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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good evening.
Today is December 12 th and final meeting of this year. Please call to the order and Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand up everybody.

Go ahead, Linda.
(Pledge of Allegiance)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please mute your cell phones. Can somebody help me for the main door?

Thank you.
Okay. And roll call.
MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. FLETCHER: Member Sanghvi. Absent.
Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member Longo. Absent, excused.

Member Montague?


MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to approve the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody make a second, please.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Approval of agenda unanimously.
Minutes of meeting November 2023, somebody make a motion. Any changes or any modifications,
please let me know. Somebody can make a motion.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to approve the minutes from November 2023.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody make a second.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any nays? No.

Okay. Public remarks. This is the time where you can speak up and anything.

Looks like none public hearing also.
Okay. And today we have five cases. The first case is PZ23-0058, Colucci, C-o-l-u-c-c-i, Colucci Properties, LLC, 40245 Grand River Avenue, south of Grand River Avenue, east of Haggerty Road, Parcel 50-22-24-451-006. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 4.19.2.f.iv to allow the location of a dumpster enclosure within the required 10 feet rear yard setback. The existing dumpster encroaches 2.5 feet on the adjacent property. This variance would clarify the location of the dumpster for any future project proposals. The property is zoned Non-Center

Commercial, NCC.
Is the applicant is there? Please present your first name and last name clearly for our record. And if you're not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath. Please go ahead.

MR. COLUCCI: Good evening members of the board. I'm John Colucci. I am an attorney. And I'm here in connection with the request for a dimensional variance pertaining to a dumpster enclosure at 40245 Grand River, which encroaches also on an adjacent property at 40255 Grand River. The Colucci family has owned and developed the properties in excess of 30 years. The dumpster corral was constructed at some point in the mid-90s. We don't have an exact date on that. My father would have known that, but he's passed away. And the practical difficulties in moving the dumpster corral are immense.

We have a very shallow greenbelt area at the back which itself is about nine feet. So we couldn't even be in the greenbelt with the dumpster corral if we were to move it. We'd have to move it up.

We have the parking area. There's immediately adjacent to the corral areas a big
transformer DTE installed. Also, there's a drain for the parking lot right in that area.

So both would be interfered with if we were not able to maintain the dumpster corral.

It otherwise meets the requirements of the enclosure ordinance and is otherwise in an appropriate place, albeit we do need the variance with respect to the setback at the rear of the property.

We will also need a variance with respect to 40255 Grand River. We will be back on that in January. The notice for this particular variance only included one address. So we'll have to come back.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you have any diagram or anything to show the public, please?

MR. COLUCCI: Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and present.

MR. COLUCCI: I do have as a part of the package we submitted, there's aerial photographs showing the location of the dumpster at the west -- the southwest corner of 40245 Grand River. We also have the survey recently done by Boss Engineering.

And in connection with site plan approval for
a veterinarian who wishes to move into 40245, we have prepared a cross easement that's been reviewed by both engineering and legal and it's approved by both engineering and legal as well as planning.

I'm not sure how to show you the --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You can put it on the -- yeah, projector.

MR. COLUCCI: Okay.
(Document displayed.)
MR. COLUCCI: This would be the location of the dumpster corral right here, the point of that arrow. The line running through the dumpster corral would indicate the property line. So it's about two and a half feet over the line.

The two buildings share the dumpster corral and have done so for many, many years. So 40255 is the building running perpendicular as such to Grand River and then 40245 is in this area here.

So the dumpster is located and shared by both buildings. That is a feature that the tenants and a potential purchaser would want to maintain.

This is a little bit more of a zoom version showing the dimensions of the encroachment as well as
the enclosure itself.

So for the reasons I've indicated, as well as the existing approvals of legal and engineering, we would request that the board grant the variance with respect to the setback and in January, the encroaching portion on 40255 .

I'm happy to address any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

## From the City?

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we concur with the applicant's presentation. They will be seeking a zero lot line variance for both properties. We're only doing the one tonight. The next meeting we'll do the second one because of advertisement purposes. And the variance will be for not only the enclosure walls of the dumpster, but also its foundation system in case it's, you know, a little more than that. But we have no comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
From the audience would like to speak on this, anything, before we can move?

Looks like none.
Okay. Correspondence, secretary?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Is that me?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any correspondence?
MEMBER KRIEGER: For this case, 40 were
mailed, three returned, zero objections, zero approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sounds good. Thank
you. Thank you so much.
Okay. Thank you so much for your
presentation and as my city also mentioned. And I'm open to the board to speak on this case.

And please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm going to have to recuse myself from this case. Mr. Colucci is my brother-in-law. And a very fine brother-in-law.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Excused. And please make a note.

Okay. Any other correspondence board -- I mean, board members would like to speak on this case?

Okay. Looks like none. And I have no
questions. And secretary -- Linda, can you make the motion on the first case?

MS. SHORTLEY: Good evening. Joellen Shortley from Rosati Schultz. If a member is abstaining from voting, $I$ believe your rules generally say that they do not sit at the dais while the vote is taking place.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please excuse -- you can step out for a few minutes.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And take rest.
Thank you, Attorney. Yeah, I agree with you.
Sometimes she also -- Linda --
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: -- I remember you did one time.
(Mr. Montague left the dais.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: I did have a question, though.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: For the dumpster, it's a shared dumpster. So if the veterinarian moves in, is it going to be office and then also biohazard or that's
just --
MR. COLUCCI: No. Sharps and biohazards are handled separately by the dental clinic. So they already deal with biohazards since there are dentists in 40255. And we would expect the same from the dentist. And that would be part of his approval process with the city is to determine that he's going to be not generating hazardous waste, which I believe is the representation made to the city already.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, okay. Very good. Thank you.

MR. COLUCCI: And there's two
dumpsters there, so one gets the left and the other gets the right. So ...

