let us see what we can do. I'll put it on the board.

Board members, this is the time you can speak up. Anybody? It's open.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Could you put a picture or rendering that you have in our packet of what the house is going to look like? Just so everybody at home can see what we're talking about.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, there is in the package, but it's not on this disc.

MEMBER KRIEGER: It's not on your clip?
MS. WILLIAMS: Sorry, no.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MS. WILLIAMS: But it does not look like a multi-family dwelling unit. And it's not 7400 square feet. It's approximately 3400.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's specific northwest design.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Wait. I'm sorry. If you speak, you have to speak at the podium with the mic. And then my question is to clarify three stories versus height requirement and what's the difference or how are they the same.

MR. BUTLER: It's two and a half stories. MEMBER KRIEGER: It's two and a half stories.

So the height?
MS. OPPERMAN: It's 35 feet or two and a half stories whichever is less is the requirement. And they're requesting three stories.

MS. WILLIAMS: And 33 feet in height.
MR. WILLIAMS: So it's less than the height. The height spec is 35 max.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And that's similar to the homes along the street?

MR. WILLIAMS: The newer homes. The older homes are shorter.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Linda, you can proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: But to answer your question about the design, it's specific northwest. TK Design from South Lyon did it. Some people call it the Frank Lloyd Wright look. It's the hip roof with the horizontal lines.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I wanted you to put it up there because I thought it was a beautiful picture of the house. I wanted everyone at home to appreciate what the intent is.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. It is beautiful. It's
really well done.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I still am digesting all the notes and everything. So I would like to hear from other members first.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, Member
Krieger. Thank you.
Any board member would like to speak?
Member Sanghvi, please go ahead.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Good evening, Mr. and Mrs. Williams. Welcome
to ZBA. First of all, I want to accommodate you for a very beautiful application you have prepared. I came and visited your property also a month ago before, you were coming here previously, and looked around the neighborhood.

I see you have taken the trouble to talk to your neighbors. And I know everybody doesn't always agree to what you're trying to do, but that's inevitable in a democracy.

Every single property around the Walled Lake is a nonconforming structure these days because the ordinances have changed over the years. So everybody needs some kind of variances to build anything better
than what is already existing. So I'm not surprised you need quite a few variances.

I also note that in the publicized from the ZBA you had 32 percent lot coverage but you are asking for 30 percent now; is that correct?

MS. WILLIAMS: 32 percent is correct. I'm sorry.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Please. Don't talk in the middle, please. Thank you.

I'm asking the City.
MR. BUTLER: I misspoke.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes. I think it's 32
percent. We just saw it in the application. We have advertised 32 percent.

MS. OPPERMAN: The calculations are in the description.

MEMBER SANGHVI: And while you are doing that, I also have another question for you.

MR. BUTLER: 32 percent she's asking.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes. That is what we advertised, but they asked for 30 percent.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So if they're asking for 30, then that's less.

MR. BUTLER: They can go less.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Because what $I$ saw in the presentation is 30 percent.

MS. OPPERMAN: If I may, we should go by what is in the description. That is what was determined by our building reviewer. If they do only end up needing 30 percent, that's great, but we should go by what is written.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Another question for Mr. Butler is how do you define attic as compared to a floor? What's the difference?

MR. BUTLER: What was that again?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Between the attic and the floor, when we're talking about he's doing a third floor there, $I$ think it's very important to distinguish between a regular floor, which is minimum of 10 foot of height, as compared to an attic.

MR. BUTLER: Because that is considered a half height because it doesn't go all the way up to the ceiling. So that's why we have it at two and a half floors.

MR. SANGHVI: This is a half floor?
MR. BUTLER: Yes.
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MEMBER SANGHVI: This is not three floors, but two and a half floors?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
Considering everything, I realize that you asked for quite a few variances. But I think you got a beautiful home there from whenever plans I have seen and I think you're doing a good job of preparing all these things and I have no difficulty in supporting your application.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member would like to discuss on this case?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes, please.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, Member Clift. Go ahead.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I applaud you in talking to your neighbors, for sure. What concerns me is 32 percent lot coverage. It's getting very dense out there and I do appreciate people wanting to see a lake and that lot coverage is getting excessive. I don't
think because some other people have come through and got some, $I$ don't think we should keep stretching that. So I do have a problem with that and I'd really like you to look at that lot coverage and getting it down. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Clift.

Any other board member?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I have a question for you. On the lot coverage and some of the other issues, wouldn't a fair amount of them go away if you went to a three-car garage instead of the four-car garage?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. For sure, if we went to a three-car garage, it would reduce the lot coverage. MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: We would still need all of the other variances.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So if you went to a three-car garage and moved the house back, because there was one less garage needed, so couldn't the house go back towards the road and the people that needed -MR. WILLIAMS: When I look out my side windows, I see my neighbor's house. When my neighbors look out their side windows, they have some view of the
lake.
MR. CONDON: Incorrect.

