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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good evening and welcome to the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals. And Happy New Year 2021. Hopefully this year will give a good strength. And, everybody, you know, 2020 already happened. And hopefully the 2021 give good strength and good to everybody.

And welcome to Novi Zoning Board members and all attendees. Thank you. And today is Tuesday, January 12th, 7:00 p.m.

And the roll call, Katherine.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, of course.
Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Present.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
(No response.)
MS. SAARELA: So now that we're into the new
year, the new --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MS. SAARELA: -- regulation requires us to
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say what state, county and city you are appearing in on Zoom, each one of us when we check in.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yup. Thank you. Before I was about to tell you, you raised the hand. Thank you so much.

Okay. Go ahead. Beginning, Katherine, can you call the roll call again beginning.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Linda, if you could, since you already said you're present, state as Beth said, your physical location, county, city and state, please.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Novi, Michigan and Oakland County.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Mike Longo. I'm present. Novi was the city, Oakland, and the great state of Michigan.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I am here from Novi, Oakland County, and Michigan.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
Chairperson Peddiboyina?
 mute. Can you check, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: There he is.
MEMBER KRIEGER: He said he was here a second ago.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, he's there.
Member Verma?
MS. OPPERMAN: He's working on it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Member Verma, are you there?
MEMBER SANGHVI: He was there a minute ago.
MS. OPPERMAN: Looks like he was connecting to audio.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I can see him that he's there.

Okay. Let's come back and we'll see. Thank you, Katherine. I appreciate your time. And I think do you have quorum, enough quorum for today.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. We have a full board today.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you so much. We have board enough for quorum.

And make sure your phones should be on mute. And once you call in on our public hearing and we need to call each person, whatever it is and they have to
spell your name and clearly and where you are living, an address for the court record purpose. And if anybody wants to, this is a Zoom call, you need to raise your hand in the Zoom call so that they will know. Our acting secretary Katherine can watch who all is raising their hand.

Okay. And we have a television. There is a link that people can come on the Zoom, you can talk and also the people who are to state, as I said, spell your first and last name and sworn by our secretary, acting secretary. And we have a total number of cases is six, I believe. Am I right?

MS. OPPERMANN: Um-hmm.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. And let's go for the approval of agenda for December.

Somebody can make a motion for the approval of agenda for the last month meeting.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Motion to approve the agenda for tonight's meeting.

MEMBER VERMA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you both of you.

Ramesh Verma is there. Thank you.

Okay. And approval -MEMBER KRIEGER: All in favor?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: In favor say "yes" and --

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Today's meeting, any changes or anything you need to add or anybody who wants to talk or anything, please let me know at once so that way we can move apart from our agenda.

Anything, Katherine, to add anything on this? MS. OPPERMAN: No changes to the agenda, but if I could have Member Verma now state his location so we can have it for the record.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER VERMA: Ramesh Verma from state of Michigan, city Novi, county Oakland. Present.

MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. There's no changes. All in favor on the agenda of today's meeting, say -- all in favor say "aye."

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Approval for today's meeting agenda.
Public remarks, anyone having any on this other than these cases, something on the ZBA, you can come. You can raise your hand. Anybody wants to in the public, now is the right time to, you know, you can raise your question before we move to the first case for tonight.

MEMBER KRIEGER: What about the minutes?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry?
MEMBER KRIEGER: The December minutes?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You said they approve, no? You were the first one, person who approved.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, I thought it was the agenda.

But sure, do for the minutes too. For the December meeting to approve?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, we did that one, Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Couple of corrections I
would like to point out.


Okay. And let's go ahead and the first case for today and we can see.

The first case today PZ20-0053, Z. Joe Huang, West of Old Novi Road and South of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-10-228-018. The applicant is requesting a variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a proposed lot coverage of 27 percent, 25 percent required, variance of an increased two percent. Section 3.6.2M for a watercourse setback of ten feet, 25 feet minimum required, variance of 15 feet. This variance will accommodate the building of a new home. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

This is a rehearing, the case was previously before the Zoning Board on December 8, 2020.

Am I right, board members? This was last month?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yep. Thank you. Is the applicant is present?

MS. SAARELA: So let me just add to this that we went through the entire hearing and -- public hearing and ZBA discussion last month and what happened
was that the motion was voted on in error because we had a full board and an alternate member. And the alternate member mistakenly voted when we had a full board and that caused there to be a tie and it impacted the outcome of the motion. So the case is before you again to redo the motion, to revote on the motion.

I don't know if you recall the full facts of the case, if you need any refresher on the facts of the case. But really all that is before you again at this point is correcting the motion to be voted on by the full board without the alternate member.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, Beth. I really appreciate bringing that, you know, last month's meeting. I agree what you are saying exactly, that is alternate member board member voted. I accepted that. And now I want to go with the voting rather than going over all the case. What do you say, Beth?

MS. OPPERMAN: If I could, please.
I do believe the applicant for this also has his architect with him today so he may have additional details to add to the case. We might want to check with him first.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds
good.
Okay. Is applicant present, please?
MS. OPPERMAN: Mr. Huang, it looks like you're still on mute.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, he's there.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you hear me, sir?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you unmute, please? Still, you're on mute.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no, no. You're on -- please make unmute.
(Pause.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I can see you're not -- you're muted.

MS. OPPERMAN: It looks like he's working to fix it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. HUANG: Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, yeah.
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes.

MR. HUANG: Okay. I apologize. Hello, good evening. And I appreciate the time. And as a matter of fact, I -- since last hearing, we -- I invited my architect to come to join me today. His name is Lombardo. And between him and I, we did some like -we hear the neighbors and we did some, like, pretty -like, based on the neighbor's input, we have some changes. And the main important thing is, like, we have make an alternative plan. Like -- that was in the original, like, the variance request as well.

And if you may -- and I want to shift your focus to a site plan and I can explain why we try to change it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, you want to take a vote on this case before starting?

MS. SAARELA: Let me clarify what's going on here today. Are we listening to a revised variance request at this point?

MR. HUANG: Yes and no. As a matter of fact, that was in the original -- the plan -- in the original, like, a variance request I submitted two, the one main and one alternative. So both is on the form, as a matter of fact. And as we working with the
architect and then we come to the conclusion, hey, maybe the alternative plan seems will address all the neighbors' concerns. So that's why we present it.

MS. SAARELA: Were the variances you're requesting public noticed for this plan already? Were they included in the public notice?

MR. HUANG: Yeah, it is. It is. It is in the form. It's on the original form.

Yeah. In the original request, I request, basically, one preferred, one alternate. And as we discussed it and we found, like, the alternate makes more sense and we should address all the neighbors' concern, we think.

MS. SAARELA: Kate, were all those variances posted as alternates in the public notices that went out.

MS. OPPERMAN: I don't believe so. They are on the application. I think it was advertised as the original. Everything is on the online packet. The ones that he's proposing as alternates are lesser than the ones that were advertised.

MS. SAARELA: Okay. So as long as they're lesser variances, you can grant lesser variances. I'm
just -- I'm speaking to the board now, but it should be clarified. It sounds like we're looking at a different plan with different variances than were previously discussed.

MR. HUANG: If you allow me, like, a five minutes $I$ can explain. It's very straightforward, as a matter of fact.

MS. SAARELA: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before you going into the case, Katherine, do you need to take a vote on this before he starts the explanation?

MS. OPPERMAN: Sorry. Did I need to do what, Joe?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: A vote.
MS. SAARELA: So it's sound like he's requesting that you hold off on a vote and hear an -- a variant request for some reduced variances.

MS. OPPERMAN: In that case I think I should then do his -- spelling his name and swearing in, and then also his architect if his architect is going to speak, correct?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. That's right. Yeah. Please go ahead.

