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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good evening, everybody. And welcome to the Novi Zoning Board, January 14, 2020. Welcome and Happy New Year. Please, all of you, stand for the Pledge of Allegiance followed by Michael.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

Katherine, can you please roll call.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Present.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Present.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: Here.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague is absent, excused.

Member Verma?

MEMBER VERMA: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Thank you.
And thank you to Katherine.
And I would like to say sad news for one of our board members. He passed away in the last month. And sorry to his family and we want to send condolence to his family.

Silence for one minute. Can you please stand up.
(Moment of silence.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
Okay. Now, we have a full board. Enough for a quorum. I think we have two cases today. And please turn off or put your phones in vibrate mode so we don't have any disturbances. And we have a public hearing in each case where you can make remarks. It is on television at home and the people can watch. The applicants can come up to the podium and speak on your case and show on the computer also. Please watch on the computer at home as well.

And people come to the podium, as I said, and spell your name, first name and last name, for our

And we have an agenda for tonight. We have two cases on the agenda.

Katherine, for the agenda. Any changes?
MS. OPPERMAN: No changes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And ...
MEMBER KRIEGER: Move to approve the agenda. MEMBER SANKER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All in favor.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Okay. And anybody say none?

No.
Minutes for November 2019, I'm going to move the motion for that. Any changes on that?

Anybody have changes on 2019 November meeting minutes?

Okay. Anybody wants to make a motion for
that one?
MEMBER VERMA: So moved.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I'll second it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Say "Aye"
all in favor.
THE BOARD: "Aye."
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And the motion is approved.

And the public remarks, anybody have anything apart from our two cases? And please, before moving to the public hearing and the applicants if you have any other things, you can come to the podium and you can speak out, please.

Thank you.
MS. DUCHESNEAU: This is for the cases tonight?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I mean, apart from the agenda.

MS. DUCHESNEAU: Apart from the agenda. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Seeing none. Thank you.

Let's move to the first case. PZ19-0049
Bonner Properties, LLC, Beck Road, east of Beck Road
and south of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-33-100-013.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 3.1.2 for a front yard setback of 19 feet -- 30 feet allowed, proposed variance is 11 feet; and a rear yard setback of 15 feet, 35 feet allowed, proposed variance is 20 feet -to accommodate the construction of a new house. This property is zoned single family residential, R-1.

Is the applicant here?
Yes, please come to the podium.
MR. BONNER: This right here?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
Okay, for our secretary, please raise your hand for your sworn in.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. BONNER: No.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Do you swear or
affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. BONNER: Sure. Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And spell your name.

MR. BONNER: Bonner, $B-o-n-n-e-r, ~ J e s s e$, J-e-s-s-e.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: If you don't mind putting the mic closer, so she can hear clearly. Can you spell it one more time.

MR. BONNER: Jesse, J-e-s-s-e, Bonner, $B-o-n-n-e-r$.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. The applicant can proceed what you want to say to the board and public in the presentation of your case.

MR. BONNER: Well, we're requesting a variance on the setbacks so that we can build a house that goes along with the rest of the subdivision or the houses in the area. The property is -- it's been made smaller because of the deed of right-of-way from earlier in the '70s or '90s. I think the 990 is when they deeded the road -- when they paved the road. So it makes it difficult to get a house that would go along with the rest of the houses that are there. So we are requesting a variance on the front and back setback and also on the sides.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anything else you
want to say?
MR. BONNER: That's what we're proposing.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Did you want to present any photos or any slides you want to show?

MR. BONNER: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Do you have any documentation you want to show in the presentation?

MR. BONNER: I presented all the documents to you when we submitted the application.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Apart from that, you don't want to say anything else?

MR. BONNER: I guess, once I hear what you have to say.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Because I want to ask you that. Thank you.

And audience, anybody wants to ...
Okay, please come, ma'am. Come to the podium, ma'am.

You can stay back, sir.
MS. DUCHESNEAU: My name is Dorothy
Duchesneau, D-u-c-h-e-s-n-e-a-u.
I live at 1191 South Lake Drive. I do have one page I would like to kind of show off. It's from
the City websites.
The idea of building a home on that property and making it useful, no objections with that. However, I do hope that the applicant is aware that Beck Road has a target on its back. It is one of the few viable roads that can be widened in the city of Novi to improve traffic flow. And it's on the very, very short list. And at that point in time, all 66 foot of that right of way, if it goes into a five-lane road, will be used up.