MR. WILLIAMS: The reason is --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry. Please continue.

Your time is done. Please let him present.
And I'm sorry for that.
MR. WILLIAMS: Well, and very specific, real specific, let's go to the pinch point on the design. It's a great question. I love it --

The pinch point on the design is in the southeast corner of the house effecting the property to the south. And when I look out my window to the south, I see the side of their home. When they look out their window on my side of the house to the north, they see the lake. And the reason why is because their house is seven feet closer to the lake than my house is. They're compliant with the code, the 35 -foot setback. I'm going to be compliant with the setback. There's no variance request for the setback from the lake, from the rear yard.

So, yeah, I'm moving it out two feet, but not two feet past their house. Their house is still five
feet closer to the lake than mine. It's hard to explain, but ...

MEMBER THOMPSON: It's hard for me to understand. My thought is just that I don't want your master bedroom to be any smaller. I get that --

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, no. What you're bringing up is a good point. You're right. Bring the house closer to the road. But then if I bring the house closer to the road, I'm burrowing the house between the houses and, specifically, the house to the south.

So when I look out my front window -- forget about the side window. He's saying -- he can see the lake everywhere out his front windows. He's saying -and it says in writing -- out his side windows he sees my house. If I did what you're proposing, pulled my house back even more behind his house, when I look out my front windows, I wouldn't see the lake at all. I would see his house with the lake.

It's great to pull the house off the lake more, but it kills the view.

MEMBER THOMPSON: It wouldn't kill the view from the deck and, like, really where do you want to be anyways?

MR. WILLIAMS: The master suite is in that corner, the southeast corner of the house.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So the setback is not an issue?

MS. WILLIAMS: We're not requesting a rear yard setback.

MR. WILLIAMS: There's no request for the rear yard setback on the house.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm trying to figure out with listening to the neighbors say, you know, what's the hardship and this and that, I'm just trying to figure out if there is other alternatives to get the house that you want without -- I mean, steal from the garage.

MR. WILLIAMS: Make an invisible house.
MS. WILLIAMS: We did have a lot of this dialogue with the neighbors and we really -- I mean, the house is like, Mr . Ott's statement said that, well, geez, just center it between the setbacks without pushing it, you know, five feet off the south property line. Well, if we did that, then the neighbors on the other side are going to not be happy.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, if you move it -another solution, like Wendi was saying, is move the whole house north, then it completely eliminates the objection from the neighbor to the south.

Well, if we move the house further to the north as he's proposing, it's a good idea. Then we'd have three neighbors that are adversely effected. One of them is in this room that would be opposed to that.

So we're going for the five-foot setback on the right-hand side of the house and the 12 and a half or whatever it is, 13 feet. I think 12 and a half on the north side of the house, 17 foot total. We see tons of them are five foot on both sides, tons, very large homes.

And it goes back -- really, I should have started with it -- the first floor master suite. If we put that master bedroom upstairs, we could eliminate a lot of this.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I -- okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Are you done?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Confused. But, yeah, I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
 footprint?

MR. WILLIAMS: Approximately 2400 square feet. The new deck would be 900 square foot smaller. MEMBER KRIEGER: So the deck would be smaller. You're keeping the master bedroom for resale value, I guess, is on the first floor. I don't know how supply and demand works on that.

MS. WILLIAMS: No. It's not for resale. I'm sorry.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MS. WILLIAMS: It's for our own personal
health. I broke my knee and my wrist last year and we're not comfortable living with the second floor -MR. WILLIAMS: There's a very high likelihood we'll have an elevator in the house. It would be within the confines of the footprint that we've outlined here.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Very good. If you move as previously suggested the house further west -- yeah, then that possibly could obstruct view from the people in the subdivision on other streets.

So with your current plan, I appreciate you started back in 2018 speaking with neighbors about building a new property. So that is forethought and
good planning. The plan itself that you presented in our packet is an excellent packet presentation. The house is beautiful. It is similar to other home requests that have been granted on West Lake in different areas.

Each house is unique. Each property size is unique, topography is different. I appreciate when I drive by over the years the fence that you have on the north side, all the flowers every year. As I've learned from before location, location, location. When you buy a house that something can happen. The house that I'm in, the prior owner built it and there was nothing to the east of the house and all of a sudden a subdivision popped up and he moved.

So you can't please everybody. You can please some people some of the time. You can't please all the people all the time. This is a unique plan. It is -- the requests are seven requests, but considering the presentation and the footprint of the first floor, the height is stated as three stories but is in height permissible per the ordinances. So it's two and a half because it's an attic space.
You're willing to reduce it to a three-car
garage and stated that it could be 30 percent, which is less than 32 percent printed in our packet for the public to review. The lake view, they pay a premium for lake view. It's an adjustment. Everybody's got to see that Novi is evolving. That the homes of the '40s when this location was first built meets the ordinances of the past. People who are moving in now have a different demand and idea and considering all the elements I would move to accept the request. MEMBER SANGHVI: Second. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No.