MS. OPPERMANN: If you could state your name and spell it once more, Mr. Huang, and then swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you, please.

MR. HUANG: Okay. My name is Joe, last name $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{g}$.

MS. OPPERMANN: And then do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you? MR. HUANG: Yes. Nothing but the truth. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER KRIEGER: And the architect?

MS. OPPERMANN: Was your architect also planning on speaking?

MR. HUANG: Yes. I think he standby as needed basis. He educate me well enough. I think -- I mean, we're getting to the technical stuff here, I think he can jump in. His name is Lombardo. I saw him on that. He's on mute.

MS. OPPERMANN: Okay. If he chooses to speak, then I'll swear him in at that time.

MR. HUANG: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Katherine.

You can proceed.
MR. HUANG: Okay. I'll make it as quick as possible. And you see the screen, I -- let me see. Okay. There we go. Everybody see that?

Okay. This is the original plan we have. And the problem is, like, the water line. That was the original plan was, okay, I'm requesting a -- like a 20 -- a 15 feet, like, a variance.

And as one alternative we have, as a matter of fact, what we tried to come up with is, we want to move this thing a little bit further.

So we are asking as alternative, we are asking ten feet variance on the front setback.

And as if it were the same building, of course this is going to move around ten feet as well. So this going to be -- this area is going to be located around here. So within the water line. So one of the neighbor biggest -- the next-door neighbor complaint is, like, he's -- like, he's here. I notice -- I mean, his house is built like a -- it's a pretty old house that's more close to the road. And because of it, I think his -- like, this structure is block his lake view. And this like a little incompatibility between
the old and new zoning code. If you think about it, if it's 30 feet like a -- like a setback, his house would be somewhere around here, supposed to be.

But now because it is our house we build in front of and we are following this like a front setback. So we're going to put it back in a way it block his water view.

Now, if we move two -- ten feet which is about that distance, so we're within the water line itself. So from next-door neighbor's perspective. So this is going to be in compliance. So he view it is like a just as if, like, this house will be built within the water line with the zero variance.

Of course, because there's a little dent, if you look at it, that's just the nature of the water line itself. So it's a little dent over there. So as a result, the water course is kind of a little curve here. So I still ask a very minor like a five feet, like a variance here. Just a little corner there we have to cut it through.

So five foot variance here and then we push this thing a bit, the ten feet itself so the whole house will fit. That will address, like, most of
neighbors' concerns. And as, of course, he won't be able to see it. He see just as if this house will be in compliant.

And another thing is we can -- because we working some, like, masses here and there, we believe that we can fit into, like, a 25 percent variance.

So 27 variance that can be withdrawn. We no longer need it.

So in summary, it's basically we have ten foot -- we're asking ten foot front setback variance and from original, like, 30, basically, it's become 20 feet front setback.

And five feet water course setback is from original, like, a 25 feet to 20 feet water setback. And no coverage -- lot coverage variance needed as alternate, so forth.

So this is, basically, we come up with -- and also, just if I may. Let me -- let me share with you another screen. Hold on a second. There's another quick screen I like to share with you setback.

Just a minute.
My screen froze for whatever reason. Just -okay. Just bear with me a second.

Sorry. Technical -- some little minor technical difficulties.

Setback.
(Pause.)
Okay. So this is the site line map. I show that this is the Shawood Street. This is the lot we intend to build. And so this the next-door neighbor house and the next door, next door over there. So as you can see, all of these houses it's, like, all built beyond the 30 feet setback. So if you think about the character of the neighborhood, really, I mean, if we follow like a 30 feet, the house is kind of like a -it's a little dent just like -- it's not like a -because most of the houses are built very close to the road. Think -- I mean, if ten feet -- this is, like, 30 feet, roughly. So if we are going to build it, we're probably going to be just slightly, ten feet is probably around here. So really you are not out of the character of the neighborhood. I think it looks more harmony -- in harmony with the neighborhood because every house is kind of built close to the road and the ten feet is, like, a fairly minimum.

And we -- I'm pretty sure that -- that if you
can accommodate that, $I$ think it will make everybody happy. The neighbor, my next-door neighbor had the biggest concern, of course, and this way we won't block his view anymore.

Just as like we fall, you know, within the water line.

So that's in the -- basically, in the highlight of what we have changed.

And this was the original -- in the original variance request. That was on it as a matter of fact. It's just like it never get presented. At the last one, it was dragged too long so I never had a chance to do it.

So there you have it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Joe.
Any other person who would like to speak before moving? Joe?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Joe, can you hear me? Hello?

MR. HUANG: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, can you hear me?

MR. HUANG: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Would you like to speak any other thing apart from that?

MR. HUANG: Me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MR. HUANG: No. That's all -- that's all I have. I mean, basically, it would present an alternate plan.

And also, one more thing. It's like,
Lombardo and I, we also going to lower the roof, the house we have. And as a matter of fact, it's in Livonia. As a matter of fact, $I$ went actually to the actual site, that house that was exist and we look at it and we found that the roof was original roof is low so we going to try to lower the roof about five feet. We change the front elevation a bit. So the roof going to be less than -- I would say five feet less.

So, in other words, it's like a -- it looks more in harmony with the rest of neighborhood. So that's the two things, basically, where we have on the table.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You took ten minutes' time. Okay. That's fine.

Any other -- before going back, any other audience would like to speak on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: It looks like there's a Mr. Urm I believe that wants to speak on it. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You there?

MR. URM: Can you hear me?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MR. URM: Yes. I'm -- my name is Kalmer Urm and I'm with my wife Kristi here. And we are neighbors across the street to the east a little bit, right. And, I mean --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You have three minutes to proceed, sir, and --

MR. URM: And Joe trying to throw us a curve ball. You know, he wants to change the variance to the other variance that he proposed. And I don't know how he's going to be able to fit the same size house now with that -- on a two percent less. But, you know, maybe the math works out somehow. But the three points I still want to make, you know, based on this original proposal and it kind of fits to the same thing, this house is still going to be in -- the way how it's
angled to the street, there's really -- he says he's going to lower the roof, but I'm looking at 65 feet of the side house which is -- and the 35 feet. So now it's 35 feet height. And it's going to be visible highly from coming from a street.

And I'm really concerned because there's going to be two houses there. Where he's maxing out that lot with the variances. He's going over the size. So it's going to be -- still looking at out of place. There's not going to be room to put the trees between the houses so it's going to look like any other new development we have because we are trying to preserve the original nature of this neighborhood. And we have trees in between houses. This is going to be an out of place new development in our view, right.

And, you know, so my second point there was -- oh, it appears like -- and Joe can correct me. He has purchased both lots. So you already had a plan B going on without the variance. Because he could not possibly think this is going to be reheard again. So he has another plan what he was probably, you know, able to work with without getting any variance because as far as I know, he has purchased the lots already.

The third thing is, that watercourse setback, even if it's five feet should not be treated lightly. Because as $I$ was thinking about this more, that -- why this 25 feet is so important. You know, we -sometimes I actually have to kind of visualize to myself, as we collecting all the dust and pollutants on our roofs and then the rain hits, everything gets washed down, right? If you are on the lakeside property, if it doesn't hit the ground 25 feet from the lake, it's going to wash to the lake. And this -- a small lake that we have here, every five feet is kind of, you know, important for us. We sometimes -- the environmental rules we take it for granted, you know. We want to be green, but we constantly with democracy override these. Ah, it's five feet here and there. It's no big deal.

So even though I like that Joe wants to make, you know, these changes and he wants to be part of this neighborhood, I'm still concerned about it because he's talking about two lots and two oversize houses because other house will be built, maybe two years, maybe five years from now, but it's going to be there. And, you know, environmental, you know, problems. And it's just
in the middle of -- and that's pretty much it.
I would like to address Joe purchasing the lots and what was his plan $B$ if it didn't have a sense to revote on it again.