My other thing is that within the city of Novi, since 2016, which was the latest map that I could find, they're indicating on both the left and the right sides of Beck Road outside of this 60 foot right of way, major future sidewalks. Now, in the meetings I've attended with walkable Novi, major translates to wider than usual. That 16 foot that he has left over is going to get awful tight to his front door.

With the elementary school being in what I would consider a targeted walkable area and with Beck Road being a major northbound flow to 696, Beck Road is going to happen sooner than you might think.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Anybody in the audience, please?

Yeah, please come to the podium. Please spell your name for my secretary.

MR. BONNER: Yes. Thanks. My name is Brett, $B-r-e-t-t, C h e a n e y, C-h-e-a-n-e-y$.

I submitted a form of a formal objection in writing yesterday as well. I'm here representing myself and also my mother, who is the property owner of 22200 Beck Road, which borders this parcel on the east and north.

If people aren't familiar with the area, I do have this visualization here, which shows how small this parcel is deemed to the rest of the residential properties. It is an $R-1$ district, which, $I$ believe, is a low density district. So adding another home on a small parcel of land could potentially diminish the property values. Especially, of my mother's home with a 15 foot setback.

As you can imagine, that's a very, very small backyard especially since the front of our home would look almost directly into the back of that home. There would be a minimal buffer for noise. You can imagine
if you put a patio or deck, that would come almost absolutely to that fence line. And the experience of living in an area where one has rolling lots and open lands -- most of the lots there are one acre plus or more. And to have a home kind of -- you know, to put it lightly, crammed onto a small piece of property, would really change the sense of, you know, seclusion and privacy and peace that you get in that area, which is really unique to have that really sense of open land cover and trees and also accessible to the amenities of the city of Novi.

So I think it is a really special part in a little corner of the city and to add more homes in there would really change the dynamic and the feel. So primarily, in the area of standard number five, for the review standards of altered property values of surrounding properties, that's my main objection. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Anybody in the audience for the last call?

Oh, please come on to the podium. You can spell your name.

MS. CHEANEY: Hi.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Say your name.
MS. CHEANEY: I'm Deborah Cheaney,
D-e-b-o-r-a-h, C-h-e-a-n-e-y.
I'm the owner of the property directly behind the proposed property to be built on. I personally stand to lose the most in property value along with my neighbors up and down Beck Road. But also very important to me is the loss of the beauty of my land. I have so enjoyed living here for 30 years. My husband Don for 20 years before he passed and Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Cheaney for almost 60 years.

In building this home, I will be looking directly at the back of this new home from my beautiful front porch, which is on an acre of property, the large properties which many people have enjoyed on Beck Road for many years. Also unusual is for any person having to face the back of a home from the front of their home. I ask that you please do not allow the building of this home on this property that has been vacant for almost 50 years.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

Anyone in the audience for the last thought, please?

MS. DROGOSCH: Hello, my name is Wendy Drogosch, D-r-o-g-o-s-c-h. I live next door to Deborah at 22250 Beck Road. And, yes, I'm concerned. I agree with everything the last two people just said -- or three, actually. I object to the variance. I do have the aerial footage, unfortunately, in black and white. I'm not sure how that's going to look. You can see the parcel of land. The home would be literally built in front of her house. Where the large arrow is, is her home. I live next door to that. Just to the north.

But the house, $I$ believe would be a big loss on the resale value of her home which also effects my home and others. The house would be intrusive to me. The view from my front porch, which is on the south side of my house, that house would be on top of me when I'm on my front porch. There's just a small bit of land. We have her driveway and you can see the fence line of the parcel.

We live in areas with stand alone homes with large acreage. We're not on city street blocks with houses on top of each other. The parcel has an acreage
of 0.19. The house would be so close to Beck Road. The proposed build is 19 feet from the road and I do believe that new builds have to put in a sidewalk. And what if Beck Road does expand, the house would get even closer to the road. Who would want to live 19 feet from Beck Road. I feel a new build that close to our properties will greatly hinder the resale value of our houses.

Over the years there's been a progressive loss of woodlands and farmland to development which causes fragmented habitat. When less land is available to wildlife, natural habitat like older wood lots and hollow land and hollow trees may not be readily available for the wildlife. Lack of traditional den sites may cause wild animals to use chimneys and attics as alternate shelter. That patch of woods is home to countless animals, bird, insects. Fragmented habitat restricts wildlife access to basic life requirements. It also helps to lower the noise level and dust and reduces water runoff. There -- I looked at the regulated woodland map. There are two streams. One directly across the street from me with wetlands and one down on the adjacent corner of Beck and Nine.