MEMBER KRIEGER: That wasn't a motion, but thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no, no. This is not the motion. Everybody, please, listen. Member Krieger, thank you so much. And it's time for the motion.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. You can make a formal motion now.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Michael, please go ahead and make a motion.

MEMBER LONGO: In addition to what she said, I move that we grant the variance in case PZ21-0022
sought by Daniel and Wendi Williams for two side yard variances, maximum coverage variance, deck rear yard variance, maximum garage variance and a third story or half story, whatever that thing is variance, because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty fitting a modern home on this lot.

Without the variance, petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because the home would be dramatically smaller. The property is unique because it was an irregular shape and narrow at the front. The petitioner did not create the condition because the lot dimensions were existing when they purchased it.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the lots are narrow. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinances because the lot was laid out before most of these ordinances were set up. And the view blockage for the neighbors is not overly done.

Thank you.
MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair? One last question before you guys pass a vote. I would like to make one
correction. Mav had asked me a question about.
It is a three-story, not two and a half
story, Mav. Because there is a three-story building.
The two and a half story that would have been considered an attic which you asked from before. I read right past that.

MEMBER SANGHVI: It's a very important point to clarify. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: You're very welcome, sir.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.
I appreciate.
Can you add that, Member Longo, on that three story? Can you correct yourself on that?

MEMBER LONGO: So the third story, I did say third story?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Then it's okay. MEMBER SANGHVI: I second the motion. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Can I say something before we vote? Could I have one more say before we vote? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please. MEMBER MONTAGUE: I just want to say that I
do have the concern for the lot coverage, but the need for the master bedroom -- I was looking at the plan.

The need for that master bedroom on the first floor definitely limits the thing that's driving this, which is the width. So that sort of puts you in a -- I think that's a special problem that's addressed here. MR. CONDON: So could somebody explain to me why they need the deck variance? MEMBER KRIEGER: You're out of order, sir. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No.

MR. CONDON: I'm just asking the question, why do they need the deck variance?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You had your chance when we started at the beginning. Thank you, though.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. I appreciate.

I would like to put -- I want to close this one. Member Sanghvi, you did the second?

MS. OPPERMAN: He did.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I agree with you. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Roll call, please, secretary, Katherine.

MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly. Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Congratulations, Dan and Wendi. I appreciate and congratulations to your project. Thank you so much.

And I want to request -- I want to tell the audience, anybody, just, you know, you have a time. You know, conversation on the case and the applicant and the board, we discuss. Once the audience members speaks, their time is done. This is the part that we have the board closed. I appreciate for your cooperation. Thank you so much. And the limit of the
time is three minutes.
Thank you.
MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.
MR. CONDON: I only want to say that you're making a mistake in your math.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Today's second case, PZ21-0031, Michael Jocz, J-o-c-z, 45144 Nine Mile Road, east of Taft Road and north of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-27-355-031. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 4.19.1.E(i) for a 1,688 square feet of garage space, maximum of 850 square feet allowed by the code, for a variance of 838 square feet. This variance would accommodate the building of a garage addition. This property is zoned single family residential, R-3.

Is the applicant present?
Okay. Please tell my secretary for your first and last name clearly.

Member Linda?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup. If you could spell
your name for the court recorder.
MR. JOCZ: Michael Jocz. M-i-c-h-a-e-l, last
name J-o-c-z.
MR. MYERS: And I'm Frank Myers, F-r-a-n-k M-y-e-r-s.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Will you raise your right hand.

If you could swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. JOCZ: I do.
MR. MYERS: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Go ahead, please.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, secretary.

You can proceed on what we can help you with on this case.

And please get close to the mic so the audience can hear you.

MR. MYERS: I'm Frank Myers. I'm working with Michael and Adalaide (ph) on their project here. They're proposing a new renovation to their existing home and want to attach a two-car garage to the home. And that's pretty much, you know, all that there is.

They're on a very, very large lot, like 200
by 350 feet. And I guess its special use only allows 850 square feet so we need a variance to increase that. MR. JOCZ: Just to ...

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. JOCZ: Just to add that the variance that we have due to the presence of an existing pole barn structure, that is why the variance is required that's setback from the property that was there when we purchased the property.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Any other thing you would like to add or you want to show anything on the projector?

MR. MYERS: I didn't have anything to show on the projector other than what we've presented to the board. We have, you know, the plot plan there. We have the proposed plans for the addition and then also the existing property that's on there.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case before moving today?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: This is the time to talk, please, any audience. After that we don't give

Thank you.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Yeah, I see.
I saw the property and what you're looking and the variance on this. Let me put it on my board. Let them speak on this and we'll see how things will go from there. It's open to the board.