Thank you. That's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Any other person? Can you see, Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There's also a
Mr. Doulaveris.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you unmute, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: I believe they're still getting him set up to speak.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
(Pause.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Or else you can call somebody -- we can call later this person.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I think Beth had something to say.

MS. SAARELA: I just was checking since you are rehearing additional, different evidence if you are going to reopen the public hearing and you did. So I don't have anything else.

MR. DOULAVERIS: Here you go. Can you guys hear me now?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yep.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yep.
MR. DOULAVERIS: All right. Thank you. So I kind of wanted a clarification because I'm really not sure what we're doing here. If we're revisiting the initial item or are we actually looking at the new modifications, it wasn't clear. But that was one of the things I want to talk about. And I guess since I jumped in, $I$ want to wish everybody a Happy New Year by the way.

But I met with Joe and we discussed beforehand on this and we were supposed to get together and go over this just because $I$ offered to get the three neighbors together, at least that are directly impacted, and that never happened. So we weren't able to even look at the stuff. But I do appreciate him lowering the pitch of the roof line. It may make it a little less intrusive. But, you know, I think what's happened, maybe he's -- he doesn't need a 25 percent variance because he's going to split the -- buy the two
lots. If that's the case, that's definitely a direction we wanted to go. I think the only other thing that's open is, like -- Kal was saying, because it's such a big house and it's coming in from the side, I mean, the thought was it would actually put it more in the middle of the two lots. That was the thought process.

But what I'm going to ask the team members here -- and I got Member Sanghvi, Member Longo, Member Verma and Member Sanker, they're the ones that, you know, are okay with the variances, what we're asking here is whether or not there's a hardship and whether he can't build. And the question is that's what you guys got to answer truthfully. Otherwise, I mean, the facts are there. I didn't really have a chance to look at the changes. I would have preferred to have seen this and gotten the three neighbors together to go over it. But seeing as we haven't, I'm not a hundred percent going to say this meets everybody's concerns over here. If it's a concern to you guys, I don't know. But that's all $I$ really want to say at this point in time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DOULAVERIS: And one more though, I want to understand, who's the alternate so I don't make the mistake here? Who's the alternate on this that's not going to vote on this motion here? And if you guys can identify, that would be good.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo is our alternate this evening and he's already been appraised of the issue of last meeting so there should not be having that issue again.

MR. DOULAVERIS: So it would have failed anyways, obviously, this variance. It's just a formality. Now, we went back and are rehearing this thing. 'Cause the original one was just to approve this motion. But I'll let it to you guys to figure it out.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MR. DOULAVERIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other audience would like to speak, Katherine? Is anybody raising their hand?

MS. OPPERMAN: (No verbal response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, are you there?

MS. OPPERMAN: My apologies. Yes. There's also a Mr. John Karakian, $I$ believe is his last name.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Mr. John, are you there?

MR. KARAKIAN: Hello, can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, sir.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
MR. KARAKIAN: Okay. Yeah. Sorry about
that. I'm opposing the variance request being increased forward. This was ruled upon on December 8, 2020 and the application rejected, and I believe we should stick to the vote. I want to stick to the regulation that states you can't build beyond the 25 percent lot coverage all the way around. I'm opposed to the requested increase in lot coverage because I believe it would devaluate my property and I believe we should stick to the rules. This is tight corner on this end of Shawood Drive. And I believe the increase in brick and mortar structure size will create a feeling of pressure because by allowing the applicant to unnecessarily expand forward like he says now, it puts potential hardships upon me and others. Why place any potential hardship upon us when the applicant can
freely build the way the lot is properly regulated for at 25 percent all around and within?

On December 8, one of the zoning board officers suggested the applicant move his proposed home onto the other -- move it over on the other lot in order to take up room on that other side, but the applicant said no. Well, that says it all right there. That was a possible good idea to solve the problem, but the applicant said no. So why stick us with the encroachment of such a close and large brick and mortar structure and possibly hurt all of us just to make one applicant happy, who for all intents and purposes could build just fine within the 25 percent regulation all the way around and within. Or move his proposed project to the south a little bit upon the other lot so we can all have some elbow room and still keep the beautiful view of the lake which we believe we have the right to continue to enjoy. Maybe in that way we can all be happy. But the applicant said no way.

Therefore, I'm opposed to the applicant's noncompromising request or we present homeowners could be hurt in the process.

Thank you, Zoning Board.

I would like to ask the city. Larry, any correspondence city, Larry?

MR. BUTLER: No. I have no comment at this time. It's up to the board to make their decision.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
At this moment, Katherine, do you need to go call for the correspondence or no?

MS. OPPERMAN: We need to go over it, yes. Nineteen letters mailed out, one letter returned, two objections received at this time. Both from neighbors who have already spoken, Mr. Urm, as well as Mr. Karakian. No approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you very much, Katherine.

And let me put it on the board, anybody who would like to speak on this case? The board members, it's your time to talk.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please go ahead, Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Joe, do you own the two properties? I misunderstood that.

MR. HUANG: I own both land, if I may --
MEMBER KRIEGER: Two?
MR. HUANG: There's Lot 18. I call Lot 18. The last digit it's like L18. And the next lot, Lot 17, 017. Seventeen I call it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Two lots.
MR. HUANG: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And you're going to put the one house on -- the previous discussion, the Lot 17 was going to be left alone and then you're building only on Lot 18?

MR. HUANG: That is correct. And think of this, like, again, the owner, the previous two owner is related. I mean, when we design the house, we all -we did all the soil tests and everything. We intend -originally intend to just buy 18 and they really want to sell 17 as well. Believe it or not, my wife and I took us five minute to decide to take it. Reason is we
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both environmentalist. We like preserve and it's next to the -- like a beautiful, like, a Lakeshore Park and we went -- we walk there every day.

And, again, I'm not in the -- I never buy and sell real estate other than my home ever. I never own any commercial real estate. Never own the land. I'm lucky enough in the high-tech industry. I'm a small business owner and I just don't see myself never ever going to get into real estate or would build anything on it. So we're not interested. Our kids are east coast and west coast of the country. They never going to get back to Detroit, so we don't need two house to live. We just need one house. The other house we just save it -- just like a classic car if you think about it. I mean, we in Motown. A lot of people want to spend tons of money on classic cars just for noneconomic reason. And here we go. We just enjoy the land and we want to restore it and save it as a park in the --

MEMBER KRIEGER: So Lot 17 would be like a large side yard?

MR. HUANG: Not really.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Even --

MR. HUANG: Half of Lot 17 is all like wild beautiful. Like, it's a marshland. It's just like a part of a Lakeshore Park. And we fall in love with it. I mean, like, we would hate to destroy it. I mean, it's like -- just like a natural beauty of a Lakeshore Park itself. And the frontal part has a beautiful woods as well and we're going preserve that as well, definitely. It's a beautiful -- there's many beautiful trees there, so forth. So the one that facing the street, like Shawood itself. So like think it's an L. It's a beautiful land. I mean, we just don't want to destroy it so forth. And we have enough money. I mean, like, again, this is our classic car. We don't have much hobbies and we build our retirement home here. That's it. We're not going to move anywhere. My wife promise me that. So ...

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I appreciate the effort and even though this was a voting misunderstanding, that you came back with a reduction request and lowering the roof which, does impact the neighbors. And since this is your -- the lot that you've bought that as the homeowner it would be a practical difficulty to build
the house on -- because it's on the water -- closer to the water side along the same street. And that the -that you see the harmony, as you were saying and the -with the neighborhood streets, that I would be able to support your request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other board member who would like to speak, please? MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes, I would like to. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Mr. -Member Montague, go ahead, sir. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I'm just kind of disturbed because we've got two things written on the request and a third thing talked about and I don't know, do we vote on things that are just verbally presented at this meeting and not advertised? That troubles me and I don't know what the protocol is.