MEMBER KRIEGER: That helps too. Thank you. MR. COLUCCI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda. Please make a motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. For this case, PZ2 -CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can stand there, Attorney. Yeah, please. The case is completed, then you can step over.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For case number PZ23-0058
sought by the petitioner, I move to -- they have shown a practical difficulty requiring the variance and has shown through the testimony that they meet the request. Without it, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because it has been that way with the -- as he's explained with the green space and the location, the parking, and it's already been configured to handle both properties and each have their own -- each business has their separate dumpster and is enclosed properly.

And the property is unique because of this. And the petitioner did not create the condition because it was created that way.

And the relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it is between the two buildings and not interfere with neighboring businesses.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it works for the benefit of the area.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER McLEOD: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Roll call, please. MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member McLeod?

MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Thank you. Motion passes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Congratulations.
MEMBER KRIEGER: See you in January.
MR. COLUCCI: Thank you very much. We'll be back in January.
(Member Montague resumes the dais.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: PZ23-0059, Lithia
Motors Inc., 24315 Haggerty Road and 24355 Haggerty Road, south of Grand River Avenue, east of Haggerty Road, parcel 50-22-24-476-022. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi zoning ordinance Section 3.1.12.D for a reduction in required side yard parking setback to zero feet. A 10 feet
minimum, variance of 10 feet.
This variance will enable a proposed lot split in which existing parking lots will be divided between the new parcels. The property is zoned General Business, $B-3$.

Okay. Please spell your first and last name clearly for our court record for our secretary. If you are not an attorney, take the oath from our secretary, please. Go ahead.

MR. LONGHURST: Good evening. Jason
Longhurst. And it's J-a-s-o-n, $L-o-n-g-h-u-r-s-t$.
I'm with Nowak \& Fraus Engineers. We are here tonight continuing --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Are you an attorney?

MR. LONGHURST: I am not an attorney. I'm an engineer.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please, my secretary will take the oath on that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So in this case, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. LONGHURST: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
$\square$
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jason. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And then are -- is the other person -- are you going to be speaking as well?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If needed.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead where we can help you tonight, Jason. (Document displayed.)

MR. LONGHURST: Sure. So we are continuing to work with the redevelopment of this property here.

So the existing parcel is a little unique in that it's a single tax ID, but it has three separate dealership buildings created on it. Over the last probably 18 months, two years, we've been working with the city to redevelop the old Jaguar site just to the south, and then the frontage here will be the Porsche dealership, with the groundbreaking coming up in a week there.

The rear is going to be the Audi service center that will be tied to the redevelopment of the Jaguar site. And then the Infiniti dealer to the north is remaining as is.
What we are proposing to do as the next step
in this redevelopment is to split that single parcel into two different tax IDs, with the kind of the pink reddish line you see here being the proposed property line.

What we've found out as we've gone through the lot splits and in the process is that that proposed property line results in a parking setback requirement of 10 feet.

And we've got some existing landscape islands here along the south side of the Infiniti dealership that don't quite adhere to 10 feet. And then as we come along to the west property line here where we're bisecting an existing parking lot with the property line, we obviously don't have a 10 foot parking setback for that line there.

So we are asking for a variance to allow for a zero foot setback. Again, the zero feet being along the west line. And then we have greater greenbelt setback there where the existing landscape islands are in place in front of the Infiniti dealership.

With that, I think I'd be happy to answer any questions or go over any other details that you may want to dive into.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Thank you, Jason. Jason, this is the old Jaguar showroom, no? MR. LONGHURST: This is the property just north of the old Jaguar showroom.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MR. LONGHURST: Jaguar is this site right here to the south, so we're just one parcel north of there.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Now I understand. Okay.

Okay. From the City?
MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we concur with the applicant's presentation. This is being created for a lot split from an existing parking lot. So there would be a zero foot -- or a zero setback clearance for both properties. This was advertised as such for both properties were in the advertisement, so we can do both variances tonight. We have no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. I appreciate, Alan.

Okay. Correspondence, secretary?
MEMBER KRIEGER: For this case, 26 cases were
mailed, four returned, zero objections, zero approvals. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

Anybody in the audience to speak before our board members speaking?

Looks like none.
Okay. It's open to the board.
MEMBER McLEOD: Sure. I have a couple of questions just to understand the background. In this case even with the property split, will it be the same owner for both lots?

MR. LONGHURST: As far as this proposal, yes. In the future, I couldn't say.

MEMBER McLEOD: In the future it may not be. Okay. And then if $I$ understood the material correctly, if we were to enforce that split, the end result would be a loss of parking for both lots, correct?

MR. LONGHURST: Correct. Yeah. So basically
any way we looked at this, this split requires variances, whether it be for parking or for setbacks or either way. But with the -- kind of the site configuration, it's hard to see here, but we've drafted up a kind of parking layout that will work in honor of that property line. But if we were to adhere to
parking setbacks, then we're going to lose somewhere in the neighborhood of 20,25 spaces there.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. Personally, I think with a single driveway leading to three lots, it does make sense to keep the open parking. So that's where I'm leaning at the moment. Thank you.

MR. LONGHURST: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You said that it's the same tax ID, no?

MR. LONGHURST: Correct. There currently is one tax ID.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: One tax ID. Okay.
Okay. Any other board member, please?
MEMBER KRIEGER: So the split is just going to make it easier for tax purposes or the intention for the split?

MR. LONGHURST: Correct. Yeah. So the split will separate the Infiniti dealership from the two southern buildings. The proposed Porsche dealership and then the Audi service center.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. From the City, how is it going to be known, the tax exemption,
you know, kind of thing? Is it okay or how it works? MS. FLETCHER: That would be in assessing. MR. HALL: Yeah. That would be an assessing question. We can assess that when we do that. That's going to be -- I think the intention is to sell off the property. Am I correct? Eventually you'll sell off the property. I think that's the intention.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no. You need to come to the podium and tell your name so that way we can take --

MR. LONGHURST: I can answer for him, then. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MR. LONGHURST: Yes. The intent would be to sell the property.