MEMBER KRIEGER: From the City?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, from the
City, Larry, anything on that?
MR. BUTLER: No comment on this at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Member Krieger.

I'm sorry, Larry.
And correspondence, Secretary, Member Krieger.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Fifty-one letters were sent. Zero returned, one objection, one approval.

This is from Debra McCann, M-c-c-a-n-n.
"Dear City Board of Appeals. I am resident of 45049 Huntington Crossroad whose property is adjoined to the
property seeking variance. Due to the size square footage, 1688 square feet requested, $I$ find it difficult to label this addition as a garage. The transparency of their request seems questionable. For the following reasons I object to the request: The size alone will reduce the existing park-like setting to a garage thereby diminishing the view. I see on the designs that an apartment is part of the plan. As a senior citizen, $I$ do not want renters in my backyard. Even if the owners' intent is not to rent that will possibly always exist. Once it's built a single family residential standing will be gone.
"Attached are two photos displaying the view from inside my home showing the visibility of the property in question. The sheer size and design of this requested variance will devalue my property and I respectfully ask that you deny it."

And an approval from Lawrence Taylor, 45398 Mayo Drive. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Okay. It's open to the board.
Member Sanghvi?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
I came and visited your property a couple of days ago and I didn't come inside, but I drove around and saw you have a huge property. You can hardly see anything from Nine Mile Road even if you look twice the size of it. Why do you need such a big garage?

MR. JOCZ: So I guess for the correction.
The square footage, it is a 30 by 30 garage, two-stall garage. There is no existing garage to the house. The closest structure is the pole barn which is on the order of 120 to 150 feet away. So the addition of the garage would be to allow us to park our cars there in the winter and have access to them as opposed to experience the hardship of the winter to go out in the snow and shovel off our cars.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I understand. Thank you.
Yeah, I have no problem. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Could you speak to what the resident in the back was -- the second story -- or the
room above the garage? Is that for storage or what's the intent?

MR. JOCZ: So that has multiple intents to it. There is a bedroom and a bath, but essentially added living space adjacent to our current residence. So we have ideas of rec rooms, weight room, as well as to space above the garage.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And regarding renters?
MR. JOCZ: No renters. A single family
house.
MR. MYERS: Yeah. You can't have renters. They're all going to be on the same meter; gas meter, electrical meter. So you can't split if off and have renters. It'll allow a quarter at some point in time for in-laws, but that would be about it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I appreciate you speaking to that.

I have driven by there a zillion times. I can't count the number of times. And there isn't a garage and I totally appreciate the need for a garage and storage space. I'm sure -- I don't know. Is there a basement in that property, in the house?

MR. JOCZ: There is. Older, semi-finished.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Head space?
MR. JOCZ: Low head space, but it is cement
floors.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. So not really much space. So the second story to an added garage for storage or as needed. In case you get in a fight with your wife or something, you can go to the garage.

I can appreciate that and I can approve your request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?
Okay. It's time for the motion. Member Clift?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0031 for 1688 square feet of garage space. Without the variance the petitioner is unreasonably prevented from using his property. Most places in this climate would like a garage.

The property is unique because it is a very large size piece of property that can absorb that kind of square footage. The petitioner did not create the
condition because he purchased the property and it had a building on it which makes this variance bigger.

The relief will not unnecessarily interfere with the surrounding properties because the size of the property and the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance for a person to use their property in a manner that is fitting for our climate.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Clift and Member Krieger.

Okay. Roll call.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
Congratulations.
MR. JOCZ: Thank you.
MR. MYERS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Moving to the third case for today, PZ21-0032, Metro General Construction (sic), 39601 Grand River Avenue, Suites A and B, west of Haggerty Road and south of Grand River Avenue, parcel number 50-22-24-476-017. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of ordinance, Section 28-5(b) (1)a for a 46.67 square feet wall sign on the north, 17.50 square feet maximum of the area is allowed, based upon 14 feet lineal frontage; and a 41.42 square feet wall sign on the north elevation, 22.50 square feet maximum area is allowed, based upon 18 feet lineal frontage.

Section 28-5(d) (2) for a 46.67 square feet of wall sign on the west elevation, 24 square feet maximum area is allowed on the wall at the side entrance per code.

Section 28-5 (b) (2) a and 28-5(a) for an oversize and overheight ground sign, 32.17 square feet
maximum area is allowed, based upon the 64'4" setback from the center line of Grand River and six feet is the maximum allowable from height grade.

Section 28-7(b) (2) for three 4.22 square feet directional ground pole signs at the west and north entryway driveways and northeast landscape island, three square feet maximum area is allowed. The third sign is also over the maximum allowable number of signs on a parcel. These variances are to accommodate the signage for the new 11:11 Burgers and Jimmy John's restaurants. This property is zoned general business, B-3.

Please spell your first and last name clearly for the secretary, please.