MS. SAARELA: Well, the protocol is you can -- the board always has the discretion to grant a lesser variance than what is originally posted in the notice. So the -- what the applicant is proposing is to reduce the size of the original variances that were noticed to a lesser variance. So that is within the board's discretion to vote on a lesser variance without
renoticing it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Beth.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: But the advertisement then was for something else or how is that -- how does that work? I mean, somebody -- these people are as confused as I am I think.

MS. SAARELA: What I'm trying to explain is that once you -- once a variance is posted, a variance request is posted, the applicant can't come in and request something more, but they can come in and request something less. And that's what he's doing. He's indicated he's waiving the request for a 27 percent lot coverage. That variance is gone. He's moving the variance out of the -- the rear setback closer to the front. So what he's doing is requesting a lesser variance than what was originally posted. That is permissible. He cannot come in though, however, and say I want ten feet more than I originally asked for. That would have to be renoticed.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Beth. Thank you, Member Montague.

Any other board member who would like to
speak, please?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, go ahead, Member Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I just have a question for the city attorney. Is the ownership of the other lot, is it relevant to this particular discussion?

MS. SAARELA: I mean, it really -- unless he's asking for a variance on that lot, it isn't.

MEMBER SANGHVI: And there is no variance needed on the other lot so it doesn't matter that he owns it or not?

MS. SAARELA: That's correct.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I think that has been muddling everybody's mind with the other lot available. And this is the lot we are talking about, these are the variances he's asking.

Now, he's asking reduce variances. I have no problem. I'm quite willing to support his application. Thank you.

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

Any other board member would like to speak tonight?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I'd just like to say a quick comment, too. And I also am in support of it and primarily because this is exactly what a board is intended to do. If you look, the water cuts into his lot making it smaller than the other ones around it and so it's difficult for him to meet the variance requirements. And the variance -- the variances are designed to govern, you know, broadly all kinds of land. And so this land clearly has some lake impinging on it and that's precisely what the board is designed to grant variances for.

And because the variance is so small and that he made it even smaller tonight, I'm still in support of it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanker.

Okay. Any other member before going?
Okay. Looks like seeing none. I have no objection and considering all this and, you know, the applicant is requesting a variance also changes and also the board members already mentioned. I don't want
to repeat. And also the attorney. Thank you so much. And, Katherine, our secretary also in this case. And we are bringing to the second time on this case.

Okay. And this is the time to motion. And Linda, or anybody can make a motion on this one, please.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I can -- oh, go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: You want to do it?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes, I can do it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Go ahead,
Montague. Member Montague, go ahead.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I'm sorry. Go ahead, sir.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: That's all right. I move that we grant the variances in case number PZ20-0053 sought by Z. Joe Huang. And the variances -- without the variance, the petitioner would be prevented from using his property because of the nature of the lot. We are granting a variance for a five-foot watercourse setback and a ten foot variance on the front yard. Those are the two variances that we are -- that I'm
motioning that we accept.
The property is unique because of its
location. There's a watercourse. The size and the configuration of the lot make it difficult to build upon and meet all of the requirements. The petitioner did not create the situation because the lot was created that he purchased.

The relief granted I don't believe would unreasonably interfere with the adjacent properties because he's done a nice job of revising the layout such that it impinges upon -- doesn't impinge upon, I should say.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the quality of the house will be an asset, I think, to the neighborhood.

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

Okay. And any other discussion?
Seeing none.
Okay. Katherine, can you please call roll call?

Beth, you would like to speak anything on
that before roll call?
MS. SAARELA: No. I think you're -- that was good.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Beth, I appreciate.

And, Katherine, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTANA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. HUANG: Thank you very much for everyone, for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you everybody. Thanks on this case and appreciate.

All right. And this brings to our next case for tonight. Okay. That case number PZ20-0054, Coy Construction, 23403 Mystic Forest Drive, West of Novi Road and South of Ten Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-27-427 -- sorry, 429-006. The applicant is requesting a variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a proposed 30 -feet rear yard setback, 35 feet required, variance of five feet. This variance will accommodate the building of a new deck and sunroom. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4. This case was tabled from the December 8, 2020 meeting.

The applicant is there?
(No response.)
MS. OPPERMAN: I can see that Mr. McCoy is there, yeah.

MR. McCOY: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
MR. McCOY: Hi, Kate.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please go ahead and say your first and last name and be sworn by our secretary for the court record purpose.

MR. McCOY: Mike McCoy. I'm the owner of Coy Construction. And I live in Oakland County.

MS. OPPERMAN: And do you swear or affirm to --

MR. McCOY: And I've been before your board a number of times before for the same kind of variance and I'm here to answer any questions that you might have.

Can I -- should I just start off by -- I've never done this Zoom before so it's a little new to me.

MS. OPPERMAN: I will need you to still swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MR. McCOY: I swear to tell the truth.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr. Mike.

MR. McCOY: You're welcome.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And please go ahead
and present your case.
MR. McCOY: Yes. The homeowner has a huge deck that's about 700 square feet that we're completely removing. It's poorly designed, poorly built and way bigger than it needs to be. So the proposed new deck that we already have a permit for is, basically, about 40 percent smaller than the existing deck that they have.

Now, because of the angled lot line in the rear and the pond in the back, there's just a lot of mosquitoes there and the homeowner now would like to put a very modestly sized screened-in porch on top of this deck that requires a basically in total about a 40 square foot variance. On the one corner of the twelve foot screen porch, it doesn't require a variance at all but because the angle -- the lot angles, it requires a five-foot variance on the other side.

I think the plans that I submitted explain that pretty clearly.

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

MR. McCOY: We've done about five or six or seven screen porches on top of existing decks in that
subdivision that we've built, Mystic Forest. And I think we needed variances on two or three of them and received them in the past. And this is probably the smallest variance we've requested on a screened-in porch of the last 10 or 12 that we've done.

You guys have always been very cooperative and reasonable and I think it's a very fair -- it's a -- we're not asking for a very large screened-in porch. It's only coming out twelve feet.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCoy.

Okay. Any -- Katherine, can you see any other audience raising their hand or anything?

MS. OPPERMAN: No. There's no audience raising their hand for this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good.
And city Larry, any correspondence on this?
MR. BUTLER: No comments at this time, standing by for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

And acting secretary, Katherine, can you tell me any correspondence on this case?

Okay. And, Coy, thank you for coming and you presented what you.

And let's go now to my board and let me just see what they say.

MR. McCOY: If I could just -- could I
interrupt for just a second? Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, go ahead for one minute.

MR. McCoy: Yeah. I just wanted to apologize for last week. I'm not -- I'm very technology challenged and last week $I$ was on the -- or last month on the agenda and the first -- we were number two and the first one lasted about an hour and then I tried to connect with you and I -- you guys couldn't hear me. So I apologize for that inconvenience, but here I am again and I think we've got it working this time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much,

Coy. This is -- 2020 is a bad year. 2021 is a good year.

MR. MCCOY: Yeah. I hope you're right.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
Okay. And let's open for the board members and please raise your voice and speak out on whatever you want and let me open to the board, please. MEMBER SANGHVI: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, Mr. -- Member Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir. MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I went and visited the site last month and looked around and they're asking for a very minimal variance. And there is a pond behind it and I understand their need to cover it up. So I have no problem with granting this variance to this -- for this property. Thank you.

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

And any other board member would like to speak?

