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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's seven o'clock and now it's time to call for order. And Pledge of Allegiance by -- let's move on to Montague.

Member Montague?
(No response.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Pledge.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm sorry.
(The Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Montague.

And roll call. Katherine, can you please roll call?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes, of course.
Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Malott is absent, excused.

Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Here. Novi, Oakland
County.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, yeah. I forgot.
MS. OPPERMANN: Let me go back and we'll do that again.

Thank you for remembering. MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you, Mav. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thanks, Mav.

MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Peddiboyina, once more?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. This is Joe Peddiboyina, Novi, Michigan, Oakland County. MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. Member Krieger? MEMBER KRIEGER: Linda Krieger, Novi, Michigan, Oakland County. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Malott is absent, excused.

Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Clift Montague, Oakland County, Novi, Michigan.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
 inclined to move items.

| Page 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I'l |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beth, once the approval. Do you want me to do it |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| before the approval of agenda? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. SAARELA: Yeah. If someone is proposing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| to move one of the items to a different position, you |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| can discuss it now and then approve the agenda with |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| changes. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. That's true |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okay. The case number, third one, they're |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| requesting $\mathrm{P} Z 21-0025$ (sic) to move to first today. I |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean, they want to have some other appointment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| scheduled prior to that. So is it okay? For all the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zoning Board members, if you can say "Aye" to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| everything, then $I$ can go to approval of agenda. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEMBER SANGHVI: No problem. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS. SAARELA: You can do this as voice vote, |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| just all in favor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. All in favor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| say "Aye." |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE BOARD: Aye. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (No response.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

            (No response.)
    MEMBER KRIEGER: No, 25.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No, 25. Katherine, 25.

MS. OPPERMANN: Why would we move 25 up?
MEMBER KRIEGER: That's the request.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You sent an E-mail for the request for the ...

MS. OPPERMANN: The request was for the Yono's case.

MEMBER KRIEGER: What?
MS. OPPERMANN: The request to move the case up, it came from Maria Tilmos, a neighbor. And it's regarding Mr. Yono's case, which is PZ21-0026 for 1401 East Lake Drive. That's the case that they requested to be moved to the first.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, that is the fourth case for today?

MS. OPPERMANN: Correct, yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Okay. Then
I can take back. And we can move to the PZ21-0026 to
move for the first case for today and the PZ21-0022 is moving the case to fourth. Is everything okay and say "Aye" everybody.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Aye.
THE BOARD: Aye.
MS. OPPERMANN: And I did also want to
confirm for anyone watching, that case PZ21-0022 for Dan and Wendi Williams, 1419 West Lake Drive, was originally slated to be at this evening's meeting, but has been postponed at the applicant's request to the next meeting, July 13th, 2021.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, there's no moving to the fourth. Then it is going to the July. Okay.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I get you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Approval of agenda?
MEMBER SANGHVI: So moved.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Minutes of meetings for May?
MEMBER KRIEGER: April.


Okay. Start the case number PZ21-0026, Joseph Yono, 1401 East Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and south of 14 Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-329-027. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 for a 20.25 foot front yard setback, 30 feet required, a variance of 9.75 feet; an 11.75 foot rear yard setback, 35 foot required, a variance of 23.25 feet; a side yard setback of eight feet, 10 feet required, a variance of two feet; an exterior yard setback of 11.08 feet, 30 feet required, a variance of 18.92 feet; an aggregate total side yard setback of 19.08 feet, 40 feet required, a variance of 20.92 feet.

And a proposed lot coverage of 38.16 percent, 25 percent maximum allowed, a variance of 13.16 percent. These variances would accommodate the building of a new home. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

The applicant was previously denied on case PZ21-0015 during the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting April 13, 2021. They are now pursuing lesser variances.

Is the applicant present?

MR. SCHAUER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Hi. You can tell
your first and last name very clearly for the court record. My acting secretary can take it up.

Katherine, can you take this one, please?
MR. SCHAUER: My name is Raymond Schauer. I reside at 48854 Rex Street, Shelby Township, Michigan.

MS. OPPERMANN: Could you spell your last name, please?

MR. SCHAUER: S-c-h-a-u-e-r, the third.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. And then do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. SCHAUER: I do.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. And you can proceed slowly for our -- this case is recording everything. And what we can help you, where you want to accommodate, what is, you know, you're pursuing on this case. This is your time. You can speak up.

MR. SCHAUER: Okay. So I'm going to share my screen here.
(Document displayed.)
MR. SCHAUER: Can you guys see that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yup.
MR. SCHAUER: Okay. So just for some context here, on the left-hand side we have Walled Lake on the site location and then the existing survey of the existing property. So we have some existing site photos here of the house that is honestly falling on hard times. There's some settlement issues with the house itself, floor levels kind of sagging and -- it's not in disrepair, but it's on its way. Especially, if you look, you know, along this kind of flat roof section and the house is -- you know, it's definitely aged.

Here's some views of the property from the rear yard looking at the waterfront. And then, just for some context, here's, like, the side yard from Herman Street.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm only seeing one picture.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. We're not seeing those.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Looks like a new house.

MR. SCHAUER: Hang on here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, take your time.

MR. SCHAUER: Can you see that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yup.
MR. SCHAUER: Okay. We'll just do it this way. I'll start here again. So existing context. There's the existing property on Walled Lake and then we're talking about this property. This is the footprint of the existing survey of the house.

If I scroll down here, these are the existing site photos. So this would be kind of standing at the corner of Herman Street right here and East Lake Drive. This is looking at it from a different perspective there.

Like I was saying, the house has seen better days. It's in rough shape, a lot of sagging floors, a lot of maintenance issues, especially with that flat roof. So that's kind of one of the areas of concern that, you know, we had with this property in particular.

And then this would kind of be the rear corner looking towards the waterfront and then this one
as well. And then, again, this illustrates kind of that flat roof and just how this house kind of sits on the property. It's, obviously, very dated.