MR. TOMEY: Anthony, $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{Tomey}$, T-o-m-e-y.

MR. DEDVUKAJ: Luk, L-u-k, Dedvukaj, D-e-d-v-u-k-a-j.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Can you raise your right hand?

Do you both swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. TOMEY: I do.

MR. DEDVUKAJ: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, guys.
Please go ahead.
MR. TOMEY: Thank you guys for listening to our petition. I own Jimmy John's in Novi. I own 50 locations throughout Metro Detroit and I do have two stores in Novi with potentially a third one as well at Twelve Mile in Novi at some point. Maybe. I've been waiting about 12 years for it.

But in the plaza connected to this building here, I've been there for 18 plus years. You know, we've been around for a long time and we decided to eventually, when this building was vacant -- it's been vacant for almost, maybe even more than two years now. It used to be a Burger King.

After many years working with the landlord, we came upon an agreeable price. And we wanted the drive-thru because, obviously, with COVID. We've always wanted a drive-thru, but with COVID, that has been the -- you know, the move pretty much for all restaurants is to try to do a pickup service or drive thru of some sort.

So we made the decision to do this. And Luke owns the 11:11 Burgers, and is also my general contractor. He's built all my Jimmy John's. So with this, we're looking to see if we can increase the size of the signage as we've put in almost a million dollars between both of us on the building, the demolition, the inside, the outside, the landscaping, all these different things.

And with the visibility not as good as the rest of the plaza -- it's to the east of where I'm located already. And it was one existing building, obviously, for the entire time, one Burger King, and now we're splitting it into two as it was too big of a restaurant, almost over 2600 feet, for either of us to take as one. So we're requesting a variance for the size of the signage both on the building and the monument sign as well.

Yeah, basically, that's where we're at. Just, you know, the traffic flow and the site configuration of it, we're simply asking for a larger directional sign of three and a larger monument sign so people are able to visually see what is there as it has been vacant and it was a, you know, dilapidated
building for over two years now.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other thing you would like to add before I move?

MR. DEDVUKAJ: No. I'm good.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Audience would like to speak on this case? Anyone?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like seeing
none.
Okay, City?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
MR. TOMEY: I'm sorry. If I could, also?
The size of my sign currently is the same size of this sign that we're asking for. So there would be really no difference in the size of the sign that I have in the plaza next door.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Correspondence, Secretary?
MEMBER KRIEGER: 15 were sent; two letters
returned, zero objections, zero approvals.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.

Your time is saved.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Yeah. I saw the building and I went many times to the location, Jimmy John's location, current location, and I never knew that you are moving to that building, Burger King one.

It's open to my board. Let's discuss what is going to happen.

Thank you. Member Michael.
MEMBER LONGO: Yeah, I think you understand how difficult it is to see the sign down there because you're tucked down in there on the east side.

MR. TOMEY: Correct.
MEMBER LONGO: As I -- I know that area well and as you drive by you kind of see the other signs, even though they sit back. But that building is tucked in back there. Plus, it's Grand River and most of us are getting ready for the intersection. Not everybody is, but you should be paying attention to the intersection.

So I think you understated how difficult that is and the signage is not overly done. So I will
support you.
MR. TOMEY: Thank you. And then also with the monument sign, that's a big thing for us as people are coming and going -- heading west on Grand River, you know, you pass it. You pass the light. There's a large couple of trees right there which I don't know if we can do much with it. It's, obviously, the City property.

MR. DEDVUKAJ: And it's a wetland.
MR. TOMEY: And it's also a wetland. So going by, you know, coming going west on Grand River, it is very difficult to see if you don't know it's there, $A$; and $B$, with two restaurants there, you know, we just were asking for extra signage and visibility for us.

Again, we have put in a lot of money into this and we both have been within the city for many, many almost 20 years between both of us, you know, working within the city. You know, we have a lot of jobs. I need about 20 some people. That's our best store.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Thank you, Member Michael, also.

Any other board member would like to speak? MEMBER KRIEGER: Question?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member Krieger.

MEMBER KRIEGER: The hours of operation? So for the, like, ground sign, if it's going to be lit, the hours?

MR. TOMEY: Would they be posted; is that what you're asking?

MEMBER KRIEGER: No --
MR. TOMEY: We were open until 9:00 p.m. every day. Monday through -- Sunday through, you know, Saturday.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So in the winter as it gets darker it would be lit?

MR. DEDVUKAJ: Yeah. Usually 6:00 to 5:00 a.m. Six to 6:00 a.m., 6:00 p.m.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So you'll have it lit 24 hours?

MR. TOMEY: Maybe not 24 hours. Maybe from 5:00 p.m. or 6:00 p.m. through the morning.