Okay. Mr. Montague -- Member Montague, please go ahead, sir.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. Yes, sir. I went by
last month, too, and there's really not -- it's not infringing upon the neighbor. There's a pond behind so I'm fully in support of this variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Montague.

Any other board member, please?
Okay. Looks like seeing none.
Okay. And I heard a lot of thing about Coy Construction. I know in the last month they difficulties. And I visited this place. And what you said, Member Montague, the same issue. And I have no objection on this case. And somebody can make a motion.

Before that, Kevin, would you like to make a motion on this, Mr. Sanker -- Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: Sure. Be happy to do that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, sir.
MEMBER SANKER: I move we grant the variance in case number PZ20-0054 sought by the petitioner for a 30-foot rear yard setback, which is a variance of five feet. Because petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring the variance. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented
or limited with respect to the use of the property because he will not be able to enjoy his backyard. The property is unique because it has a pond in the back and an angled lot line which results in a lot of mosquitoes. Petitioner did not create the condition because they purchased the property in its uniquely situated lot at the time of purchase. They didn't alter the lot when they purchased it.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it's a minimal variance request and the deck is actually 40 percent smaller than the -- the new deck is 40 percent smaller than the current existing deck. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the petitioner will improve their home with a minimal variance needed.

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

Okay. And say "aye" all in favor?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Roll call.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please,
Katherine, can you roll call, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Congratulations, Mr. Coy Construction. And good luck.

MR. McCOY: Thank you. Thank you, board.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And for the next today's case number three, PZ20-0056, JB Donaldson and Lineage Logistics, 46500 Humboldt, $H-u-m-b-o-l-d-t, ~ D r i v e, ~ W e s t ~ o f ~ W e s t ~ P a r k ~$

Drive and North of Twelve Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-09-176-019. The applicant is requesting the variance from the Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 4.19.1.J for the quantity of accessory buildings, two permitted by code, 34 carports proposed. This property is zoned General Industrial, 1 dash -- L-2, not I dash. Okay. Thank you.

And the applicant is present?
MS. OPPERMAN: That would be Mr. Wickline, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. JB
Donaldson.
MR. WICKLINE: Yeah, I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, okay. Good. Go ahead, sir, and present your case. And before that, state your first and last name for the secretary for the court record.

MR. WICKLINE: I'm Christopher Wickline with JB Donaldson, 37610 Hills Tech Drive, Farmington Hills. I swear to tell the truth.

I'm presenting this on behalf of the building owner. They are looking to add the accessory structures in the back parking lot that we just
completed for them. They're doing this to, you know, give their new employees protection for their vehicles. And this back lot will also be -- is built to have future car charging stations. So they're looking to, you know, have car charging stations and then covered parking for, you know, a vast percentage of their employees.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, are you there?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I need you to take the vote on for this case.

Okay. Anything you want to add, Chris, for tonight on this case?

MR. WICKLINE: No. I think that covers it. You know, the plans that we submitted kind of show the location and the design of the carports that we're looking for.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Any other audience or any of the board members -- sorry. Any other audience on this case to speak on this, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMANN: There's no one raising their
hands for this case.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. And before going on to the board, I visited this property and I have nothing to say on this, the carports. And it's open for the board.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And Larry?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please, Member Krieger.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Anything from Larry and the city?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. From the city, anything from the city?

MR. BUTLER: No comments. I just wanted to mention one thing to Chris. Could you kind of explain to the board a little bit of the makeup of the carports, just structurewise so the board members can understand exactly what's going in?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Chris, are you there?

MR. WICKLINE: Yeah. Yeah. It's a single post carport, kind of like a commercial industrial style carport covered structure, where it's a single pitch roof with a single column near the front of the
carport which would in the future house the car charging stations along that column.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Chris.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.
And thank you, Chris.
And correspondence. Secretary, any other correspondence on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: For this case there were 25 letters sent, one letter returned, no objections and no approvals.

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

Chris, I have a quick question. Do you have any diagram or any layout on the -- you can share or you don't have?

MR. WICKLINE: Yeah, $I$ can show that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please, go ahead. So the board members can see what exactly and what kind of so they can see this commercial; how big is those.

MR. WICKLINE: So here's the existing building right now, right there, or if you can -- if you guys can see my cursor.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yep.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MR. WICKLINE: Okay. And then in red I've marked where the carport locations are going to go. This is a new parking lot that we just installed. And if you can see, we've kind of anticipated or hoped that we'd be able to build the carports. We've created walking paths in between the vehicle parking so that once the carports are installed, this would create, you know, a nice walking path for the employees with the -you know, with the covered parking. And then I can scroll down here and kind of show you the design.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Will they be lit for this time of year?

MR. WICKLINE: They will have -- there is a new photometric so there will be lights underneath the parking structure.

This kind of gives you an idea of what the parking structures look like. So it's a single post design. You know, the park -- the walking path would be underneath the front edge of this parking space, right about here. So there would be two of those back to back with a walking path in between the cars.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: How many carports on this, Chris?

MR. WICKLINE: So the total spaces would be 208.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: 208. Okay. Thank you, Chris. I appreciate your presentation.

And the board members can speak on this case, please.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, please, Member Sanghvi. Please go ahead, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited this property a couple of days ago. There's an enormous parking lot in the back of the building over there and they are planning to cover it and also provide facility for charging the future electric cars. I think in every way this is a great idea and I have no difficulty in supporting that request for variance. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

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

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, question. Does it matter if the car is electric or not to be able to park under there?

MR. WICKLINE: No, it does not.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other -- anybody would like to speak?
Okay. Looks like none.
Okay. This is the time to motion. Linda, can you make a motion on this case, please? Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: In this case I move that we grant the use -- the variance request for PZ20-0056 sought by the petitioner. That they established a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship because of the future in auto being -- going to electric. That they'll need car places summer or winter to have a vehicle plugged in. So having a carport would be very helpful.

Petitioner is not -- did not use the property as permitted in the district because -- cannot use the property as permitted -- oh, I don't -- in this
district.
The unique circumstances of the property consisting of its location is light industrial, $I$ believe, and prevents the --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: General
industrial.

MEMBER KRIEGER: General industrial.
The physical condition of the property consisting of neighboring with similar industrial buildings and parking structures.

The condition is not a personal or economic hardship. The using the property for parking the vehicles could be either electrical or non with the structure in this zoning will not alter the essential character of the area because of the similarity in the associated business subdivision. The petitioner and his predecessors did not create the need for this variance because of the anticipation of futures in vehicles. And the variance is granted.

And that's it. Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. SAARELA: Yes. So I'm reading the variance request as being for a dimensional variance,
being an increased number of accessory buildings and it looks like the standards down there for unnecessary hardship are for a use variance. This would be the typical if this is for dimensional variance and increased number of buildings. This should be for a practical difficulty, not an unnecessary hardship. MEMBER KRIEGER: So I can find one -- the one that's got practical difficulty?

MS. OPPERMAN: My apologies. I misunderstood that to be a use variance so I included that particular criteria.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Start over?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. SAARELA: They're requesting additional accessory structures so it's permitted, correct.

MEMBER KRIEGER: It would just be the roof over a parking lot.

MS. OPPERMAN: Correct. Yes. Additional parking structures or accessory structures.

MS. SAARELA: You can just use the same standards that were in the -- the first packet item that we had.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Practical difficulty?

All right. So I move that we grant the request in case number PZ20-0056 sought by the petitioner. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of their future use with vehicles that are auto electrical. The property is unique because it's in an industrial area. That neighboring subdivision -- or industrial subdivision would create the uniqueness for this area. The petitioner did not create the condition because he purchased this property in an industrial area.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of -- the use would be not as increased building structure. It is for parking. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it's a minimum request for the parking.