So the proposed site plan that we sent in, if you look -- what I'm showing you right now, this dash line and this dash line represents where the current house sits on the property. So we're proposing to not go any closer to this side yard setback than the existing house is. In fact, we're technically further away because this is that corner of Lot 26 there.

Additionally, this circle, which I'm going to keep referencing a couple more times here, would be where we could put a house potentially if we were to strictly comply with both the 10 -foot and the 35 -foot setback requirements there. So let's say, for example, we were to build a house and didn't need a variance whatsoever, we could potentially put a wall there and we're actually putting it further away from that to maintain more of the lake view for this property to the rear of Mr. and Mrs. Yono's property.

So I did this kind of setback diagram to illustrate what we would be looking like if we were to strictly comply with the front yard, the rear yard and
the side yard setbacks. We would have a 2020 square foot footprint and that's the max footprint. So if we're going to be creating any architectural interests and bumpouts or projections, any of that stuff would have to be taken away from that footprint. And I'll kind of illustrate that on this next slide.

So I just kind of threw, you know, what I consider to be a mocked-up floor plan if I were to follow based on those setback elements. One of the things that we have working against us with this nonconforming lot is that this property line is not parallel to that property line. And then we have these two property lines that are adjoining, creating very unusual setback requirements.

And if $I$ go back to this image, the prior one, you can see what I'm talking about here. Obviously, we're not going to put a house that's that shape so we would be looking for a 90 degrees, like a normal, you know, standard new construction.

But if you look at what I have proposed here, we're very limited. We would have, essentially, a flat wall along Herman Street, if we were to try to maximize this allowable footprint. And then, also, we would not
only have a pretty flat wall or pretty much a flat wall along East Lake Drive, but it would be set back significantly from where the existing house sits. It would be about a 16.8 foot setback.

It's also worth noting that this shaded area on this diagram is 1010 square feet approximately of the current structure that is outside of the strictly combined setback requirements.

So Mr. and Mrs. Yono, I mean, they don't -it's not in their best interest to demolish a house and then build one that is significantly smaller and doesn't utilize as much of the area. So that's kind of where we were going towards with this proposed site plan.

So for context, we have a proposed three-car garage. This would be a two-story residence. And, like I said, with that diagram, the views are as maintained as, we feel, more so, than what would be if we were to have a property line right at that corner were we to build specifically there. Just go through here real quick.
(Scanning document.)
MR. SCHAUER: Just for some other context, we
have on the first floor plan living room, kitchen and dining, library, back of house mudroom. One item to note, too, is based on the current -- most of the houses along on East Lake Drive have high water tables. So you'll notice they have a significant amount of steps going up to the front door, especially, on East Lake Drive. So we're trying to encompass a future elevator so that with this being their forever home, they have the ability to exit and enter the home with no restrictions healthwise. Like I said, they plan on, you know, staying out the remainder of their lives here at this property.

On the second floor, we have a master suite, master bath, walk-in closet, bedroom two, bedroom three and a suite floor encompassing above the garage, proposed lakefront elevation. I mean, I think this looks better than what is currently on the property. Like I said, it's definitely not blight but give it a couple more years of, you know, unattention and it potentially could be. So we feel that this would be a much better scenario and improve the lake or the curb appeal of both East Lake Drive and the greater Walled Lake/Novi area in general.

And then also here we have just a mixture of brick facade and stone in the front. I didn't color the side elevations, but the same things would apply. So we would have all brick around here along Herman Street. This would be the right side elevation. Same thing, brick. We have some horizontal siding along the back there and then the rear elevation.

You know, kind of revisiting the comments that we got last time. We understand the concerns of the neighbor behind them that resides at 1404

Paramount, but we are also -- we're providing a less obstruction of that lakefront view than they currently maintain.

If you look at the existing site plan here -I'm sorry. I'm going to go back.

The majority of the view that they currently have is directly over what kind of, we would say, the left side of this house. And, like I said, that is where we could build with having no variance requests whatsoever.

What we're proposing provides more of a lake view that they would have left and I've highlighted kind of a generic view of that from here. So from the
far right corner, basically, right by this fence post, there's still all of this lake view that $I$ can still see and I took those photos personally.

And I kind of would just like to illustrate that as well with this diagram. So in the application where we would be strictly complying and we would be 10 feet off and 35 feet from the rear setback, the views are less parallel with Herman and the views would be this way. In this scenario, the views are not parallel with Herman. So from this property you actually get more lake view than you would have in this scenario.

I think that kind of summarizes what we have going on. So $I$ would turn it back to the board if you guys have any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other person who would like to speak on behalf of your case or you're the only one?

MR. YONO: I don't know if you guys heard me. I'm Joseph Yono, the owner of the property. What we're trying to do is have a permanent resident for me and my family.

MS. OPPERMANN: Mr. Yono?
MR. YONO: And --
 us. Other neighbors on East Lake Drive had concerns
that we've addressed and taken care of and if I'm not mistaken, they have sent in letters of approval or recommendation of building.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other things to add before we move on?

MR. YONO: (No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Yono?
MR. YONO: (No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other person would like to speak on this case before I close?

MS. OPPERMANN: (Raising hand.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Katherine?
MS. OPPERMANN: I did want to point out that there does appear to be an inaccuracy in certain statements you just made, Mr. Schauer.

MR. SCHAUER: Uh-huh?
MS. OPPERMANN: You're stating that there'd be only a 10-foot requirement for that site on the Herman side. You actually are seeking a variance for that because it's required to be an exterior side yard setback, which would be 30 feet. Not the simple 10 of a regular lot.

MR. SCHAUER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
And I would like to speak on the City, Larry, any correspondence? Would you like to speak anything on this, Larry?

MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Larry. I appreciate.

And our acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes, there is.
All right. There was 31 letters sent for this case. No returns, one approval and three objections.