MR. HALL: Yeah. So then that would be an assessing. They would do the tax IDs. And the assessing would tax on the different properties at that point -- when the split is approved.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. We don't need to do anything on this thing. MR. HALL: That's correct. That's correct.
 and their continuous uses is very similar.

[^0]| Page 22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| It's consistent with the spirit and intent in |  |  |  |  |  |
| the ordinance because it allows maximum use of the |  |  |  |  |  |
| property and actually the tax roll. |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And can you add the |  |  |  |  |  |
| tax purpose also say -- assessing department is going |  |  |  |  |  |
| to take it from there. Thank you. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER MONTAGUE: Uh-huh. |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Roll call, |  |  |  |  |  |
| please. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina? |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, make a -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| somebody can make a second, please. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER KRIEGER: Second. |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okay. Roll call. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina? |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, ma'am. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. FLETCHER: Member Krieger? |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. FLETCHER: Member Montague? |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. FLETCHER: Member Thompson? |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. |  |  |  |  |  |

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Thank you. Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations,
Jason. Good luck.
MR. LONGHURST: Thank you. Appreciate it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Case number
three for today. PZ23-0060, BLM Group, 46850 Cartier Drive, south of Pontiac Trail, east of Beck Road, parcel 50-22-04-151-036. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.14.5.C to increase the maximum building height to 36 feet eight inches, a maximum of 25 feet, a variance of 11 feet eight inches.

Section 3.1.18.D to reduce the front yard setback to 18 feet at the southeast corner. Minimum of 40 feet, a variance of 32 feet. This property is zoned Light industrial, L-1.

Okay. Please go ahead and spell your first and last name clearly for our secretary.

MR. JONES: My name is Glenn, G-l-e-n-n, Jones, J-o-n-e-s.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?

MR. JONES: No, I'm not. I'm director of operations with Dembs Development and I'm not an attorney.

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

MR. JONES: Yes, I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
COURT REPORTER: What kind of development?
What's the name of the development?
MR. JONES: Dembs, $D-e-m-b-s, ~ D e v e l o p m e n t . ~$
COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Glenn, please go ahead and proceed where we can help you tonight in this case.

MR. JONES: Yeah. Like you had just mentioned, we're her for two variances on the height restriction, as well as the front yard setback.

The building was originally constructed as a speculative (phonetic) building back in 2014. When we built the building in 2014, we went before Zoning Board of Appeals and were granted a height variance on the building. The building was constructed to the variant height.

We got a tenant in 2017, which is BLM USA. And they went back for another height restriction variance to increase the building height again to the 36 foot height what we're looking for today.

The reason that we need it on the building addition is the building itself has a 20 ton craneway constructed within the existing facility. Within the new addition to the building, the 20 ton craneway is going to have to traverse between the two buildings to make the facility contiguous of one operation with the new addition.

In addition to that, the front yard setback is somewhat in conjunction with the craneway traversing through the new addition. We tried to maximize the size of the building for BLM to give them the most sizeable addition that they could get within working within conjunction of the -- and I'll show you on the -- it was in the packet that we had submitted.
(Document displayed.)
MR. JONES: But if you look at the cul-de-sac and the configuration of the corner of the building, it kind of hindered us in our development in trying to lay the building out and make it conducive to running their

20 ton craneway from one end of the existing facility all the way into the new facility. Hence the request for the front yard setback.

So with that said, I'd be happy to answer any other questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Glenn. I appreciate for your presentation.

And let me ask from the City.
MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, he is asking for two variances, a height variance and 32 front yard setback, which is 80 percent of the setback, which does put the corner of the building rather close to the road. But there is a cul-de-sac there which reduces the speeds of the cars so it does seem feasible that we could -- you could approve that. And the height variance does -- is in keeping with the rendering which shows it is keeping with the building so it's not out of scale. So we have no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before that, can you show the diagram one more time, Glenn?
(Document displayed.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: That's the corner one you're talking about --
$\square$
MR. JONES: Yeah. That's the corner right there.

MR. HALL: Yes. Yes, yes.
MR. JONES: We didn't really feel that it was going to be an impact to anybody else on down the road just 'cause it is a cul-de-sac configuration. It's going to remain a cul-de-sac. So we felt that it wouldn't have any impact on any other further businesses on down the road.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Secretary, any correspondence?
MEMBER KRIEGER: In this case, 19 were mailed, zero returned, zero objections, zero approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any public comments on this case?
Looks like none.
Okay. And as long as my city has said, you know, the cul-de-sac thing, the -- you know, any -- is there any objections? Without any objections, it's a good thing. And I'm open to the board to speak on this case.

Yeah. Anybody?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Two questions.
$\square$ CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MEMBER KRIEGER: One for the city. Is that a house that's behind this area? Cause I notice there's the apartments when I was looking at MapQuest to see how to get there. And then there's like a building with a drive and I actually went through the back of the apartments to see and --

MR. JONES: It's a pumping station.
MEMBER KRIEGER: It's a pumping. Okay. So there's no residential.

MR. JONES: It's city -- I think it's city owned.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Very good.
Yeah. There was a gate so I couldn't get through.
MS. SHORTLEY: There's a little line.
MR. HALL: Yeah, that's right.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And the second one, are you going to have like a barrier at the cul-de-sac if a semi comes around that they don't hit that corner?

Do you anticipate any of that?
MR. JONES: We've done all the turning radiuses with our civil engineer and we didn't see any
conflicts with any semis coming through the cul-de-sac, so we didn't anticipate any.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. There was one going
through there today when I was over there and it was doing fine.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. JONES: It's an extremely large cul-de-sac.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before that for the City, does he has to take any association permission, homeowner association?

MR. HALL: No, I don't think so.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please go ahead. Any other board member would like to speak? MEMBER McLEOD: Yeah. One clarification question. In your presentation I missed, was the proposed addition the same height as the existing building?

MR. JONES: Correct.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other board member?

Okay. Looks like none. Okay. Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. I move that we grant the variance in case PZ23-0060 sought by BLM for a height and front yard variance because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring this building addition. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because the building right next door is the same height.