MR. DEDVUKAJ: The morning, yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Mav.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, Mav. Go ahead, Member Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. I came yesterday and drove around there. It's not an easy place to drive around at the moment because his big stuff was sitting there and it was hard. But I understand you need the signs. But if you had tried to put up a few mockups, I could have better visualized what you are trying to do about the flow of the traffic there. Because you got two restaurants and you're going to have a drive-thru for both of them, the same drive-thru?

MR. DEDVUKAJ: No. Only one is going to have a drive-thru.

MR. TOMEY: Yes. Just the Jimmy John's has a drive-thru.

MEMBER SANGHVI: It's very hard to realize -and I tried to go around there. It wasn't very easy. I know you need the signs and I know you are going out on the street more from where you have the place right
now.
MR. TOMEY: Correct.

MEMBER SANGHVI: So congratulations on stopping being a tenant and becoming a landlord. I wish you all the best. Thank you.

MR. TOMEY: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. We're banking on, obviously, the people knowing we've been there for 18 years.

MEMBER SANGHVI: You're really tucked in a corner and your visibility is going to be a major problem.

MR. TOMEY: Yeah. But I do, I'm banking on the people knowing that we've been there for 18, almost 19 years. And we'll have a sign. I think eventually they'll figure it out, maybe not the first minute. MEMBER SANGHVI: The place was known for burgers before anyway.

MR. TOMEY: Correct.

MEMBER SANGHVI: So I suppose some people are aware of it still.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member before I move?
Okay. Yeah, my conclusion, also I have no objection for that. I saw it many times and I used to go to Burger King before, but also occasionally to Jimmy John's.

Okay. I have no objection to approve. And it's motion time.

Member Krieger, please go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0032 sought by the petitioner. That without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of its location of the building with the wetlands to the east and the position of the building setback that it will be difficult for passerbys. It's unique because of that and that speed, the speed limit, the posted speed and intersection at Grand River and Haggerty make it difficult for drivers to see the sign.

So the sign as requested would assist them. And the petitioner did not create the condition because of the location of the building previously. That's how they purchased it. The relief granted will not
unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is next to -- it was a burger restaurant and it will continue as a food source. So that will create a draw for the surrounding area properties. So that would be a plus.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a reasonable request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Member Krieger.

Katherine, can you please roll call?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Wait. I need a second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh.
MEMBER LONGO: I need a second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Yeah, Katherine, please roll call.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Congratulations.
MR. TOMEY: Thank you, God bless. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Coming to the fourth case, PZ21-0034, All Construction SCI, 41131 S. McMahon Circle, east of Meadowbrook Road and south of Ten Mile Road parcel number 50-22-25-105-034. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 for a side yard setback of three feet, 10 feet required, a variance of seven feet. This variance would accommodate the building of a home addition. This property is zoned single family residential, R-4.

Is the applicant present?
Please come to the podium, please.
Yeah. Please, tell your first and last name
to our secretary and take the oath.
MR. BUZIMKIC: My name is Edin Buzimkic, $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{n}$, last name $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{z}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{c}$.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Will you raise your right hand.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. BUZIMKIC: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Go ahead.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. BUZIMKIC: I'm a contractor for the owner and I'm asking for a variance of seven feet on a side yard.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Talk in the mic, closer to that, please.

MR. BUZIMKIC: I'm asking for a variance of seven feet for a ten-foot side yard setback. And that's all. It's a 600 -- 558 square foot addition on the back. I'm meeting the rear setback. All of the variances I'm meeting except the one, the side. So just asking for that one side variance of seven feet.

And the reason is because the existing garage
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MEMBER SANGHVI: All right. Thank you. I came and visited your place and I know that street very well. Those houses are so close to each other when they were built that you're always going to need a variance to do anything to that place out there. And I realize that. Only sometimes $I$ worry about it whether there is enough room for a fire truck to get around between the two if there is a major problem. But I think there is a way around on the back so I think they can always get to it.

And I really have no problem. I wish you all the luck in that.

Thank you.
MR. BUZIMKIC: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member?
Okay, Member Clift?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I was also by there and I noticed that the existing building being close and I understand why you want to lineup with it. And I do notice on the plans you're trench footing. So
that's a good way to do it without disturbing the adjacent property. So I appreciate that attention to detail and you did take advantage of that.

MR. BUZIMKIC: Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So I'll be in support of your addition.

MR. BUZIMKIC: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Clift.

Any other board member?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I do. So this is three feet off from the property line?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MEMBER THOMPSON: It says 12 feet away. So that would be twelve feet away from the other house?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Yeah, right. (Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're done?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm sorry. I'm done, yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, member Thompson.

Any other board member before we move to the motion?

No. Okay, Member Krieger. Can you make a motion, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Sure. I move that we grant the request in case number PZ21-0034 sought by the petitioner. The petitioner has shown a practical difficulty for his request that he will be unreasonably prevented and limited with respect the use of the property because of the home already situated where it is on the property, that it's three feet from the property line and 12 feet from the next house and that it's unique because of the subdivision and when it was built.