The first, which is an approval, is from Olivia Arnold at 1727 East Lake Drive. She says to please note her approval for the requested variance for 1401 East Lake Drive.

Next is an objection from Lee Cohn, C-o-h-n. And it states: "The appeal to the homes in this area is the lake view. With any addition to the property mentioned that takes away from the view from standing on our property, which decreases the enjoyment and
value for us. This expansion would only add to the hindrance for the three homes directly behind."

Next objection is from Anne Fiedor, F-i-e-d-o-r. And her objection states: "I purchased my property, specifically, for the lake view, not the poorly maintained house built in the 1940s. I have invested 50 to 60 K to make the house functional and aesthetically pleasing to surrounding neighbors. The requested expansion at 1401 East Lake Drive will obstruct and block my lake view and decrease the value of my property and home."

And then we have an objection from Wayne and Maria Tilmos, T-i-l-m-o-s. They have a rather long objection and $I$ do believe they are both waiting to speak so I will let them speak for themselves on that when you get to the public comments section.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Katherine. I appreciate.

You know, $I$ don't know how long with this pandemic in the Zoom calls. Once we come back to the -- you know, in person, it will probably be less. Thank you so much, Katherine.

MS. OPPERMANN: Certainly.

not been given to me in the settings.
But my name is Maria Tilmos and I live in Novi, Michigan at 1404 Paramount Street.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MS. TILMOS: I'd love to present, but I can't. I don't have any options to share my screen nor do I see my video.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can try calling back again. I'll call another person. You can try.

MS. OPPERMANN: Joe, I believe the option for her to share her video would have to be given to her by our IT person who is currently monitoring the meeting.

MR. PETTY: Yes. I was just about to chime in. I have to promote her to a panelist. So I will do that momentarily.

MS. TILMOS: Thank you.
(Court reporter timing clarification.)
MS. OPPERMANN: It's standard for three minutes to be granted. It's at the board's discretion if they want to grant longer or not.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Katherine.

MS. TILMOS: Okay. I think $I$ am on, but $I$ just want to stop my virtual background. Can you see me and hear me okay?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.
MS. TILMOS: Okay. I'll try to keep my head blocking the sun. So I'm just sitting on the deck so that you can see my view from the deck and you can see the blue house behind me. That's the current home that Mr. Yono owns. So if someone could help me with -- oh, share screen. There we go.

Okay. So I'll just start with this: I wanted to follow-up with what Kate said about the mistake in the side yard setback. So he was going with a standard side yard setback, which is ten feet. But because Herman Street runs alongside the home, he has to have an exterior side yard setback and the minimum currently is 30 feet.

So, basically, what I did was I took this little distance of ten feet and $I$ drew over it in red and then I tripled it to get this distance here of 30 feet. The 35 feet from the back of the property is correct. So what that does is it moves the circle
which he had had here, all the way over to here. And what you can see is that that's pretty consistent with the existing footprint for the current home. And if he were to build, you know, the back corner of his property at that green circle, we would have no issue whatsoever. That would not be a concern. So I just wanted to put that out there to you.

I'm sorry. I'm trying to move you around so I can find ...

So, basically, I'll start with my objection to standard number five, because this is what we're talking about. He states in the second paragraph, "It would also not impact any adjacent properties any more than if the side yard --" which is on the north side.
"And rear yard setbacks were strictly complied and no variance request was needed at the northeast corner of the property."

So this is just quoting what he stated in the second paragraph of standard number five. He said, "It would also not impact any adjacent properties anymore than if the side yard, north, and the rear yard setbacks were strictly complied and no variance request was needed at the northeast corner of the property."

And like you just said, this is not true because of the existing exterior side yard minimum setback of 30 feet and an existing rear yard setback of 35 feet. So that's what drew me to that circle.

And, of course, here are the -- this is from the City's website: Rear yard setback 35. Minimum side yard, he was using the ten feet, but the notes below say, "All exterior side yards abutting a street shall be provided with a setback equal to the front yard setback." And that was, according to this, 30 feet.

So I already talked about the green circle on the diagram. So if no variance is requested, that's where the northeast corner would be. And like I said, if that were the case, our views would be only slightly altered and we'd be satisfied with that. We bought our house because of its lake and sunset views and we are very concerned about how Mr. Yono's proposed home would negatively impact the resale value of it.

And then based on -- basically, from the last time we were here to now, Mr. Yono has basically, inched in the back of the house, the side of the house and -- the two sides of the house and the back of the
house. So the back of the house is east and this side is north. Those are the two sides that impact us the most and he's inched them in by three and three quarters of a foot and three and a half feet. So it's not really a big difference. It's not going to make much of an impact.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Ma'am?
MS. TILMOS: Yeah?
MEMBER KRIEGER: If you could just make it more concise.

MS. TILMOS: Yeah. Okay. Let me come back to number four because $I$ haven't talked about this yet.

I just wanted to -- so in number four he stated that the variances requested are "kept to an absolute minimum to allow for a moderately-sized home based on the price point of the zip code and surrounding new construction along East Lake Drive over the last two decades."

So I took these photographs here and I just want to point out that the blue house is his. The one to the right is Lauren Pober's. Her's is 1500 square feet. The one behind is mine. You can see the canopy.

That's 1600 square feet and then I'll just move it down. And we can see Herman Street here. And the house over here on this side is 2314,2314 square feet. It belongs to Dave and Carolyn.

What Mr. Yono is proposing is a home greater than 5000 square feet. So I don't think that's really a moderately-sized home compared to the surrounding homes in our neighborhood.

His current lot allowance is 25 percent and he's requesting to increase that to 38.1 , percent, which represents more than a 50 percent increase over what is currently allowed. So we don't feel this -- we feel that this request is extreme and doesn't represent the best interest of the neighbors.