The property is unique because it has a craneway and is at the end of a cul-de-sac in an industrial park. The petitioner did not create the condition because they're trying to have a building equal height to the one next door.

The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. Adjacent to the one next door, it's the same one. And it's in an industrial park so it's actually going to match really well.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance and promotes business development in the City of Novi.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
 in case number PZ98-0070 to be transferred from the
petitioner to the property. This variance was granted for the petitioner at that time to utilize the existing barn as an antique shop in a $R-A$ zoned district, and was specifically intended for the previous petitioner only, and only for the use described at that time. The property is zoned Residential Acreage, R-A.

Okay. Please spell your first and last name clearly for our secretary.

MR. TEUBERT: My first name is Douglas, D-o-u-g-l-a-s. And my last name is $T$ as in Tom, E as in Edward, U, B as in boy, E as in Edward, R, $T$ as in Tom.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. TEUBERT: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. TEUBERT: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Mr. Douglas, please proceed with the case where we can help you tonight.

MR. TEUBERT: Okay. So the barn antiques is the old Maybury -- or Meyer berry farm and we own the
farmstead. It's two acres. And Grandma Meyer ran an antique shop out of that barn a long time ago, probably 30 years ago. And then Elvy's restored the barn. It's all Ponderosa pine. I mean, you could live in it if you wanted to.

And so we requested a variance when we bought the property from the Elvy's, but the variance is specific to our name. And so what we're asking is that the variance be specific to the property address and not to our name.

We are having discussions with Living and Learning. Are you all familiar with Living and Learning?

Living and Learning is for kids on the autistic spectrum. It's the old Massey Cadillac building. And the founder of Living and Learning had a child on the autistic spectrum, but he was older and there's nothing for older kids. So she started this, I think it was probably maybe three years ago. And so we're in conversations with Living and Learning coming into the barn. Nothing would really change as far as, you know, we're selling antiques. They would do the same thing.
$\square$

And so we had conversations with the city before and the suggestion was to come before you and present to have the variance specific to the property.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. What kind of antiques are you selling?

MR. TEUBERT: What kind of antiques? You know, it's mostly primitive. It's not high-end. You know, like $\$ 5,000$ for a hutch or something like that. Vintage. You have to come through and see.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I've been through there.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Douglas, any other you would like to add or anything?

MR. TEUBERT: (Nods.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. From the City?

MS. SHORTLEY: Just wanted to point out that what they're really requesting is a use variance and they want it to run with the land. So this is a very high standard that requires you to find exceptional circumstances for that. Currently they are able to make use of the property with the permission given to the owners themselves. So I'm not clear why they would
not, you know, need this to run with the land. But if you are interested in that, then you need to go through the standards for use variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. From the City?

MR. HALL: And I just want to add another comment. So he's -- or they're suggesting that they're going to have -- selling antiques. And that's only the sale of antiques, which may have some help with the sales of those antiques, is that correct, that's why you're mentioning the organization?

MR. TEUBERT: Yeah. Living and Learning, what they're doing is they're training these children so that they can have a vocation, you know, when they are of age. And there's no help for these kids now. It's -- all the help is directed at the younger ages. And so that would be a wonderful legacy to have, a place like that in Novi that's helping kids.

The use of the building isn't going to change at all. It's -- they would have -- and they do have children that -- young adults that, like, manage the counter, do the cash register, things like that.

MR. HALL: Okay. Yeah. And that's fine.

Our planning department wanted to mention that if you're going to do anything beyond the scope of what you're doing now, so living quarters, if you're going to have any kind of classroom settings, you know, kitchenettes, that kind of stuff, that would have to go through a planning department. That would be a different approval. I'm being exaggerating because you haven't said this. I'm just trying to be over the top.

MR. TEUBERT: No. I understand. From our conversations that we had with you before, nothing's going to change. It's just going to be somebody else doing it. That's the bottom line.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Attorney, do we need to take any other precaution on this case?

MS. SHORTLEY: Only that if you are interested in proceeding as granting a use variance, that you go through all of those standards.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. And our city manager mentioned that if there's any planning, any necessary to take on that.

MR. HALL: If they go beyond the scope of what they're asking for.

The commercial uses are prohibited in the district where they're at right now. So they're being granted -- they've already been granted variance to do this kind of activity there. If the activity expands, that would be the issue.

So that was, well, now we have to go to planning because now we've got a parking, handicap type situations and that kind of stuff so it would be more to it than just selling of antiques, which they're doing now. They're not saying they're doing that. We're just making that clear of what we're trying to approve tonight, if that make sense.

MR. TEUBERT: And that's the way I understood it.

MR. HALL. Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. All right. And he mentioned high-end or something mentioned at the beginning so $I$ was on the caution on that.

MR. HALL: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Public, anybody -- any comments on the public on this case?

Okay. Secretary, any correspondence?
MEMBER KRIEGER: For this case, 17 were
mailed, two returned, zero objections, zero approvals.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Linda.

And any other board member would like to speak on this? Okay.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: So you're saying that with this new group operating it, they can still operate now with what they're doing?

MR. HALL: Yeah. Right now it's -- the variance is for the individual and they want to transfer it to the property. And so we're saying that you can approve that, but you can't expand the activities. If we expand the activities, it becomes a planning issue and there's more to it than just a simple --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: No. What I'm asking is, this new group that he wants to have help sale --

MR. HALL: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: -- they would be able to do it with the variance they have now, correct?

MR. HALL: I believe so because it's under his name.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: It would not preclude them
so there's not really a hardship of not being able to do or help this group which is very admirable --

MR. PEJANOVIC: Can I --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: One second. Let me finish my board member.

Member Montague, please continue.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. So, I mean, it's very admirable. So if it's not restricted there, I don't think a blank check to whomever might come in there is something that $I$ would support.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Montague, are you done?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Yeah. Please come to the podium and spell your first and last name clearly.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Sure. It's Deni Pejanovic, P-e-j-a-n-o-v-i-c. First name D-e-n-i.