Disruption to the land could cause soil erosion issues.
On our map, the regulated woodland map, it's not going to show up well here. Unfortunately, it's very small, squeezed in. The city of Novi, this is a map of the regulated woodland areas. The red mark, number 33, that section is where our home is. There's a small blue X where our home is right here. And if you look at Beck Road on the East Side of Beck from Eight to 10, there is a lack of regulated woodland area there.

So one of the things I want to say that I did read in preparing for this is the wildlife habitat plan.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you summing up?
MS. DROGOSCH: The ability of wildlife for the 21st Century. It was created by the wildlife management services.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Okay.
MS. DROGOSCH: And I can just tell Novi does care about its wildlife so I want to personally propose and say that the city of Novi buys the land. Takes away the residential zoning and makes it a regulated woodland area.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, ma'am.
MS. DROGOSCH: I think that would be
beautiful. When sidewalks get created, it would be lovely to walk by.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. DROGOSCH: All set.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And anybody in the audience I would like to say you cannot give no more than three minutes of time. Please note on that. I forgot to mention that. We'd appreciate it. Anybody wants to come to the podium the only allowed time is three minutes. Thank you.

Anybody wants to say anything? Final?
Do you want to say anything, ma'am?
MS. CHEANEY: I just have one question.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please come to the podium.

MS. CHEANEY: I saw in the paperwork that the last time the property itself was surveyed was, I believe, in 1972 and I just want to know when the last time the City has been out to observe and if they have before they even approve or think of approving. That is what I really want to know is when the last time
somebody physically looked at the situation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
And also once the motion and everything is done, nobody can talk inside the hall. Once the motion is done, please decline talking. That is also one more thing I would like to bring to the audience. Thank you so much.

From the City?
MS. SAARELA: I do have just some brief comments regarding the issue of the future road improvements and future sidewalk improvements. So there may well be plans in the future, but that's not something that you can take into consideration in deciding whether to grant variances tonight. That's something that would be considered, would have to be dealt with in the future if and when those plans come to fruition. Michigan law is very clear on the fact that in making zoning decisions that the City cannot make a determination based on what the future right-of-way might be or future plans for, you know, City projects might be. So just as you consider this based on Gordon versus City of Warren you have to stick
with what the actual property right-of-way is now. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Elizabeth.

From the City?
MR. BUTLER: No comment.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No comment. Okay.
MR. BONNER: Am I able to submit a letter
that I have from the building officials or show a letter that is from the building officials?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You have the letter?

MR. BONNER: Yes, I do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please do.
(Documents displayed.)
MR. BONNER: Is that legible?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: If you can read that, that would be nice.

MR. BONNER: If I can read it?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MR. BONNER: It says: "You have requested verification that you will be able to rebuild --"

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Excuse me. Can you put the mic near your mouth.

Thank you.
MR. BONNER: "You have requested verification that you will be able to rebuild should you deed the westerly 33 feet of your property to the city of Novi. Your property is presently zoned R-1, family residential district. This district requires that your proposed residence be located in such a manner that there will be maintained 30 foot front yard, 35 foot rear yard, a 10 foot side yards. The district also requires your property to have 120 foot frontage and be one-half acre in area. However, because this lot presently is a lot of record, a single family dwelling together with its customary accessory buildings may be erected even though your parcel fails to meet the requirements of width and area provided further with the yard dimensions and other requirements not involving area or width of the lot shall conform to the regulation of $R-1$ district. The yard requirement variances may be obtained by the approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals."

This was the opinion of the building official in 1985.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

Correspondence, Secretary?
MS. SAARELA: Mr. Chair, I just want to comment on that, too. As you know, you have a letter in your packet regarding that same issue and we do agree with that statement of that letter.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For correspondence, 15 letters were sent. Zero returns, zero approvals, two objections.