And I think that's pretty much all I had to cover except for the photos that I'll show you very quickly. I did this last time.
(Photographs displayed.)
MS. TILMOS: But, this is the photo from the master bedroom of our home. There are three windows that have lake views and this is our whole view, but this is my son standing at the new proposed northeast corner and here is a highlight that shows you that the
home would extend all the way here and we'd only have a little sliver of a view.

And here is another view. And you can see, again, we're losing all of this view, and we have a little bit through the neighbor's deck.

And here's the last one. So here we have a little bit more of a view left, but it's still cutting off a significant portion of our current view.

So I think that's all I have to present. So thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
Katherine, I think any audience is not allowed more than three minutes to speak. And this is taken up more than eight minutes, it looks like.

Any other audience raising their hand, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. There is a Wayne raising his hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry?
MR. TILMOS: Hello, my name is Wayne Tilmos. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I request, Wayne, only three minutes allowed for the audience.

Because we have a lot to take care. I request, please, for the time.

MR. TILMOS: Sure thing. I will take one minute. I'm a man of few words.

I want to thank Mr. Yono for trying to accommodate. I saw -- I'm an engineer myself and I respect what he was trying to do and his architect were trying to do. I get it and I appreciate that. I just want to say, as my wife has said, the house, in our view, is too big for the area. It's going to be, in our viewpoint, a mansion, not a modest house.

So I think if we can come to a compromise like move things over back to where it is right now, come out a few feet if you want, whatever. But I think you can build a house that you want to live in, if you can put it in a long rectangle. And that's all $I$ want to say.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
Any other audience, Katherine?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. There is a Kimberly Levy raising their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Please go ahead.

MS. LEVY: Good evening. My name is Kimberly Levy and I am also a neighbor. We live on Paramount Street and also own a home on East Lake near Lashbrook.

Our lot is a similar size to the Yonos and -our lake lot, I should say.

And we have also tried to at one point build a larger home there. So we totally understand the variance constraints. We support the Yonos in building a beautiful home on the lake. It will benefit everybody in the neighborhood, but we'd like to maintain the character of the neighborhood. We understand variances are needed, you know, to build a home that meets today's standards, but we don't think a 10-foot setback on the side yard where Herman Street lies is really required to build a nice home on that lot.

While I think neighbors appreciate nice homes in the neighborhood, this is not a neighborhood for big foot homes and mansions. And, you know, everyone in Novi really appreciates enjoying the lake and it should not come at the cost of other neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Any other audience, please, before I close?

MS. OPPERMANN: There's no one else raising their hands.

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

And it's open to the board. Anybody who would like to speak on this board on this case, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I have a question.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes, I have a question.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, go ahead, Clift.
Or Mike.
MEMBER LONGO: Katherine, do you have a signed application for this one, for the zoning appeal? It wasn't in our records.

MS. OPPERMANN: That is actually my error. It does look like I missed getting one that was properly signed by the applicant and property owner. I should have caught that previously. I do -- both the applicant and the property owner are here and they also signed the previous one. I'm sure I can get an updated one from them.

MEMBER LONGO: So you have -- okay, that's fine. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Michael.

Thank you, Linda, please. Member Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: What is the height that is being requested and what is the height that is asked of in the City, if you could repeat that?

MR. SCHAUER: The height, let me see.
MEMBER KRIEGER: It's going to be two story but then the --

MR. SCHAUER: It's 33 feet to the midpoint of the roof. So I think max is 35.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And I totally
understand where the neighbors are coming from, but then I also see where you're trying to come from and it's only fair for it all to come together. Because in neighboring streets in that area there are people building homes and all the new homes are similar to what you're proposing.

MR. SCHAUER: Sure.
MEMBER KRIEGER: And in neighboring communities, even, you look at homes and the same thing is happening. So the older Walled Lake homes in Novi are growing in size as well.

So, Mr. Yono, are you also understanding the atmosphere that's created? You're build- -- it looks
like you want to build a nice home. It'll fit. It will affect the neighbors in the back. But you go on any street in Novi that has a street that is not accessible to a lake view, that is always the risk. And Mr. Yono, he moves in and plans on staying there with the feeling of his neighbors are, he's got to live with that.

How are you willing to negotiate? I mean, you made a request to reduce and that's only fair. So I want to support you, but I feel bad for the feeling that's going to be created in the sub.

MR. YONO: Well, we're not building a 5000 square foot home like she's saying. We had a proposal. The first one was a little bit over 5000. This home that we're proposing now is 4300 and some change. It's not 5000 square feet like she's saying. And no house on Paramount Street has lake view, if you drive down that street at all.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. I have been down it a million times. So I understand.

MR. YONO: So our variances was to, you know, build -- and we shrunk it down more than what she said. We went down almost 1200 square feet from our proposal
that we did last time. So where she got 5000 square feet, I don't know. You guys have the proposed -- the first floor is about 1900 square feet, if I'm not mistaken, R.J.?

MR. SCHAUER: That's correct. It's 1906.
MR. YONO: And the second level is about 2200, R.J.?

MR. SCHAUER: Yeah. And I'd also like to point out, too, one of the items I forgot to mention is the minimum lot size for an $R-4$ is 10,000 square feet and we are 7744 here. So that, coupled with two front streets, it creates an unusual scenario. If the lot was 10,000 square feet, then we could probably build a -- you know, closer to this size house but we're fairly restricted with what's going on here.

And also, the existing house sits outside of these restraints currently. So we're just looking to kind of meet somewhere in the middle which is I feel like what we're proposing here.

MR. YONO: And another thing --
MEMBER KRIEGER: That's -- oh, go ahead.
MR. YONO: I'm sorry. We have a double lot there. Normally, the lots are single with 33 foot
front. We have a 64 foot front and 82, I believe, in the back. So the property sits like a pie shape. I have a bigger lot than -- you know, more of the ones going towards 13 Mile than their houses that sit there.