COURT REPORTER: Spell the last name one more time.

MR. PEJANOVIC: $P$ as in Peter, E-j-a-n-o-v-i-c. I live in Maybury Park adjacent to the barn. I've known Doug for over 10 years that I've
lived there.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?

MR. PEJANOVIC: No.

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

MR. PEJANOVIC: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
MR. PEJANOVIC: I do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. PEJANOVIC: What we're doing is we're exploring some options for that barn to work with that Living and Learning Center, and that may require a transfer at some point. And anytime there's a transfer, we're going to have to appear before this board and keep going through this process. I think this is the third time that this has been a name transfer. And for the sake of not doing this over and over, we want to move it to the property. That's the reason for the request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You mean the transfer, you are doing any -- within the period of, do you have any intention or any thought of transferring?

MR. PEJANOVIC: That is the hope is that we
want to transfer and be able to utilize it for that purpose that it's utilized today with no changes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board member would like to speak?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like none.
Linda?
MEMBER KRIEGER: For the kids that come in there, they were already there doing that?

MR. TEUBERT: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Then would they be bussed in or how does that work?

MR. PEJANOVIC: The transportation?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MR. PEJANOVIC: We haven't worked out all the
details. The only request that we have is that it can continue to be used for the purpose it's used today with no changes. As far as the transportation, I honestly don't know if they're transported by a parent or guardian today --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. PEJANOVIC: -- and they would be dropped off.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then the Living and
Learning, do they want a sign then? Because then you would have to come back for that.

MR. PEJANOVIC: I didn't understand the question. Do they want a sign in?

MEMBER KRIEGER: The Living and Learning -MR. TEUBERT: A sign out front.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Living and Learning --
MR. PEJANOVIC: Oh, a sign.
MEMBER KRIEGER: -- is the group so you want to advertise that --

MR. PEJANOVIC: I'm not aware that they would require any signage. And if they did, I would assume they'd have to come back before this --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right.
MR. PEJANOVIC: -- committee to ask for that.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
MR. TEUBERT: Right now, just to clarify, there's nobody from Living and Learning works there or is being trained or anything like that.

We're having conversations to bring kids in to give them the proper training so that they can get a vocation and, you know.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, which is great.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Good. As my board member said, you know, the reason of the board sign. And you mentioned Living and Learning in the beginning and you explain what is Living and Learning, autism big kids. That's why we're concerned about the sign board. That's all. Okay.

MEMBER McLEOD: Sorry. Some more questions here. This is for my background. I don't have much background on this place. But can you remind me, how many years has this barn been operating as an antique shop?

MR. TEUBERT: We bought it around 1998. The Elvy's were there probably for five years before that. So that goes back to 1993. And Grandma Meyer -- I don't know really know when she went in. When she was selling antiques, there was a dirt floor. So that goes back quite a ways. So I would say, you know, 40 years we have been doing relatively the same thing.

MEMBER McLEOD: So roughly there's two generations of people who grew up seeing this barn as an antique store in Novi. How old is this barn again?

MR. TEUBERT: It was built in 1910. It
burned down in 1910 and they rebuilt it in 1910.
MEMBER McLEOD: Okay.
MR. PEJANOVIC: Originally it's --
MR. TEUBERT: Originally.
MR. PEJANOVIC: -- 1850, isn't it?
MR. TEUBERT: Well, the original farmstead
goes back to -- the house goes back to 1850, about.
It was actually -- there's an abstract. It was granted before Michigan was even a state, the property was. And then the Meyers, like I said, they turned it into the Meyer berry farm. Had to sell off the farm part but left the farmstead. There's a picker's house, a migrant's house. There's the barn itself. Then there's the old -- the house that they lived in and there's a garage with a -- like a tool barn there.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. So if I understood correctly, the barn is effectively older than the state of Michigan, and I believe rebuilt in the early 1900's. It's been selling antiques for at least two generations. And because of the length of time, you and your family has been coming in to update the permission to continue selling in a residentially zoned
area, despite the fact that you're older -- the place itself is older than the state of Michigan.

I -- at least personally, I think with that type of background -- and let me ask this -- one more question. Sorry. What would happen if -- I'm assuming you're the owner. It's in your name today. What if you were to be hit by a bus tomorrow and disappear, what would happen?

MR. TEUBERT: Well, hopefully my wife would -- so my wife and I own -- well, actually my daughter's name is on the deed, too. So there's three of us that are on the deed. But it would be provided for through the trust.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. But I guess from the city, would the -- does the approval go down the familial chain in that way?

MR. HALL: Yes. It would be the owners of the property. And so if they got new owners, then they would have to come forward today or again for this kind of use variance.

MEMBER McLEOD: So in this example, his daughter would need to come in for a variance?

MR. HALL: Yes. If it's -- well, if she
doesn't have the same name. So it there's a different name, then there would have to be -- it would be a petitioner for it, yes.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay.
MR. HALL: So that's why they're trying to transfer it to the land to avoid that, you know, kind of, you know, approval process.

And we're just clarifying the fact that the -- you know, that the activities don't -- aren't changed. And having someone being trained to sell, whether it be a high school student or a person of this organization, that's in -- well within the caliber of what would be done with selling antiques, just that there might -- that may expand those activities and that's where the warning comes in it becomes a commercial property at that point.

MEMBER McLEOD: Yeah. It makes sense to me. I think -- at least from my perspective, given the scope of the discussion we've had, I think it makes sense to do that, to transfer it to the property, keeping the scope of activities the same as been agreed to for the last 40 years. That said, those are my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Member McLeod.

Any other board member? Oh, Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Hey, guys. Totally support what you're doing. In fact, the old Massey house, they had to come in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals to get some approvals from us so they could operate. Right?

MR. TEUBERT: Right.
MEMBER THOMPSON: But you're able to operate now doing this, correct?

MR. TEUBERT: We've been doing it for over 20 years.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Getting the help from that organization?