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

And thank you, Member Sanghvi.
Okay. Katherine, can you please roll call? MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.

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

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Congratulations.
And brings to the next case tonight.
PZ20-0063, Power Home Remodeling, 41370 Bridge Street, East of Meadowbrook Road and North of Eleven Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-13-351-020. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance Section 28-5(d) for a proposed 35.83 square
feet wall sign on the east elevation of the building. This property is zoned Light Industrial, L-1.

Is applicant present?
Hello?
MS. TOMASETTI: Hi, my name is Michelle Tomasetti. I am representing Power Home Remodeling. I'm the executive operating administrator. I also have our co-founder, Adam Kaliner on the line, and our building owner Chris Davis.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before proceeding I would like to bring my secretary for the oath on this case.

Katherine, can you please take it.
MS. OPPERMAN: So anyone that's going to be speaking here in the case needs to spell their name and then also swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case.

MR. DAVIS: Chris Davis, I'm the building owner. I swear to tell the truth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, both of you, Chris. And you can proceed with your case and you can present what we can help you on this.

MS. TOMASETTI: Am I --

MS. OPPERMAN: You would also need to state and spell your name, Ms. Tomasetti, as well.

MS. TOMASETTI: Great. My name is Michelle Tomasetti. It's M-i-c-h-e-l-le, T-o-m-a-s-e-t-t-i and I swear to tell the truth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Michelle. And you can proceed and you can present what you can.

MS. TOMASETTI: Okay. Great.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead.
MS. TOMASETTI: Got it. Thank you.
We are leasing the property here from the owner, Chris Davis. And there are signs on -- there's a sign on the -- it's the east side.

MR. DAVIS: One is the north. One is kind of the north.

MS. TOMASETTI: Okay. So a sign that is positioned. The front of the building, that's where the number one is. That is kind of the front of the building and that's where the main sign goes and that sign is there and installed. However, it's only visible from Highway 275. The entrance that you use to get into the building from Meadowbrook and Bridge

Street, the sign is not visible there. So we're requesting -- we have positioned another sign above our front doors that's on this side of the building where the number two is and we're requesting approval to keep that sign. So that when we have the -- our interview candidates and visitors come to the building, they're able to recognize the building and enter the facility.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Michelle, any other you would like to add on this case?

MS. TOMASETTI: And just additionally, we are kind of a growth company so we're constantly hiring and interviewing new candidates. So there's probably about three to four new visitors to the building per day. So obviously you can see that confusion would add up. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Anybody would like to speak on this before we proceed?

MR. DAVIS: Yeah. This is Chris Davis. I'm the building owner. My company used to be in that building and when the new owners moved to Troy, I leased it to Power Home. I will tell you when it was my company for seven years, it was very difficult to tell which building was which in that office park.

Michigan Milk was the first one and you could see their sign, I think, from Meadowbrook, not Bridge, and my building and my sign was where their current sign is and I didn't have as many visitors or people coming in for training. So adding a sign at number two from my perspective wouldn't take away from any of the owner's buildings or signs and it's not unsightly for anyone else in the park.

I happen to be the president of the association for Meadowbridge right here. I also own the LabCorp building which is second one from the end next to Rathsburg. And fortunately, those buildings' front door and entrance is at the front of the building where their sign is so it's easy to recognize where you're going. My building where Power Home Remodeling is, it's just difficult to tell what building it is as people come off Meadowbrook onto Bridge Street. And technically, you see where Bridge Street is, you actually have to pull into the office and drive back to the building.

So anyway. That's all.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Chris. Thank you so much.
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Any other in the audience, Katherine, raising their hand? Anybody?

MS. OPPERMAN: There's no audience members raising their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

From the city, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the city.
Standing by for questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much,
Larry.
And correspondence, acting secretary,
Katherine, can you please tell the correspondence, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Of course.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: There were 11 letters mailed, two returned, no objections and there was one approval by Kelly Kerrigan representing Michigan Milk Producers. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine.

Okay. Please, Michelle, I really appreciate in your presentation and also I visited your property
and I know you have been in this, as you said, several years, and $I$ know this sign is very important for the business and any business. I have no objection. I want to open to my board and let them speak out and we can move from there.

So open to the board.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I have two questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please, go ahead, Member Krieger.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For the sign number two, would people be able to enter that as well as where sign number one is or number one is the main entrance?

MS. TOMASETTI: They can only -- they can actually only enter the building where sign number two is. So sign number one, there's no entrance to the building on that side. I don't know if you can see up here.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then, so the request for a second sign is because it's larger than what our ordinance asks for?

MS. TOMASETTI: It's because it's a second sign.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.

I agree that finding your -- if you have just the one sign facing 275, it's very difficult to -- as soon as I saw the Power sign, it was very helpful. So I can understand your request and I can support it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Mr. Sanghvi. Go ahead, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. Yeah. I came and visited this site here. It's not very easy to find it best of times. It's right in the back of the building, it's nowhere visible on the front side of any roads and only way they can find where is the entrance is by putting this new sign. And I think it is required for the business identification for people to get into this particular business. So without this, it is very hard. So I have no problem supporting their request for this sign over their door.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member

Sanghvi.
Any other board member would like to speak?
Okay. Looks like seeing none. And it's the time to make a motion.

Michael?

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we grant the variance in case PZ20-0063 sought by Power Home Remodeling because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the sign variance.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because there is not a door under the first sign where they want people to go. They want people to go where the second sign is for training and interviewing.

The property is unique because they're trying to show their company name along 275, but still directing people to the right place when they get to the site. The petitioner did not create the condition. Just because of the way the park was laid out.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is zoned light industrial. If anything, it
would probably help some other properties with people knowing where to go rather than driving around the park. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

I don't know how to word that correctly. The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Minimal request?
MEMBER LONGO: Because of -- yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Minimum request.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Minimum request.
MEMBER LONGO: There you go.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other thing, Michael, you want to add or that's all?

MEMBER LONGO: No. I think that's a good idea.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Member Krieger. Thank you, Michael. And any other discussion on this case? Seeing none.

Okay. Katherine, can you please roll call? MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly.

MS. TOMASETTI: Thank you very much.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?

MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
Thank you and good luck, Chris and Michelle. Thank you.

MS. TOMASETTI: Thank you very much.
MR. DAVIS: Thank you. Have a good night.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Next, going to case number PZ20-0064. Erik
Laird, L-a-i-r-d, 23437 West LeBost Drive, East of
Meadowbrook Road and South of Ten Mile Road, parcel
number 50-22-25-153-012. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.11 to allow the installation of a fence in the front yard setback of a corner lot. Fence shall not extend toward the front of the property nearer than the minimum front yard setback distance by code. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4. Is the applicant present?

MR. LAIRD: Yes, present.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. Thank you.
Thank you. I know you both are watching since
beginning. I saw that 6:50 both of you on the call.
MR. LAIRD: Yes. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please spell your
first and last name for our court record and the secretary.

And, Katherine, can you please take it?
MR. LAIRD: My first name is Erik, E-r-i-k, Laird, L-a-i-r-d. And this is my wife Stephani Laird.

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

MR. LAIRD: Yes.
MS. LAIRD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, both of you. And you can proceed and you can present what you want and the board can hear on this.

MS. LAIRD: So we're looking to keep our fence where it is. It -- the current fence -- we put in a privacy fence and the current fence actually replaced the original fence that was there when we purchased the home. It follows the same exact line. We got approval from both our neighbors from behind and next to us. They were for the fence. We got approval from our HOA for it. And, you know, we went through all of the residential fence requirements. We met all of them and then we got hit with a variance.

MR. LAIRD: We thought we had our ducks in a row.