There's one going up that literally is about 10 feet from the road and about 10 feet from his rear driveway that was approved -- I don't know the address right off the bat. But he had to go through this variance stuff also.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Well, considering that you've made an adjustment, you've taken other people into consideration. I have seen other homes in Novi that are like a box shape. It's not aesthetically pleasing. You're creating something that is more aesthetically pleasing and you've down-sized and you've said that your topography, the shape of the lot, the size of the lot is different than others. So I would be able to support your request for this case.

That's it. Thank you, Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'd like to ask a couple of questions if I could. Member Montague.

Okay. So what I'd like to ask is, yeah,
could you summarize the changes you've made?
And, by the way, on a 10,000 square foot lot you would be allowed 2500 square feet, just to get the numbers correctly. Could you summarize the changes you've made because -- what's different than the last time when we denied the request, please?

MR. SCHAUER: Yes. Can I share my screen again real quick? It might be easier to do that.

And I agree with you there about the 2500 square foot, but that would also be including the porches, the garage. So that wouldn't necessarily be the square footage of the house itself. I'm talking about total lot coverage.

So I want to go back to this plot plan here and just zoom in. A couple of things, previously, we had the house situated at the existing front of the house, which is this dash line here. So we shifted the house -- the main foundation wall of the house back five feet. We also added a jog in the garage with the door here so that it pushes the house closer towards the side yard this way.

Previously, this number was five feet that we were requesting. And like I said, now, we are not
asking to go any closer to the property line than the current house already is. So this dash line represents the existing structure. We have it set at this corner and it does not go any closer to this property line than the existing house currently is.

Also, we pulled this back, I think it was about four feet. It was the distance that we adjusted through here. And then with that, also, you know, I striked about 18 inches this way, 18 inches through the middle, two feet here and kind of reduced the plan.

And like Mr. Yono said, we were about 1250 square feet taller or larger. So, you know, times two floors previously. And I think that answers your question.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes, it does. What is your current lot coverage percentage with the new plan?

MR. SCHAUER: Hang on one second here.
MS. OPPERMANN: 38.16.
MR. SCHAUER: Correct.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Is that the correct one?
Because I didn't know if that works out. So it is 38.16 right now?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. That's what
they requested.
MR. SCHAUER: Oh, the current you mean? I'm sorry. With the existing on the property, you mean? MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. That's what I'm asking, the existing.

MR. SCHAUER: I can pull that up for you. Hang on one second. I had this drawn up.

So the existing footprint is 1996 and divided by 7744 .

The existing is 25.77 square feet.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Or percent, you mean? MR. SCHAUER: Yeah, 25.77 percent. I'm sorry about that.

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

Dr. Mav Sanghvi, please go ahead.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you very much. This has been a nonconforming lot and the house is also nonconforming and it is equally true for more than 90 percent of the homes in this area. Because all the changes about the side yards and back yard setbacks all came about since these places were built a long time
ago.
I used to live in Woodward (ph) and Lake Village (ph) and I have gone through here for 40 years up and down in this area.

Not a single new improvement or new house can be built on this lot without variances. And whenever you build anything, you're going to need variances which are going to be very different than what is allowed by the new ordinances of the City. And it is the same situation here. It's a pie-shaped lot. It's an irregular, small lot and if you want to make a livable home, which the current applicant is trying to do, you are going to need variances and you are also going to need a lot more lot coverage than which is allowed by the ordinance.

Considering everything and the amount of changes they have made from the previous application, I think they went a long way in trying to satisfy the needs of the neighbors. And as my colleague, Ms. Krieger, said, I can support this because of the changes that has taken place in the previous time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member

Sanghvi.
Any other board members would like to speak before I move?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I would like to, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Sanker. Go ahead.

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. Just make a few comments here. And I appreciate both sides of the argument here. And, you know, this is a challenging one in that the variances requested are somewhat numerous and larger than maybe most of the types of variances we see. But at the same time, you know, it is a lakefront property and part of the reason that this particular lot is the way it is is because the lake is there. And, you know, that's one of the reasons that they -- that we do have variances is to -you know, the variances are made to govern every single parcel in Novi. And every single parcel is essentially different and unique. And so I think they -- you know, both the presentation from the applicant was very good and I think they've definitely shown that the shape of the lot is unique, and same with the square footage.

And a lot of that has to do with, you know, because it's by the lake as opposed to out in the, you know, flat farmland area.

And at the same time, you know, I think the person behind them has shown some legitimate concerns relating to the new house. It does look quite a bit larger than the area. And so, ultimately, you know, I -- this is a tough variance request and I appreciate both sides. And, you know, ultimately, I think they have shown practical difficulty in building on this lot and so I tend to agree with Member Sanghvi and Krieger regarding the variances requested.

And just one more thing, they did show, you know, if they followed the strict variances that are required, they are very limited in what they can build. And given, you know, today's modern needs and what houses are being built with these days, it is -- you know, they would be left with a very, I guess, insignificant or rather small house that would be almost -- I don't want to say not livable, but certainly not in with modern times.

You know, so, ultimately, I think there is a practical difficulty here. I think they've done a good
job trying to limit it, the variances, to as small as possible.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And you have something to add, Member Sanker, or you're done?

MEMBER SANKER: That was it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. I think it's my turn. And I seen all the board decides and as they mention, all the board members and the board parties. I don't want to take much time. And let's open for the motion. You know, Member Montague, can you make a motion for this?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I guess I'd like to recognize that they've made significant tries to minimize the variances. So I would like to make a motion to grant the variance in case number PZ21-0026. Without the variance, the participant is restricted in the use of their property because of the lot size and orientation. The property is unique for that same reason, where it's located, the property size is smaller than what would be.

They did not create the condition because the property exists and they're replacing a structure on the house with what $I$ think is a nicer looking
structure.
The relief granted, they have tried to minimize the interference to the extent they can based on these big constraints they have. And the relief is consistent with the intent of the ordinance because it is minimizing the variance requests.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine, please roll call.
MS. OPPERMANN: Certainly. Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: I approve.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.