First one is, "Hello, Katherine. On behalf of myself and Deborah Cheaney, the property owner of 22200 Beck Road, please note the following objections related to the requested dimensional variance of Beck Road parcel 50-22-33-100-013. The 22200 Beck Road parcel is a 2,123 square feet home constructed on 1.1 acres in 1983 and borders the parcel in question directly to the north and east. The primary objection is related to standard number five of the review standards. The first impact on surrounding area. If the variance is approved and the proposed home is constructed, I believe there will be a negative impact on the surrounding property values as well as the overall enjoyment of surrounding properties. The proposed 15 feet rear setback is less than 50 percent
of the minimum distance for $R-1$ standards and would put the rear of the home extremely close to the property line and front yard of the existing home at 22200 Beck Road. This would create a very limited buffer for distance and noise between the two homes and would no doubt alter the look and feel and general appeal of the home at the 22200 since the view from the front porch and yard would be directly into the rear of the home and backyard of the new residence. This could significantly impact the property value of the 22200 Beck Road in a negative way and create a less appealing property since the privacy and peaceful setting that currently exists would be lost.
"Another concern is related to the overall size of the parcel in question and the proposed size of the home. $R-1$ is low density district and this parcel is significantly smaller than the minimum standard listed. Actual area of 11,020 square feet versus 21,780 square feet minimum and a lot width of 95 feet versus 120 feet. As outlined in the map below, this parcel is radically smaller than the existing parcels with homes constructed in the immediate area which are all on large pieces of property. Generally, one acre
plus, that offer a sense of seclusion with wide open spaces and large yards. It is easy to see that the proposed construction would not fit into the historical look and feel of this neighborhood and alter property values and the experience of all surrounding properties.
"Thank you for your time and I look forward to reviewing the matter in the upcoming hearing. Regards, Brett Cheaney."

And the second one is objection. "This will look out of place, too close to front lot line and the rear lot line. This will impact my value. I own two properties on Beck Road. Michael Storm on 22126 Beck."

That's it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
Let me put this on the board. Anybody wants to talk on this case, please?

Mr. Mav, please go ahead.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I came and visited your area and looked around at your lot yesterday. And indeed your lot is very small as compared to the other lots in the area, but the way I feel is it is really an eyesore the way it is now. And
the other thing $I$ want to observe is we live in a wonderful country where everybody has rights. And I know there is a lot of people out front that this may not be a good idea to let you build on your property, but we on this board -- and I'm speaking hopefully for all the members here -- is we have certain constraints and we are to go by the rules. And living in a country like ours I think everybody has the right to build on their property. We can't deny that right ourselves. So in spite of all the position, I feel that I should support your request for the variance and uphold your right.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: So I will be supporting your application for the variance in spite of the opposition by your neighbors. Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mav.
Anybody in the board, please?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question for the City.

There were two other homes that are similar to this. The one that is on Napier and Nine Mile.

MR. BUTLER: Right.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And on Nine Mile and Meadowbrook, those are, like, closer to the road and then similar -- dissimilar, I suppose. And I agree with the previous speaker that every property owner has a right to do what they like on their property.

And so looking at this, it's difficult to take everything into consideration. Yes, the property is small, but the variance he's trying to fit them as well as can be into it. So I also need to listen to other board members.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you,
Linda. Anybody on the board?
Okay. Mr. Kevin?
MEMBER SANKER: Have you considered other alternatives? I guess, why is this the least variance that you need when designing the house? Could you do it smaller?

MR. BONNER: We wouldn't be here if we just wanted to just rebuild a house on the footprint that was there. We would just apply for the building permit. It looks as if it's permitted. We wanted to have a better house or a house that fit better into the
neighborhood so that's why we're in front of the board right now. Otherwise, $I$ don't know that we would need to be here. We would just apply for our building permit.

MEMBER SANKER: Um-hmm.

MR. St. JOHN: Maybe I can speak to that? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sure.

MEMBER SANKER: Sure.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. ST. JOHN: I am not.
MEMBER KRIEGER: If you could state your name for the court recorder (sic.)

MR. St. JOHN: My name is Jason St. John,
J-a-s-o-n. S-t period space J-o-h-n.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Raise your right hand.
Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. St. JOHN: Yes, I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MR. St. JOHN: So to address your question specifically, would this be, you know, the minimal acceptable? My background is engineering and for me to say it's absolutely the minimum, I can't say that.

Because you can always tweak. You can always look at things here and there. What I can speak to this parcel, if you were to follow the existing setbacks, would allow a home to be built without any variance requested that would be 18 feet wide by 55 feet wide and would also allow an accessory building to be built six feet from the property line. So when we were looking for plans to what we could put on this property, knowing that, as the neighbors have stated, they don't want something right on their property. Right?