MS. LAIRD: We thought we had everything in a row. And so we're just looking to keep our fence where it is instead of having to move it or remove it, really.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Would you like to add anything, Erik?

MR. LAIRD: No. I just -- I just think that it replaced the fence that was there and I just don't
see a problem with it. That's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Okay. Katherine, any in the audience raising their hands from this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: There's no audience member raising their hand for this case.

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

And city, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: Yes. I have a question.
Your -- I would like to ask. If you're on a corner lot and are you trying to keep in the safety of the children or pets or something there?

MR. LAIRD: Future children definitely and -MS. LAIRD: Yeah.

MR. LAIRD: -- family members.
MS. LAIRD: We plan to raise a family here and since it's right off of Meadowbrook or pretty close to Meadowbrook and we're right off of the main entrance of our subdivision, we feel it would be the best to utilize as much of our property for when we have children and stuff.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry. And correspondence, acting secretary, Katherine, can you please tell me?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 33 letters mailed for this case, one returned letter, one approval and one objection. The approval is from Robert and Susan Redmond. They live directly across the street from Erik and Stephani Laird. They are constantly working to make the appearance of their home and are a welcome change considering what the home looked like before being purchased by them. All improvements have been advantageous to the neighborhood. We do not object to the location of the fence. And they say no additional fee should be charged.

Disapproval is from Mr. Darryl Stewart. It says -- this is a little bit long. "To the Zoning Board of Appeals, please note my objection to the requested variance. I live directly north of the fence in question.
"I would like to say that I totally respect my neighbor's right to ensure their families safety and security, but $I$ differ with them on how to go about doing that. From my vantage point (the front of my
house) the six foot solid fence/wall that has been installed looks ugly. The four foot non solid fence that originally existed was barely noticeable by itself."

He says he will respond to some of the standards they responded to. "Safety and security of the family, I have lived in this neighborhood for many years and the four foot tall non solid fence rule has kept 99 percent of all the families safe in the neighborhood as far as he knows. The neighbor directly behind Erik has young children that play in their backyard with only a four foot tall non solid fence."

It says the example of the house on Woodland Creek Drive has a six foot privacy fence that is much farther back from the edge of the street and does not have a house facing them.

And the example of the house on Broquet Drive has a six foot privacy fence that is nearly 50 feet off the edge of the street and has no house facing the fence at all, i.e., nobody looks out their front window and sees a solid fence.

Then he says that he doesn't think that the fence would have an affect on Laird property value, but
it may affect his from the vantage point of his house.
And that the neighbor that did approve of the fence lives directly across the street does not have the best viewpoint, that they can only see ten feet of the fence on each side of the house. And he says if he had that vantage, he would not complain.

And additional comments. I can tell you that the kind -- he had no idea what kind of fence was going up and where it would be located until he saw the posts being cemented into the ground the day installation started.

And he would like to stress again that he totally respects the neighbor's desire to keep the family safe and secure, only differing in the opinion on what type of fence would achieve that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine. I appreciate the long letter you read, you know. Thank you.

Okay. And coming to the board.
MS. LAIRD: Can we jump in real quick?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry?
MS. LAIRD: Could we just jump in --
MR. LAIRD: I would like to add a couple of
things if that's all right?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please, go ahead. This is the last. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. LAIRD: First $I$ would just like to add that the fence is unstained as of now because it was installed right before winter and you have to let pressure treated wood dry out before you can stain or seal it. And then it sounded like his complaint is not -- he said about how long it is, but the variance, that's allowed. The variance is what I believe we're arguing is the 30 feet to the house which is where the old fence was.

So that's all.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much both of you.

Okay. And let's open to the board. Go ahead board members who would like to speak on this case. MEMBER KRIEGER: Two questions -MEMBER THOMPSON: Unless I'm -MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh. MEMBER THOMPSON: Go ahead. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Thompson, go ahead.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So I see the old one. I don't see -- unless I'm missing it, I don't see any pictures of the new one.

MS. LAIRD: Yeah. There aren't any pictures of the new one. I wasn't sure whether -- that we needed to add the new ones in there, but it basically follows the same line of that old fence. It just is a privacy fence.

MR. LAIRD: It does go farther up which is allowed according to the City's website.

MS. LAIRD: It goes to about five feet past the back of our house.

MR. LAIRD: Yeah. The violation is the 30 feet past the house where the old fence was.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Thompson?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question about the -- is it because it's on a corner lot that it's regarded -- the side yard is regarded as a second front yard?

MR. LAIRD: Correct.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, it is.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So that would be the question --

MS. OPPERMAN: Would be considered a exterior side yard, yeah.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then you're going to be maintaining the fence and maybe some shrubbery?

MR. LAIRD: Absolutely.
MS. LAIRD: Absolutely. I mean, if you could see from the photos that we sent in of the previous fence that it replaced, I mean, the back yard was in shambles and it was completely overgrown and, I mean, we -- I mean, this fence improved just that alone. So ...

But, yeah, we're going to maintain it. We plan to stain it a nicer color. Obviously, we're waiting for winter to be over.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I drove by and I can understand the request and you've got approval from the homeowners association and some of the neighbors. So ...

And you put it right where the previous fence was and it's in compliance with the City's request about fences, so I would be able to support the
request.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Member Thompson, would you like to speak any other thing? Member Thompson?

MEMBER KRIEGER: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER THOMPSON: No. I'm sorry. I was stuck on mute. No. That answers it being a corner lot.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Because you were talking and I did not hear you that's why I called you back.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Got you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Any other board member who would like to speak, please?

Okay. Looks like seeing none.
MS. SAARELA: You're on mute, Member Sanghvi.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Sanghvi, you -- oh. I do not watch him.

Okay. Mr. Sanghvi. Yeah. Go ahead, Member

Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I just wanted to add, I went and saw this place the other day. They had just replaced the old fence with a new fence. And that's the only difference. Otherwise there is no change in what used to exist before. And a lot of the discussion is I think superficial in their sense. And I have no difficulty in supporting their request to just change the old link fence into a really a better looking fence this would be. And it is probably a little higher than what it used to be, but these kind of things come in set heights and that's what you buy and that's what you put in. Thank you.

MS. LAIRD: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi. And thank you so much Erik and Stephani on the presentation. What all you presented. And I have no objection. And I drove by your site and I have no. -- and also, your subdivision people support it and all and I have no objection on this. And it's time to motion.

MEMBER SANKER: Well, wait. I just have one question.

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. So I see the outline of the fence. And according to the variance, where would the fence line be? It would help with the motion.

MR. LAIRD: You mean, where the City's telling me?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. Like, based on the variances.

MR. LAIRD: The lady who stopped and came and explained to me, they wanted the fence to go all the way back to the house.

MS. LAIRD: So off of Malott Drive they're saying it needs to be 30 feet in from where it is.

MR. LAIRD: Which I would lose -- I would
lose 30 feet from where the old fence was. I didn't really understand that.

MEMBER SANKER: So the -- on this --

MR. LAIRD: On the north side --
MEMBER SANKER: -- where it says 72 feet, that should be smooshed in towards this house. Is that what you're saying?

MR. LAIRD: Yeah. On the 72 side, that's the north side. They want that all the way to the -- it can't go past the house she said.

MEMBER SANKER: Oh, okay.
MR. LAIRD: For some reason. I guess because the front yard and the 30 feet. But like I said, that's exactly --

MEMBER SANKER: And that's because the side yard is considered the front yard. Okay. Thanks.

All right. I'm ready to motion.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Sanker -- Member Sanker.

MEMBER SANKER: I move we grant the variance in the case number -- case number PZ20-0064 sought by petitioner for, let's see, the installation of a fence in the front yard setback of a corner lot.