Thank you, Joseph Yono. Good luck.
MR. YONO: Thank you, guys. Thanks for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And moving on to the case number -- I have a quick question, Beth, our attorney. Do we have to make it this -- PZ21-0022 to make the -- any motion for July 13th or just leave it out?

MS. OPPERMANN: There doesn't need to be a motion for that, $I$ don't believe, since it was a formal request for postponement and we already stated that it will be on the July 13th meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Meeting agenda.
Yes. Thank you.
Let's move on to PZ21-0024, Abdul Al-Khafaji, 41321 Llewelyn Drive, East of Meadowbrook Road and North of Eight Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-36-352-004. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a proposed rear yard setback of 46.7 feet, 50 feet required, a variance of 33.3 feet. I'm sorry. 3.3 feet. This variance would accommodate the rebuilding of a home and a new addition. This property
is zoned Residential Acreage, RA. This case was tabled from the May 11 meeting. No applicant was present.

Is the applicant present today?
Mr. Abdul is there?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, I can see him.
MS. OPPERMANN: I can see that he's there.
It looks like he needs to unmute.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Abdul, can you unmute?
(No audio response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Abdul?
MEMBER SANGHVI: He's not responding.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, I think he's back. Mr. Abdul?

MEMBER SANGHVI: No, he's there.
MS. OPPERMANN: Yeah. It looks like they're trying to fix it. I can see that they're kind of working on the computer there.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Oh, yeah. Yeah.
MR. ALAHWAO: Yes. Yes. I'm the
architectural designer and I'm working with Mr. Abdul. So I think he's muted.

Mr. Abdul, could you please unmute?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Let's wait
for a few minutes. I mean --

MR. ALAHWAO: The bottom corner on your
left-hand, unmute. The left bottom corner.
MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Now it's okay? Do you hear us?

MR. ALAHWAO: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we're ready.

MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Do you hear us?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Is it Mr. Abdul?
MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Abdul, can you please spell your first and last name very slowly for our court record and our secretary will take your oath. And Katherine, please take it.

MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Abdul Amir Al-Khafaji.
MS. OPPERMANN: And if you could please spell that, sir.

MR. AL-KHAFAJI: It's A-b-d-u-l, A-m-i-r. Last name A-l, space, $K-h-a-f-a-j-i$.

MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. And do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you,

MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please go ahead,
Mr. Abdul.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Make your presentation. MR. AL-KHAFAJI: I don't understand what you say.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please
present --
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I am going -- I am going to help him to translate. His English is not very good. If it's okay with you.

MR. ALAHWAO: Would please present why you are asking for -- why you are requesting a variance, please?
(Simultaneous interpretation crosstalk.)
MR. AL-KHAFAJI: We correct the variance -can he help me translate?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: He believes that the architect who is present, Mr. Moneer Alahwao --

MS. OPPERMANN: I'm sorry. Can I -- Beth, do we need to swear in the translator or can he just be

MS . SAARELA: Yeah --
MR. ALAHWAO: I can represent him if that's
fine.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Moneer Alahwao is the architect who is present. We're both not very technical as good as he is. And Mr. Al-Khafaji is saying he does not believe he's requesting variance because that was adjusted in the first round of objection by the City. It was adjusted by the architect. So I think --

MR. ALAHWAO: No. No, I'm sorry. No, Mr. Al-Khafaji, there is --

MS. SAARELA: I don't know --
MR. ALAHWAO: Yeah. There was a request for a variance --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Beth --
MS. OPPERMANN: The architect can speak on behalf of the owner --

MR. ALAHWAO: Okay.
MS. OPPERMANN: -- if you would so choose.

The architect can represent the owner as his agent and explain what the variances --

MR. ALAHWAO: Okay. I will.
MR. AL-KHAFAJI: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMANN: Sir, if I could please have you state your name, that you're the architect for the case and then I'll swear you in.

MR. ALAHWAO: Sure. My name is Moneer
Alahwao. I can spell that. M-o-n-e-e-r, last name
Alahwao, A-l-a-h-w-a-o.
And I will present --
MS. OPPERMANN: Are you an attorney, sir?
MR. ALAHWAO: Excuse me?
MS. OPPERMANN: Are you an attorney?
MR. ALAHWAO: No. I'm the architectural
designer that $I$ work for the addition. Remodeling --
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. ALAHWAO: Yes, I swear.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. You may now proceed.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Slowly -please talk very slowly for our court record.

MR. ALAHWAO: Okay. The owner is planning to remodel the existing house, but he also wants to keep the rear part of the house, which is the sleeping area and the existing basement. There's not any changes in that area. There will not be any remodeling. He will just renovate that area, like three bedrooms and three bathrooms in that area with the existing basement.

So he's requesting a variance. After, he decide to remodel the house, now all the sides are accommodating, you know, with the variances. It's complying with -- I'm sorry, with the ordinance. And he request a variance for the setback which should be 50 feet from the rear property line. And the existing house sits on 46.7 feet from the rear set -- from the rear property line.

So, hopefully, you can approve this variance for him or he can get this variance to be granted for him.

MS. SAARELA: So let me just clarify because I'm pretty familiar with what's going on in this case. When they submitted plans to remodel this house, the City discovered in its plan review that the existing structure was not within the -- within the required
setbacks. So the variance is to retain part of the existing structure that's built outside of the prior setbacks. So this variance isn't going to result in anything changing. It would just result in retaining an existing part of the existing structure.

MR. ALAHWAO: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other thing you would like to add before I move to this?

MR. ALAHWAO: No, thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
I appreciate.
And Larry, City, any --
MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Correspondence, acting secretary, Katherine?
MS. OPPERMANN: Certainly.
All right. There were 22 letters sent for this case, one return, no approvals and six objections.