MEMBER SANKER: Um-hmm.
MR. ST. JOHN: So instead of building a detached garage that would be six feet from the property line, which you would be forced to do to try to get it 10 feet away from the home, the thought was that in this drawing here, this is shown as a carport, but this would be a garage. So you move that further away from the property line. And to fit with the concerns about property values, if you build an 18 foot by 50 foot house, it's going to look like a single wide trailer sitting on that property. Nobody wants that. So we tried to fit something that was architecturally
more in line with the area.
In addition, the Novi standards call for an attempt for a side entry garage so you're not looking at somebody's junk all the time if you happen to drive by and the garage is open. The same thing, this would be a side entry garage.

So, basically, it was kind of the best we could find of a plan that made sense architecturally for the lot and that fit within trying to make some of the concerns that the neighbors had voiced. Keep it away as much as possible from the neighbors and do that in a package that's possible.

In addition, it's not a McMansion. I don't remember if it was one of the neighbors or one of the -- I think it was the comment that was read, quoted it as like a 2000 square foot. The footprint that's shown includes the garage. So the first floor of the home is only, I believe -- it's right around a 1,000 square feet. You know, that doesn't include any of the bedrooms in the second floor. But it's not asking for a 5,000 square foot footprint of a home that is going to be a 10 bedroom and five bath. It's in keeping with the scale of the property that exists.

And I guess to recap. It's the best compromise that we could come up with that fits the regulations that are there and doesn't build something that I think nobody wants, which would be allowed and nobody would have a say in it, if we just went in and applied for a permit for an 18 foot by 50 foot single wide trailer with a detached garage six foot from the property line.

MEMBER SANKER: Um-hmm.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER SANKER: So that's essentially what it would have been, 18 feet wide is how wide the house would have been?

MR. St. JOHN: It would be 18 feet deep and it would be 55 foot long along the property line. So I can show you a ...

I don't know if $I$ can zoom this or not.
Actually, that doesn't do it justice either.
So, yeah, this is Beck Road here. And the dotted line is what the actual zoning would allow. So it would be -- you know, as you faced it it would be 55 feet wide and it would be 18 feet deep.

MEMBER SANKER: Um-hmm.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Did you want to say anything, Kevin? Do you want to make a motion?

Oh, sorry.
MEMBER LONGO: Yeah, I also visited the site and it is a small lot as has been pointed out. It is a gorgeous neighborhood, as the neighbors have pointed out. I think that you're doing everything you can under the circumstances. It's a very nice home and anything less than that would not fit in that neighborhood. That would be unacceptable regardless of the size of the lot. So I think you're doing everything that you can within the constraints that Novi has put on you and I support this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody on the board, please?

Okay. Time for motion.
MEMBER SANKER: Okay. I think I'm ready.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.
MEMBER SANKER: All right. And I agree with all our board members who have spoken and I'm going to move that we grant the variance in case number PZ19-0049 sought by the petitioner for the front and
backyard setbacks for the variance in section 3.2.1 because petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring the variance. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because he would not be able to build a modern home. And if he were to be within the constraints of the variance, he would only have a very small, limited use -- or building footprint which would be approximately 18 feet by 50 feet.

The property is unique because the parcel dimensions are extremely small when compared to other parcels in the area. The petitioner did not create the condition because he purchased the property with the small dimensions.

And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because the buildings height and length will not alter or otherwise obstruct the neighboring properties which are setback from these boundaries and for those reasons.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MS. SAARELA: Can $I$ suggest an addition to
that that we just acknowledge that the property was an existing buildable lot on the date the zoning ordinance was passed? So it is a buildable lot.

MEMBER SANKER: Do I need to add that?

MS. SAARELA: Yes. If you'll just agree to add that to the end of the motion, please. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. MEMBER LONGO: Second. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Who will second it?

MEMBER LONGO: I seconded it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, you already
did. I did not hear. Thank you.
Any other discussion apart from that?
Seeing none. Katherine, please call roll call.

MS. SAARELA: Member Verma?

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

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. SAARELA: And Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. MS. SAARELA: Motion passes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Congratulations.

And moving to the second case. And PZ19-0051, Araneae, A-r-a-n-e-a-e, Inc. Ascension Providence Hospital, 47601 Grand River Avenue, west of Beck Road and South of Grand River Avenue, parcel number 50-22-17-400-046.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the city of Novi ...