Does that accurately define the variance?
(No response.)
MEMBER SANKER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.
MEMBER SANKER: For placing the fence in the front yard setback because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring the variance.

The variance -- without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because the yard would be substantially smaller and it would not adequately protect kids or pets from the front entrance.

The property is unique because it's a corner lot and the side yard is considered the front yard which makes the zoning ordinances difficult to follow on a corner lot. The petitioner did not create the condition because they bought the property as a corner lot.

And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the fence essentially replaces the old fence that was there. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it allows the owners to enjoy the yard with a relatively minimum variance and certainly a normal fence shape around the house.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member

Krieger.
And thank you, Member Sanker.
Okay. Any other discussion?
Seeing none.
Okay. Katherine, can you do the roll call?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MS. LAIRD: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
Good luck. Thank you.

MS. LAIRD: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And this is today's last case for today. PZ20-0065, Stephen and Catherine Beasley, 1254 East Lake Drive, West of Novi Road and South of Fourteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-151-017. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.11 to allow hedge row shrubs in the area between the house and the lake. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

Is the applicant present, Katherine?
MS. BEASLEY: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Oh. Thank you.

Stephen and Catherine, okay. Please go ahead and spell your first and last name for our court record for our secretary, acting secretary.

Katherine, can you take this, please?
MS. BEASLEY: Okay. Yeah. My name is Catherine Beasley, C-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, Beasley, B-e-a-s-l-e-y.

MR. BEASLEY: And Stephen -- good evening. Stephen Beasley. Stephen with a S-t-e-p-h-e-n. I'm
the same spelling as Beasley.
MS. OPPERMAN: And do you both swear or affirm to the tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. BEASLEY: We do.
MS. BEASLEY: Yes. Swear to tell the truth.
MR. BEASLEY: Happy New Year.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Katherine.

And go ahead, please. Proceed in your case. You can present how all we can help you on this case tonight.

MS. BEASLEY: Sorry. What was that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please, go
ahead. Present your case.
MS. BEASLEY: Okay. Yeah. So, basically, we -- our landscaping was damaged by our next-door neighbors new house build. That's been going on for about two and a half years. And we finally got around to putting in some trees. We picked slow growing, very slim trees. We don't want to create a hedge row because we already have a bit of a fence there and we also love the lake view. So we don't want to block the view or anything.

So we just -- we feel that we've just put nice, neat trees there and we've tidied up the area and, you know, it's been damaged for the last two years due to -- as I say, due to the house build next door. So, hopefully, we've just made it look nice and it looks better for the lake and the community.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Any other thing you would like to add?

MS. BEASLEY: No, I don't think so. I think you have all the details. Unless there's any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sounds good. Thank you so much.

And -- okay. Let me see what's going on on the public. Anybody is raising their hands, Katherine, on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: No. No one is raising their hand on this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Public remarks, none.

Okay. And let's go for the city.
MR. BUTLER: Yeah. The only question I had was, what is the height of the shrub and trees that are
going to be on the lake and that would prevent -anything that would prevent the neighbors from searching across and having a straight line of view to the waters?

MS. BEASLEY: Well --
MR. BEASLEY: There's no straight line view to the lake, actually.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.
MR. BEASLEY: It's right elevation. And they are around six foot. Six or seven foot in height only. And the reason we created that space was if you refer to our drawings, they're four foot apart so it was again reasonable to assume from our side that we were just making the edging of the garden clean and tidy and presentable.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.
Okay. And correspondence, secretary -- our acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 27 letters mailed, none returned, one objection, no approvals. The objection is from Ms. J.T. Harris. She's submitted
a somewhat long and, too, though she said it would be fine for me to summarize it for the purposes of the case.

She is concerned that the plants will grow into a hedge row. That would then block her view of the lake. She's concerned that because the plants she says are arborvitaes, that they will naturally grow into each other forming more of a hedge row situation that would block her view on the -- on the north end of the lake from her patio and yard, thereby disturbing the panoramic view of the lake for her.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Katherine.

Okay. It's time to open to the board. And board, can you go ahead, please. Would anybody like to speak on this case?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Sanghvi, please, go ahead, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I went and visited this property a couple of days ago and when I pulled in in front of the house, the property owner was in the garage. And so I talked to him and I went down
the gradient and looked at the particular shrubbery that they have planted. They are all small shrubs which are about three, four feet apart. And there being a gradient going down to the water side. They are not very, very tall. It looks like that what they are trying to do is just beautify their side of the property. And considering the presentation they have made and the photographs they have sent with the application, it looks like that this is a win/win situation in beautifying this property. It used to be relatively ugly looking before this was done. And in my opinion, this is a win/win situation for everybody including the property owner and the neighborhood. And I have no difficulty in supporting them. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member who would like to speak tonight on this case, please? MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I have a question. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, Mr. Montague, please, go ahead, sir.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you. What is the mature height and width? Are these trees going to grow
together and are they going to get taller or do you know the mature dimensions of these bushes here?

MR. BEASLEY: Yes. The trees actually, according to the documentation or the correspondence we had with the grower, explained to us that they would grow tall and thin or taller and thin. And if you actually pitch them around two foot together, they would over six -- five to six years grow together. That's not our intention. We pitched them four feet apart and we intend to maintain them to just make the area more presentable and so that we can see through them. If you refer to the pictures, they were designed to see through. So we've got from our side a view of the lake and from the neighbor's side, their view of the lake. So it was as I say a win for us and a win for them.

MS. BEASLEY: Can I also just say that we already have a fence there, so we're not trying in any way to create a hedge row that we can't see through. The area, the property line was damaged because of the house build and so it's been like that for a couple of years and we finally got around to thinking, yeah, let's just put something nice and minimalist and neat
there. So, yeah, we're not trying to create in any way -- and we're going to maintain them to make sure that we don't create in any way a hedge.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. I applaud the layout because it does allow that view through. So the layout as it sits now looks really well and I think I can support your variance.

MS. BEASLEY: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Montague.

And other board member before $I$ close in this case, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I agreed the arborvitaes, you can always prune them or top them and -- or replace them so to maintain the effect that you want for the greenery. So I would be able to support their endeavor.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Seeing none.
I think I have no objection and considering all my board members what they mentioned about the
trees and all and I have no objection, it's the time to motion. And Mr. -- Member --

MEMBER SANGHVI: May I make a motion?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member Sanghvi, please, go ahead. Make a motion, sir. MEMBER SANGHVI: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ20-0065 sought by Stephen and Catherine Beasley for 1254 East Lake Drive, Novi. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the need for a variance from the City Ordinance, Section 5.11 to allow them to have the shrubbery planted on the south side of the property line.

There is a gradient there and it is not likely to obstruct anybody's view. And it will give them the privacy they need and they deserve and on both sides of the fence. And they have shown in their application with the photographs that this plantation -- planting of the shrubbery is going to enhance the beauty of that area and their property. This petitioner did not create this condition.

And the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding property
because it does not alter the current condition and does not interfere with surrounding properties.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. In fact, also, it really enhances the property value in the surrounding neighborhood. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Second, Member
Krieger. Thank you so much.
Okay. Any other discussion on this case?
Seeing none.
Okay. Our acting secretary, Katherine, can you please roll call?

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

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Thank
you, Katherine.
And thank you for -- good luck to all the applicants.

MR. BEASLEY: Thank you.
MS. BEASLEY: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. This brings to our, you know, final cases and all for tonight. The motion before adjourn, I want to -- we have a motion and anybody can make a second for this adjourning this case of this --

MEMBER VERMA: Yes. Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Say " aye" everybody all in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Nay?
Seeing none.
Okay. Motion is adjourned. Thank you.
(At 8:45 p.m., matter concluded.)
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