The first objection is from Terry Chenault, C-h-e-n-a-u-l-t. Their objection is: "I am opposed to changing the 50 foot ordinance. This property has been allowed to deteriorate for so many years and is now an eye-sore and has been a health hazard as well. It is
very disappointing that the City allows this to continue."

The next objection is from Candace Day, D-a-y. She says: "To the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals: My name is Candace Day and I have lived at 41366 Llewelyn Drive for the past 27 years. I have watched with growing horror the neglect and deterioration of the property at 41321 Llewelyn Drive during the past eight years. For example, the former owner completely neglected his yard to the point that the City of Novi or a neighbor had to step in to mow the developing prairie. Both the exterior and the interior of the house are rundown and decaying --" (Interpreter Interruption.)

MEMBER KRIEGER: Can you put it on mute? MR. ALAHWAO: Dr. Al-Khafaji, please mute yourself because other people is talking.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine.
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. Let me go back. "Both the exterior and the interior of the house are rundown and decaying. The pool in the back yard has been filled with debris, fetid water, and dead animals. In
short, this property has been neglected, dilapidated, and practically abandoned for eight years. It's an eye-sore which stands in sharp contrast to the way the other homeowners in the neighborhood maintain their properties. This is why the residents of the neighborhood were hopeful when Mr. Al-Khafaji purchased the property earlier this year. We are waiting to see whether the new owner will quickly and adequately remedy these issues.
"Recently I learned from the City of Novi that Mr. Al-Khafaji has requested variances to reduce the 50 -foot setback requirements. Many of my neighbors and I are opposed to the granting of these variances and would be willing to address the Board, if so desired. The requirement is sound and has helped to maintain the uniformity of the neighborhood, ensuring a proper amount of spacing between properties. Furthermore, the granting of these variances would set a serious adverse precedent for our neighborhood.

I appreciate your time in considering my concerns, and will be at the meeting should you have any questions."

The next objection is from Alan and Karen

Freedman, $F-r-e-e-d-m-a-n$. They state: "To whom it may concern: Complaint concerning the condition of the home and property located at 41321 Llewelyn Drive, Northville, Michigan.

This property has been an eye-sore in the Meadowbrook Manor subdivision for seven years.

My husband and I understand the property was recently sold to an acquaintance of the previous owner, who had never lived in the home after purchasing and rarely maintained the property.

We feel the new owners request for additional footage on the home is just another stall tactic to do nothing to the property or home because it will take time to be approved by the City, contractors, et cetera, et cetera.

More time wasted as we and our neighbors look at this dump.

The owner of this property should be working on what is already there to be fixed before adding on square footage.

This is totally ridiculous. This property is a safety hazard and is affecting all of our property values within Meadowbrook Manor subdivision.

Please do not allow the expansion request on this property until we see some progress made on the existing property."

And the next objection is from Mike and Karen Bulbuk, B-u-l-b-u-k. They state: "To whom it may concern: We are residents of the Meadowbrook Manor Association of which the above-referenced property is located. We live two doors away at 41365 Llewelyn Drive.

Despite being recent homeowners and members in good standing with the HOA, we have landed in a maelstrom. We are aware that the above-referenced property has been a repeated trial, both to the longsuffering neighbors and a drag on the jurisdictional process. And despite the full involvement of both the Novi Ordinance Department and the 52-1 District Court, these owners have abdicated their responsibility to maintain this property, upkeep the home or show any pride of civic appreciation for those who dwell around this debacle.

And now, it would appear that a new owner has miraculously appeared on the scene, requesting a variance. Adding insult to injury, this new owner
chose not to be present for the last Zoom meeting in which they were requesting a variance approval. We were beyond dismayed.

We are disheartened to think that the sham of the first owner is now being continued by the second. Who is the new owner and how did this transaction occur? He would like approval from us for a variance but what assurance do we as an association have that he will be vastly improved from the last owners? The lack of citizenship exhibited by owners of this home has impacted our real estate value and released a plethora of rodents into our surrounding plots.

Please be stalwart in your decision, giving no wiggle to their unlawful and careless behavior regarding 41321 Llewelyn Drive."

The next objection is from Ronald and Janet Wysocki, W-y-s-o-c-k-i. They state: "The City of Novi Zoning Board. In regards to the 41321 Llewelyn property. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on May 11th, was a total waste of time in regards to this issue. The new homeowner did not bother to even show up. We as neighbors are not in agreement to grant this new owner the few extra feet he is requesting.

It is also apparent that the court hearing we attended back in August 2020 was a total waste of our time and the Court's time. The court orders were that the original owner had a deadline of November 2020 to repair the roof that was falling in, repair the porch that has crumbled away, repair the gutters and downspouts. He was supposed to put up a $\$ 50,000$ bond.

He was then given a deadline of June 2021 to have the home in a saleable condition.

How did he bypass the court orders and sell the home as is? We were told it was a hazmat
situation. In May 2021, we physically viewed the new owner's house plans. He did approximately -- when did approximately 20 pages of house plans come into play? Having house plans drawn up and then moving forward for City approval doesn't happen overnight.

When was this house sold behind the neighbors' backs? We do not trust the original owner. We do not trust the new owner and we have totally lost faith in the City of Novi for allowing this to happen. Manipulation by the original owner continues."

And the last objection is from Diane and Joe

Pace, P-a-c-e. They state: "To the City of Novi: It has been seven long years we have been dealing with 41321 Llewelyn with the disgrace that it looks like and unsafe state that it is in. It has many live animals living among it but it had a dead deer in the back yard also attracting even more bugs than you can imagine and the odor was terrible. We thought when a new owner took over things would change but really he needs approximately 3.5 bigger house and then doesn't show up to the meeting. How important it is to him.

How much longer do we have to put up with this track record because this is just what the previous owner did. Made false promises and the City let him have extensions one after another.

We are tired of looking at this house. You can see by my pictures everyone has a nice house but his. We shouldn't have to deal with this any longer. It is unsafe for kids and the smell is awful at times.