Okay. Sorry. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 28-5(a) and 28-5(b)(1)(B) for a 263 square foot illuminated sign on the north elevation of the building. This sign exceeds number of signs permitted and area of wall sign permitted based on the setback from Providence Parkway Drive.

This property is zoned office services
commercial, OSC.
The applicant is here.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Before you start, I would like to state that $I$ work at Providence Hospital but I have no financial gain, but if $I$ need to recuse myself. I'd like to bring it up.

MS. SAARELA: I think you can recuse yourself in this case and that's because you work for the petitioner.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Granted.

MS. SAARELA: You guys should do a vote. Just do a voice vote. It doesn't have to be a roll call.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER SANKER: So all in favor.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All in favor,
"Aye."
THE BOARD: Aye.
(Board Member Krieger exits room.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And the applicant is here, please.

And, Kevin, if you can take on the roll of
the secretary.
MEMBER SANKER: Oh, yeah. Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please spell your first name and last name for the record.

MR. BOWMAN: Sure. It's Blair, B-l-a-i-r,
Bowman $B-o-w-m-a-n$.
And, thank you.
Mr. Secretary, Kevin.
MEMBER SANKER: Are you an attorney?
MR. BOWMAN: I am not.
MEMBER SANKER: Can you state your name, spell your name for the record.

MR. BOWMAN: Sure. Blair Bowman, B-l-a-i-r, $B-o-w-m-a-n$.

MEMBER SANKER: Raise your right.
Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MR. BOWMAN: I do.

MEMBER SANKER: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And you can present your case, please.

MR. BOWMAN: Sure. In a very brief presentation, if you would, or statement, I have been
asked on behalf of the system. You know, here before you this evening is a quintessential example of where the practical and the technical meet and, you know, in the term of what this body has to deal with. You know, the practical and sincere hardship exists.

This is sincerely a symbol related to what will be integrated within the campus of this, obviously, important and incredibly high quality institution that we have within our borders. It's one thing that probably should have been even integrated with the original construction, but now it's coming before you. And, you know, in reading the technicality of the size of how the reading of the ordinance looks at it, you know, over 250 square feet. But in reality, the symbol itself is dimensionally even actually within the square footage of the dimensional requirements from the standpoint of even the standards.

And the practicality and the technicality, again, from the hardship standpoint, if you look at the size and the scale of this complex and the enormity of the building, how far it is set back from the road systems and the purpose for this element, to technically meet the requirements, it would put it into
such a small scale, it would literally be postage stamp style in view.

So, certainly, you know, representatives here from the system can certainly answer questions that you might have. I am just here as a long-time supporter for the system and asked to make a comment or two. Also, have several properties that we own and represent that we received letters and submitted letters of support to you as well, fully supporting this very worthy effort and respectfully request that you approve the variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr.
Blair.
And anybody wants to present?
Okay. Spell your first name, please.
MS. TYLE: Kim Tyle, K-i-m, T-y-l-e.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And for our
secretary you can --
MEMBER SANKER: Raise your right hand, please.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MS. TYLE: Sure. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MS. TYLE: So I did want to present the new drawing of the cross. When we originally submitted the paperwork, we actually took the rectangle that the cross sits within and we had it minimalized. So it sits up 48.9 square feet for just the dimensions of the cross. It's still really beautiful. It is 20 feet tall by 13 feet wide and it's illuminated. So it will look very nice from the road.

And this is what it will look like. So I just wanted to include those details as well that we did modify so that it did fit within the 65 square feet as required.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, ma'am. MS. TYLE: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody wants to speak on this case, please? Anybody in the audience, please?

Seeing none.
Okay, from the City?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City.
Standing by for questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Correspondence, acting secretary, Mr. Kevin?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes. 57 letters were sent. Four were returned. Two approvals. No objections. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER SANKER: I forget. Do I have to read the approvals?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You have to read the approvals, please.

MEMBER SANKER: This is from Grand Beck
Ventures Group, LLC. "Please consider this
correspondence as our strong support and encouragement for the requested sign variance for the hospital. Very truly yours, Susan M. Moore on behalf of Grand Beck, Ventures Group, LLC."

The second letter is from Central Park Management Company. And it says, "Please consider this correspondence as our strong support and encouragement for the requested sign variance for the hospital. Very truly yours, Peter Scodeller, S-c-o-d-e-l-l-e-r."

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
A solid presentation, Mr. Blair, and other team members. You did a wonderful presentation. Apart from that I have no objection on this case. I'll
support on this case.
And anybody want to speak on the board, you can speak.