MR. TEUBERT: No. We haven't gotten any help from that organization. And we go out and hire our own people now.

MR. PEJANOVIC: So this is -- we're in discussion with them. Nothing is solidified.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. PEJANOVIC: So our -- it's, you know, what they've proposed to us that they want to do. It
looks like they could work in the antique barn without coming before this board again --

MEMBER THOMPSON: Right.
MR. PEJANOVIC: -- but I don't know. Without this process, those conversations end. We need this to kind of move forward with them to take the next step to say is there any other variances that are going to be required as far as use, which we know the bar is very high, or are we able to train and work and run the counters and sell antiques and have no changes whatsoever. And we're hoping that's the case.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So I guess what I'm struggling with on trying to approve it, and maybe you could help me get off that, is if it was not approved, okay, and it just had to stay with your name, if there was a property ownership change, the new property owner would have to reapply. And I would assume if it was for the same type use it would go through with no problem. I guess I'm not seeing the --

MR. TEUBERT: Unless the new owner didn't want to sell antiques, I guess.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Right. Which is why from my side, you know, to try and help the city keep the
property in a certain way is if we did not approve it and the new owner decided to do a different type of business.

MR. PEJANOVIC: You can't do a business.
It's in an R-A district. I don't think that's -- it would sell to a developer and put another house there or two or three.

MR. TEUBERT: The only thing that property can be used for is what it's been used for for the last 40 years. It can't be used for anything else. The variance is to my wife and my name now. We just want to change it to the property.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. So we're not asking for any sort of zoning change or property change. Just so it's out of your name to the property and the only thing the property can be used for is to sell antiques or --

MR. TEUBERT: That's the way it's always been. It's never been approved to sell anything but antiques.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. Just -- okay. Just worry that that's a big term. Antique cars, antique stuff.


MR. TEUBERT: We -- I don't think you could get an antique car in the doors. I don't know. I don't think so.

MEMBER THOMPSON: No, but it could get on the lot.

MR. PEJANOVIC: But nothing is changed as far as what's previous. That's how it was designated. It's just a change from the name to the property.

I don't think there's a request for any change of use today.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Right, right.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Tomorrow --

MEMBER THOMPSON: I would just be worried
that 20 years down the line the next property owner or 50 years or 200 years, whatever the number. Right? They would -- is that kind of where you were going also?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Well -- yeah. I'm not seeing a hardship. I mean, you can do what you need to do right now with this other group. So there is no extreme hardship and that's what's required is a hardship to make this variance. And I just don't see it. I'm sorry.

MR. PEJANOVIC: So every time the property would change hands you would have to --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm okay with that. That's
fine. The new people come in and they ask for the variance and it is what it is. And it probably will go through. Yeah. I don't have a problem with that at all. That way every person -- if you change the property --

MR. PEJANOVIC: Can you ask --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: -- and they want to keep doing it, then they will come in here and verify that they're going to keep that property doing what it's doing. I would have no problem with that.

I don't see you having a particular hardship right now with it.

MR. TEUBERT: Well, the hardship for my wife and I personally is if we ever wanted to retire, then nobody could use -- I guess I would have to find a buyer which would be extremely hard to do that wants to sell antiques.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: And unfortunately, economic issues are not a reason for a variance. That's just the nature of the beast, so.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Can you ask for a variance before the property transfers?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: The person that's buying it --

MR. PEJANOVIC: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: -- I suppose could come in and ask for it.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Well, that -- I think that's what's happening is because we want to transfer the property so we can use it for that purpose. And unless we get the approval that that can continue, then they're not able to retire and necessarily sell the property.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: You're changing the whole argument here. That's not what you're asking for.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Deni, what is the role in this business --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: This is --
MR. PEJANOVIC: At some point $I$ think Doug and his wife want to retire and we want to use that property for this purpose and we can't have conversations with them because it's tied to his name and there's a big question mark whether we can continue

```
to do it.
```

Does that make sense?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You said you --

MR. PEJANOVIC: So how can I -- if we were to -- you know, if he wants to retire, how does anybody approach you to make that suggestion if we're not -- if nobody else is the property owner but him?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: The way it's been done before, they come in and --

MR. PEJANOVIC: You purchase the property first and then you find out if you can continue the business or not?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: No. You come in beforehand.

MR. PEJANOVIC: That's why we're here today.
MR. TEUBERT: Even if you don't own --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: But you're not -- you're not in there saying you're going to sell it. I mean, then tell us the true story. You're in here -- that's not -- I mean, you're going -- you're trying to sell it to somebody? I mean, that's not part of the hardship you presented. You haven't presented a hardship at all.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I asked the question also, are you transferring right now and the question -- in the beginning also I asked are you transferring anything right now, you said no.

MR. PEJANOVIC: We're not transferring it right now.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Because
my --
MR. PEJANOVIC: But this is something that we want to do. Probably sometime next year. We don't know the exact timing.

But he wants to retire and we would like to see that property continue to be used in such a fashion.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So for me, I would say we have -- I would have no problem granting the variance to the next owner, okay, for the same purpose. And, yeah, this is what we're doing and the next owner is going to do the same thing. I would be okay with that. I just struggle with putting it on just the property not knowing the future of it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Could you give us some advice on timing then, when we would appear? Would it be before, after? Like, at what point do we ask for that variance to be transferred if there was a transfer in ownership?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question. The use -- you're here for a use to continue the use as long as the barn is still in existence to -- or would you replace the barn?

MR. PEJANOVIC: No. Nothing gets changed.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So if this barn was to crumble down and fall one day, then that would be the end of it?

MR. PEJANOVIC: I don't know. I don't know if $I$ can answer your question.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then the next one is, so if you're retiring, continuing the use. So you would still own the land and then this group comes in and uses it?

MR. TEUBERT: No. I need to sell it if I'm going to retire.

And then Living and Learning has been in six or seven times thinking about purchasing it, but
they're not going to purchase it because the variance is specific to my name and they would have no assurance that they would get the variance if they came back once they owned it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So they want you to come and get the variance and they get the property and continue with the same use?