He did not create the condition because the home already has its footprint. He's just going to add along the posterior of the house and continue along the same line. So it's a reasonable request and will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is -- it will enhance the neighborhood and draw for resale or property values and is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a minimal request and consistent with the side of the house.
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MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.
MR. BUZIMKIC: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And the next case, PZ21-0036, Chadham's, C-h-a-d-h-a-m-s, Professional Services, 21067 Mayberry Park Drive, west of Beck Road and north of Eight Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-32-401-035. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, 4.19.1E(iii) for a total of 1936 square feet of accessory structure, maximum of 1500 square feet allowed by code, a variance of 436 square feet. This variance would accommodate the building of a 660 square foot pool house, the remaining 1276 square feet is from an existing attached garage. This property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Okay. The applicant is there. Please spell your first and last name for our court record and our secretary will take the oath.

Linda, can you take this one? Thank you, secretary.

MR. BUZIMKIC: Mark Merucci, M-a-r-k, M-e-r-u-c-c-i.

MR. QUINN: Dan Quinn, D-a-n Q-u-i-n-n.

MEMBER KRIEGER: If you could raise your right hands.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. BUZIMKIC: I do.
MR. QUINN: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. QUINN: We are seeking a variance to 4.19.1.E(iii). The maximum square footage allowed for the accessory structure is 1,500 square feet. We are seeking a variance of an additional 436 square feet and the hardship would be that 1275 square feet of that amount is from the existing garage that is within the footprint of the home and was there when purchased.

The pool house there -- we're building a pool as well and the pool house will have a changing room in it. So with -- after the pandemic, they will not have to have, you know, have people go in their home to change and they'll be able to entertain out there and use that outdoor space as it becomes more common and more popular.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And would you like to add anything?

MR. BUZIMKIC: No. That covers it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

Any other audience would like to speak on this case before I move?

Seeing none. Thank you.
Okay. City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No questions from the City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

Correspondence, secretary.
MEMBER KRIEGER: 18 letters were sent. Zero returned. Zero objections. Zero approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Secretary.

Okay. And, yeah, I'll put it on the board. And it's open to the board to speak on this case, please.

You want to speak, Member Sanghvi, please go ahead.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I tried to come and visit
your place, but I couldn't get in because of the gated community.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Ditto.
MR. BUZIMKIC: Sorry about that.
MEMBER SANGHVI: But looking at your plans and everything, $I$ think this is going to be an all weather swimming pool there?

MR. BUZIMKIC: Spring, summer and fall.
MEMBER SANGHVI: You have huge amount of property there and I have no problem granting this. Thank you.

MR. BUZIMKIC: I appreciate that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi. Any other board member?

Okay. Looks like none. I would like to call
for the motion.
Member Clift?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Certainly.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0034 for -- oh, I'm sorry. PZ21-0036.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm on the wrong thing. For 1936 square feet of accessory structures. Without the variance the petitioner will be prevented from using his property as he has a pool he needs to serve. The property is unique in that it's a large piece of property. It does have a pool and the pool house is associated with that.

He did not create the condition. The house is there. He's adding an amenity to it. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. It's well within his property and not encroaching on any setbacks. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance for the proper use of his property. MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Clift and Member Sanghvi. Katherine, can you please roll call? MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo? MEMBER LONGO: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Congratulations.
MR. QUINN: Thank you.
MR. BUZIMKIC: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Last case
for the day, PZ21-0039, K-i-e-l, H-e-a-r-n, 157
Wainwright Street, east of old Novi Road and south of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-11-101-011. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, section 5.11 to install a fence in the front yard of a corner lot. By code, a fence shall not extend toward the front of the lot nearer then the minimum front yard setback.

This property is zoned single family residential, R-4.

Is the applicant present?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, okay. The applicant is not there.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Number 157 Wainwright.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Nobody is there.
Can you move this case to the next month or after that or what do you want to do, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMAN: I believe a motion would have to be made to postpone it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, before that. Okay. Somebody can make a motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to move the case number PZ21-0039 for 157 Wainwright to the August meeting 2021.

What's the date? Sorry.
MS. SAARELA: It is August 10th.
MEMBER KRIEGER: 10th. August 10th.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: August 10th. Okay.
In case we have more cases, we'll move it to September.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Because we don't want to do too many cases on the day because the applicant is not present. So I want to make this one, if the cases is below five cases, we can make it on August. If not, we'll move to September.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I don't want to waste the summertime for all the board members to enjoy.

Okay. Somebody can make a second.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'll second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, Member Montague.

All in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other matters for the day before $I$ make a motion and I'll -yeah, Beth?

MS. SAARELA: There's -- you may have noticed, there's a letter in the packet with a request from a neighbor to reconsider one of the previously granted variances. This would be the only meeting that you can consider such a request. In order to consider
such a request, it would have to be one of the board members who approved the variance who would have to have a change of heart and move to reconsider the request.