Okay, Mr. Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: I would pass the site up close to the parking lot is one thing, but going down Grand River, quite frankly, that cross is not that large. I mean, it's -- a postage stamp would have been a good term had you stated that. Furthermore, the number of signs -- well, you know, we have a lot of ordinances. The fact is this is a campus. So there are no signs that are visible when $I$ came down Grand River looking at that particular part of the building.

Now, as you go down Grand River and you go down Beck, of course, there are other signs. Which you really need to know what this big place is. I totally support your view.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Michael.

Okay. Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
have known the presence of Providence Hospital complex for over 20 years in this community. We started with a
very small place on Ten Mile and Meadowbrook as the pediatric unit, which some of you may not even remember or know. It has now grown into a very viable and creditable institute in our city.

This particular request for an additional sign on that wall is not really that large.

And I have a question for the City, is the new revised calculation, does it fit into the normal size of the city ordinance?

MR. BUTLER: It does not. The fact that they are already above what they already have been authorized to have. So it falls just within that as an extra sign that they're asking for.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
MR. BUTLER: You're welcome.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I have no problem with this particular sign on this particular wall. I have known this complex for many years and I always wondered why they didn't have a sign on that wall for all this time. Because people coming east on Grand River have no way of recognizing what this big building is until they have almost gone past it.

And adding this sign -- which $I$ know it is a
cross, but in a way $I$ consider it as a corporate logo of the national brand of the Ascension Group of hospitals, not only here in Michigan but all over the place. And to recognize that as a national brand and as a logo and to put it on this wall, I think it is a natural sequence of events which has been around for a few years, if not longer.

And I personally have no problem about granting this variance to this institution.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr. Mav.
Anybody in the board, please?
Mr. Rameesh, go ahead, sir.
MEMBER VERMA: Just curiosity. This sign is made of what? What type of metal you are using?

MR. CARROLL: John Carroll, C-a-r-r-o-l-l.
MEMBER SANKER: Can you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MR. CARROLL: I do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Proceed.
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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, sure, sir. Please go ahead.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ19-0051 sought by the Araneae and Ascension Providence Hospital for an additional illuminated full side wall sign because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring installation of the additional signage on the basis of the following.

A, that failure to grant relief will
unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more than mere inconvenience or inability to obtain a higher economical or financial return because petitioner is a unique faith-based hospital organization with 175 year history in the area.

The sign is needed to identify petitioner as part of the system of unique faith-based institution. And it is consistent with the branding of the other hospitals operated by Ascension Providence in the Metro Detroit area and the branding is unique in that it is necessary to identify the petitioner in its mission.

Number two, that the request is based upon
circumstance or features that are exceptional and unique to the property and do not result from conditions that exist generally in the city or that are self-created because the patients and the visitors may have difficulty recognizing and accessing the campus safely and efficiently. The property is unique because of the large size and bulk and extended size of the site and multiple directions of approach on several roadways and plethora of services offered by this institution.

Number three, the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the sign location is located a significant distance from the address and surrounding properties.

And D, the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the requested sign is visible for the use and function of the property as well as the nature of the hospital, patients, visitors and the community of Novi.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

|  | Page 45 |
| :---: | :---: |
| MEMBER VERMA: I second. |  |
| Motion done. |  |

And, please, Katherine, roll call.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And congratulations, Mr. Blair and team.
Good luck.
And Linda, please come back up.
(Member Krieger resumes position.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other things anybody would like to?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Training class?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Training class
thing? Anybody want to say the date and time for the training?

MR. BUTLER: We haven't put that out yet because we were waiting until after the holidays? Did you get the flier that Charles sent out about classes?

MS. OPPERMAN: They received the mailing. I'm sending them the one from Charles. Tomorrow morning.

MR. BUTLER: Tomorrow morning.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Very good.
MR. BUTLER: There is a group of classes that are offered. Charles would like for you to take a look at those and we're going to see the participation we may get on those and that may substitute for our training, but everybody please take a look at it and then respond back to me or Charles if you think it's a good idea and you see any classes you would like to take.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr. Butler.

And anything else? And I would like to say motion to adjourn. And with that would you like to

1
proceed?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Motion to adjourn.
MEMBER SANGHVI: So moved.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. All in favor say "Aye." THE BOARD: Aye. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. We're adjourned.
(At 7:51 p.m., matter concluded.)

-     -         - 
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