MR. TEUBERT: Well, there's -- that's part of the conversation that we're having.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Then maybe they need to be here with you to say that they're going to buy the property because you're telling us they may buy the property, they may not.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Clift, that's where I come in that I would purchase the property and work with them so they can use it. I would be the owner and they would be the tenants. Does that make sense?

They don't have the financing lined up to do it right now so that's where the community people like myself come forward and would help them do this.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: So then you would ask for the variance.

MEMBER McLEOD: So if I could say --
MR. PEJANOVIC: I don't own the property.
That's my whole point of --
MEMBER THOMPSON: I've been through this as a small business owner on other stuff.

MR. PEJANOVIC: Chicken and egg. I, you purchase the property and then come here and say you can't do it. That --

MEMBER McLEOD: So from my perspective, this place has been selling antiques longer than I've been alive effectively. The concept of antiques being sold at this barn $I$ don't think needs to be tied to a single individual. I think it's just as readily in everyone's mind tied to the property. Functionally, the result is the same. And I'm not sure I see why there's a --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I disagree.
MEMBER McLEOD: -- tied to the name to that.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: A person is making a commitment. It is the property owner that's making a commitment to do this business. So I totally disagree that you're just saying, okay, so it's going to be a -is it going to be any easier for him to sell an -- that is an antique store. And so no. I want the person
that's going to operate the business to come in and say this is what I'm going to do.

MEMBER McLEOD: The other concern I have is given I'll say the historic nature of the barn. I don't know what the rules of Novi are for historical buildings. But I think the barn could almost count as one. And if the next owner comes in and for whatever reason by a future board they're not approved to maintain the business, it just becomes another condo or another house or we're going to lose a part of Novi history. And I don't know if that's the direction or a risk that we'd want to take.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: No, that's valid, but they need to come in -- if they've got plan to turn this over, then we need to know that plan. It's not -- you don't just set something out there on the if they come that somebody is going to buy it and want to be the -an antique dealer. That's not right either.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MR. TEUBERT: We have that lined up.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member
Montague and Member McLeod, thank you, both of you.
And you guys want to come when the transfer
is -- do you want to recome -- reapply and -- you want to come for the -- what exactly or do you want to go for our decision tonight?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I don't want to deny that. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Just I'm asking, not deny. Tonight.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Tonight I'm asking. MR. PEJANOVIC: So just could you rephrase that? You want to know whether we want to come back at another point?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MR. PEJANOVIC: But, again, I don't know what -- when would be the appropriate time; before we're in a contract, after we're in a contract? Like, that's where I don't know when would be the right time to come forward. Because without this information, our conversations with Living and Learning to do this, I'm not sure where we are with them.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So through the attorney,
when would be a good time?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. That's what

I want.
MS. SHORTLEY: So it sounds like to me that you're looking for perhaps Living and Learning coming and saying this is what we're intending to do and them to be a little further along in their discussions on maybe a draft of an agreement, something. You're not saying that it has to all be sold and done before you approve it, but you want to hear with more certainty that this arrangement is really going to take place. So perhaps if you could bring Living and Learning and maybe you're closer in a written agreement of what that would look like. It sounds like there's some willingness -- more willingness that way than now because they're having difficulty seeing what your hardship is. But they would feel more comfortable when there's a more solidified arrangement to potentially approve letting the next owner with use of Living and Learning have that ability to continue selling the antiques.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I really appreciate that, Attorney. Thank you so much.

Okay. You guys decide your plan.
MR. PEJANOVIC: We'll adjourn and come back.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So what -- do we have to do that like in the next month or how do we do that? MS. SHORTLEY: You could either make a motion to table this or do you want to pass it to a date certain?

Do you have an idea when you might want to come back?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda --

MS. SHORTLEY: It sounds like you don't know when you would be ready to come back.

MR. PEJANOVIC: There's a third-party we need to discuss this with --

MS. SHORTLEY: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda --
MS. SHORTLEY: I think you want to just table for right now until --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Table it until when --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, we table it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: -- January --
MS. SHORTLEY: Until you --

MEMBER KRIEGER: You want January, February?
MR. PEJANOVIC: Can we get back to you. I don't know without speaking with them.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Let them decide what the case. Okay.

MEMBER McLEOD: What, you put a limit on it or it has to be within so many months?

MS. SHORTLEY: I mean, you could ask that they come back within a certain number of months or you can just --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I --

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have to do that.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I recommend --

MEMBER THOMPSON: Can we give them a high
number -- is there a high number of months we can give them? I guess if this takes a while. We're trying to help you.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. Absolutely.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. They need --
MS. SHORTLEY: You could pass it until your April meeting, something like that.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: We want to help --
MS. SHORTLEY: Can you be --

MEMBER KRIEGER: April? Spring?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Spring is good. You can think on that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: April. See you in April.
April 2024. I move that we table this case until 2024 of April.

MR. TEUBERT: What if we can get Living and Learning to come in before that?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Sure. Bring them in.
MEMBER KRIEGER: That's fine.
MS. SHORTLEY: Well, okay. So first, I think you want to not table it 'cause then you have to have a motion to take it off the table.

So pass it to -- is there a meeting before April that you think you'll be ready? Do you want them to wait till March, till February?

MR. PEJANOVIC: I don't know without speaking to them. I --

MR. TEUBERT: And we would have -- yeah. We would have to talk to them -- well, what would happen, if we moved it to the January and if we couldn't do it, if they're not ready in January, we did it another month down the road or two months down the road or
whatever?
MS. SHORTLEY: Do you have a limit on the number of times that someone can keep deferring a case?

MR. HALL: It's supposed to be three.
MS. SHORTLEY: Yes. So they have a limit of three times that a case can be deferred so you might not want to do January if you aren't ready yet. Because then they could defer it another time, but they can't keep continuing deferring it if you aren't ready. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Douglas and Deni, we are telling you to try to help you. Better you take a chance for March. You have January and February. That's my advice.