MS. OPPERMAN: I did also include in your folder an action summary just for that case so you check if you were of the ones that voted on it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You mean the case PZ21-0026?

MS. OPPERMAN: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And you want me somebody motion for that?

MS. SAARELA: So, no. If there is nobody who is interested in reconsidering, you don't have to take any action.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Make a comment?

MS. SAARELA: You can comment. But before you can't -- I mean, you can comment. But before you comment, you would have to have somebody that is interested in reconsidering.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, okay.
MS. SAARELA: So not unless there is someone
who is in favor who wants to move to reconsider, then you can open the discussion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All righty. Thank you.
MS. SAARELA: But if there is not anyone who wants to reconsider, then, no.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And Linda.
And thank you so much for the packet,
Katherine, for reminding. I appreciate.
Okay. Any other matters?
MEMBER KRIEGER: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIOBOYINA: No.
MEMBER SANGHVI: No. I just, I can live with the decision we have made. And I don't see any need for doing any revision to it myself. Thank you.

And if there is no further business to be done, $I$ would like to make a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Please hear us.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, would you like something? Sure.

FEMALE SPEAKER: That's why we're here.

MALE SPEAKER: We filed the motion. That's why we're here.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Which motion?

MS. OPPERMAN: They requested the reconsideration.

MS. SAARELA: We can't reopen it unless there's somebody who wants to change their vote on it. So they do have your information in the packet. They were able to receive your request and the basis for it. But in order for them to have a discussion, one of the people who voted in favor of the variance would have to decide to change their vote. So if none of them are willing to do that, the discussion can't be reopened. But they were, however, able to see what your position was. So they were informed.

At this point there isn't another public hearing. You could have spoken at the public hearing in the beginning.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I couldn't make it.
MS. SAARELA: Okay. But, yeah, they won't be able to reopen the matter without changing their pote.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So there is no one there at the board that will at least hear us or at least
reconsider or listen to us?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Like she said.
MEMBER LONGO: No.
MS. SAARELA: So they would have to have someone who wanted to change their vote, that person would have to move and then they would have to get a majority of people to agree to that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Understood.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So she could come and make a comment if she wants?

MS. SAARELA: Yeah. Anybody could come make a comment at the public section hearing of the meeting. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. At the beginning.

MS. SAARELA: But at this point, after today, there's no ability to reconsider.

FEMALE SPEAKER: That's why I'm asking if you could please hear us.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I know you're sitting from the beginning. I know you came almost close to two hours you are here. And I called for the public remarks in the packet. At the time you should have come so the public remarks should have been
added, what is what.
I'm sorry. Katherine, please go ahead.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, if I may, I think Beth was saying that they would have had to speak at the public hearing for the first one. Not at this one. So that's why the matter is on it for reconsideration.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I don't understand. I'm sorry.

MS. SAARELA: Procedurally, we can't reopen this case unless somebody here wants to change their vote, move to reconsider and then the whole board, they would have to have a majority of people say, yes, we want to reconsider it and then you can speak. At this point there is no opportunity for you to speak again.

But just so you know, they do have your letter. It's in the packet. They have all seen it. So they do know the basis of your request. Based on that, no one was willing to make that motion to change their vote and to have everybody reconsider it.

MALE SPEAKER: In the public hearing?
MS. SAARELA: At the beginning. It's at the beginning of the ZBA meeting. It would have happened right after they approved the agenda.

MR. DUNLAP: I'm sorry. I'm Rod Dunlap. And
I saw that we were in the agenda for today. It's the last category of the agenda. I thought we'd be able to address it at that time. We waited patiently to make sure everybody could go.

MS. SAARELA: I understand. But procedurally under Robert's Rules of Order, you cannot come up and plead a case unless they want to reconsider it and no one here has expressed an interest to reconsider. So the only way that you could have a case that you're rearguing to them, is if someone reopened it. No one here is interested in reopening it. So that does not give you an opportunity to speak to them substantively.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So it was a misunderstanding on my part. Because $I$ wrote the letter. I asked for a reconsideration and then it was added to the agenda. So I believed that you were --

MS. SAARELA: But you have to -- Robert's Rules of Order, you only get to speak if somebody was interested in rehearing the matter none of them are.

MALE SPEAKER: Right. Understood.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Right. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. That ends the matters. No other matters and everybody would like to say aye, in favor to adjourn?

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: We're done. Thank you.
(At 8:39 p.m., matter concluded.)

Luzod Reporting Service, Inc. 313-962-1176

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

$$
\text { ) } s s
$$

COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

I, Darlene K. May, Notary Public within and for the County of Oakland, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of ninety-two (92) typewritten pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes.
/s/Darlene K. May
Darlene K. May, Notary Public Oakland County, Michigan
My commission expires: 01-13-2024

August 6, 2021
(Date)