MR. PEJANOVIC: I appreciate it. I know Doug has also a timeline and I want to be respectful of that. Him and his wife has some plans.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: So my attorney has already mentioned you three times. That's how it is.

Okay. And, Linda, please go ahead and --
MEMBER KRIEGER: What?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: -- table this.

MEMBER KRIEGER: To when?

MS. SHORTLEY: Are you passing it -- a motion
to pass it until your March meeting, is that what you're doing?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. SHORTLEY: Okay. Then it's not table. It's a motion to move this item until the March meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I move this item until the March meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Somebody can make a second.

MR. TEUBERT: I think if when we talk to Living and Learning, they're going to know what they can or can't do right away.

Funding, you know, for those kind of facilities is not easy. And so they're needing to come up with the funding. Deni was good enough to intervene and was willing to do the funding and then negotiate -you know, talk with Living and Learning and have Living and Learning at some point after that come in and do, you know, what they're going to do. So ...

MS. SHORTLEY: Could I just ask for clarification?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Sure.
MS. SHORTLEY: So are -- you're saying you're not able to really commit to a specific next meeting, is that what you're saying? Or you're saying March is too far out? I'm just --

MR. TEUBERT: Well, I think we're going to know when we talk to Living and Learning how far out they need to go. As far as them committing, you know, like I said before, they've been in the barn six or seven times. They all love it. They all want it. But funding is another thing. So you have to be practical about that.

And that's where Deni comes in. Where Deni would be willing to purchase the property and negotiation with Living and Learning. But we thought it would be easier if we had a variance to the property and not to the name.

It just seems to me like that would make it easier on you guys, on us, on everybody to have the variance to the property and not the name.

MS. SHORTLEY: So if I may, I think some of the members are saying they're having difficulty finding the standards to be able to do it that way. So
as an option because they're trying to be helpful, they're saying perhaps you can get things arranged with Living and Learning and this potential purchaser and then come back and do it for the new owner.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: We are giving an opportunity to you guys. So you decide and we are planning to go to March and you are thinking that way and I know your difficulty or whatever, and we want to table this case and continue on this in March 2024.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Otherwise it will get denied today.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Do you want to go to motion? It's up to you guys.

MR. TEUBERT: Yeah. I think I'd like to shoot for January.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Linda, can you --
MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to defer case number PZ23-0061, I move to defer the case until the January 2024 meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER McLEOD: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. MS. FLETCHER: Member Montague? MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Thank you. Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please
prepare and come back in January. Thank you so much.
MR. TEUBERT: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Today's final case
tonight, PZ23-0063, Life Construction, 24312 Kings
Pointe Drive, north of Ten Mile Road, west of
Meadowbrook, parcel 50-22-23-476-015. The applicant is
requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning
Ordinance Section 3.1 .5 for a side yard setback of 8.25
feet 8.25 feet. 10 feet required, a variance of 1.75
feet. This property is zoned One-Family Residential,
$R-4$.

Okay. Please tell your first and last name clearly for our secretary.

MR. FLEMING: Sure. Matt Fleming. I'm a project manager with Life Construction and Design. My name is $M-a-t-t, F-l-e-m-i-n-g$.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Are you an attorney?

MR. FLEMING: Not an attorney.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. FLEMING: I do.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and proceed where we can help you tonight?

MR. FLEMING: Yeah. So we're contracted by the Myers family to put a 250 square foot addition on the north side of their property. In the process of getting a site survey, we found out because there's a lagoon on the back side, we needed a silt fence. We found that we were too close to the adjacent building on the east side.
(Document displayed.)

MR. FLEMING: You can see it there.
And it creates a significant hardship because the addition lies -- you can see it there -- right next to the kitchen. A significant cost to redesign. If we were to move it 1.75 feet to the west, it would require that we redesign the kitchen.

The current building isn't technically in compliance because it's within 8.25 feet of the east property. And so we're asking for a variance to add this addition. We sought support from the homeowners association and both neighbors to the east and west side of the property and both were in support. So we're here to request a variance of 1.75 feet. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

Any other -- anybody in the audience to speak on this case?

Okay. Looks like none.
From the City?
MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, yeah, he's asking for a side yard variance for the addition and a deck, I believe.

Is there a deck being added to it?
MR. FLEMING: A small deck that would be on the back side of the addition. That is correct.

MR. HALL: So it would be both the deck and the addition. It looks to be in line with the existing house so it will in the end would look appropriate. We have no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Secretary?

MEMBER KRIEGER: 34 were mailed in this case, one returned, zero objections, three approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: So we have approval.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Linda. I appreciate.

Okay. Yeah. Thank you so much for your thing. And do you have homeowners approve this one?

MR. FLEMING: The homeowners?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, no. Homeowner association.

MR. FLEMING: Yes. Yeah. We got support from the homeowners association.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

MR. FLEMING: The letters were in the packet we sent.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you so much. I have no more questions.

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

Okay. Looks like none.
Okay, Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I move that we grant the variance in case PZ23-0063 sought by Life Construction for the setback variance because the petitioner has shown difficulty requiring building the addition in the envelope.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because you're saying that the addition is going to line up down the length of the house.

The property is unique because it was a foot and a half over the setback already and we're just trying to keep everything in line. The petitioner did not create the condition because the house had previously been built.

The relief granted would not unreasonably
interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because the house is going to be lined up in a flat way and the neighbors agreed with it, as well as the subdivision association.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance to keep the house aesthetically pleasing for everyone in the subdivision and the setting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody can make a second, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Roll call, please.

MS. FLETCHER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. FLETCHER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. FLETCHER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. FLETCHER: Thank you. Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
Thank you so much.
MR. FLEMING: Thanks everyone.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other matters?
Okay. I wish you a happy holidays and Happy
New Year to everybody. And before we adjourn, say
"aye" in favor.
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays? No.
Motion. Thank you. Good night.
(8:10 p.m.)
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