We understand there are procedures to follow but seven years later and we are no further ahead on this house then when it was first bought. It is a shame it has taken this long because it was a nice
house and now it's a dump in a nice neighborhood. It is making our houses look not so nice and we all try hard to keep them up.

If the owners can't show up or complete what the City is asking for, $I$ disagree with giving them a few feet. I feel that we have been patient enough and we want a guarantee that construction will be started on that house as soon as possible."

And that's all of them.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, my God.
Katherine, thank you.
Okay. And turning to the public, anybody raising their hand in public, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMANN: I don't see that anyone is raising their hand currently.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate. And let's move to, you know, open it to the board.

Let's open it to the board. Anybody would like to speak on this case?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Did Larry have anything to say?

MR. BUTLER: There was no comments from the

City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. He said. MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Sorry. I missed that then.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, Linda.
MEMBER KRIEGER: The question would be is, so according to all this commentary from the other members in the subdivision, this is the person that's presenting is the owner of the house now; is that correct?

MS. OPPERMANN: The presenter was the architect for the owner, but the owner is also present. That was Mr. Al-Khafaji.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So he probably had technical difficulties which we can all relate to. And it's the variance according to what $I$ understand is something that's not really his doing, so. And it's one variance for three and a half feet and he's willing to redo this house. So I have no problem with the request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda.

Any other board member would like to speak,
please?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member
Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I went and seen this -- saw this place over a month ago because they were going to come here last month. But anyway, to cut the long story short, this place needs fixing and I think that's what they are trying to do. And as our City Attorney very wisely pointed out, this was a nonconforming part of the variance and they are just trying to make it legal by asking this part of the variance and I have no difficulty in agreeing and granting that variance. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi.

Any other board member?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. I'll make a comment. I was by there as well and it is unfortunate. It looks like it could use a nice renovation and hopefully he's going to do that. Unfortunately, our only -- the only matter before us is the 3. -- is a three and a half foot setback. So we just need to consider that. The
rest is another issue for a different group of people. MEMBER SANGHVI: For sure. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, sir. Any other board member, please? MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I'll make a quick comment as well and piggyback off of what Mr. Member Montague was saying. That a lot of the -- I don't think any of the objections really addressed the true issue. It was more of a chance for them to complain about the condition of the property. And so it's hard to, I guess, include that into our analysis here. But in any event, the setback requirement's 50 feet and they're only over 3.3 feet and it's an extremely small percentage and doesn't appear to have any significant impact. And so for those reasons, I would be in approval of it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanker.

Any other board member, please? Okay. Actually, I also drove by this property and I saw. And I see all the other neighbors given you know, the chance for the variance for the different three feet.

And apart from that, I have no objection to grant this variance.

And so motion time. Member Sanker, can you make a motion -- or Montague already did.

Is it okay, Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: I move that we grant the
variance in case number PZ21-0024 sought by the petitioner for the 46.7 foot rear yard setback, which is a variance of 3.3 feet, because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring this variance. The petitioner -- without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented with respect to the use of the property because they won't be able to build their addition. The property is unique because of the oddly shaped lot in the back. How it comes in at the back. It's not a straight line in the back. The petitioner did not create the condition because they purchased the property as it is.

And the relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the setback requirement is a very small one.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the petitioner will be able to redevelop and enhance the property.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes.
All right. Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

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

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Good luck.
MR. ALAHWAO: Thank you so much. I
appreciate it. Thank you so much for your assistance and thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Appreciate. Good luck.

And case number PZ21-0025, James Wildman, 22635 Beckenham Court, West of Beck Road and North of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-29-476-016. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.2 for a proposed exterior side yard setback of 19 feet, 30 feet required, a variance of 11 feet. This variance would accommodate the building of a home addition. The property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-1.

Is the applicant present? James? Mr. James?

MR. WILDMAN: Yes, I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Mr. James, it's your turn. And talk -- speak slowly and spell your first and last name for our court record and my acting secretary, Katherine, to take down.

MR. WILDMAN: First name is James, J-a-m-e-s. Last name is Wildman, W-i-l, D as in David, m-a-n.

MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. And do you swear
or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?
MR. WILDMAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Katherine.
And Mr. James, please explain how we can help you on this case tonight.

MR. WILDMAN: Sure. So we're looking to do an addition on the back side of our home and it, basically, will allow us to extend our livable square footage, as we plan on putting in a crawl space with concrete foundation, heating and cooling. And it would be basically almost like a rectangle design. 19 feet out, approximately 26 feet in length. We would work towards getting matching brick and, basically, look -make it appear as if it was part of the original build of the home. It will allow us to have more square footage, add value to the property, as well as I believe not really obstruct anybody's view or cause any type of interference in their perception of what they see when they look outside their windows.

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



Sanghvi.
Any other board member, please?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Sure. I would like to. I guess they're calling this the side yard. It's kind of hard to tell because the house is on a corner. But that property line is very nicely treed with, you know, pine trees. So I don't think it's going to be an obstruction to anybody. So I think it's a very doable variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Any other board member?

Seeing none. Okay. That's fine. And I see there's no letters, you know, no objections. And this is following my fellow board members, you know, what they say. And I see these document and I'll -- and that there's no objection on this to grant this. And I would like to call Member Linda to make a motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0025 sought by the petitioner. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of their property because of its unique location, being on a regular road and then into a
cul-de-sac so that exterior yards, side yard, back yard, you can't really tell what's what. The property is unique because of that. Petitioner did not create the condition because when he purchased the property that's how the development was created.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it's a minimum request and is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of its aesthetic pleasing and use to the homeowner and appealing to the other neighbors.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And please roll call, Katherine.

MS. OPPERMANN: I'm sorry, who had seconded that one?

MEMBER SANGHVI: I second.
MS. OPPERMANN: It was Dr. Sanghvi, okay. I thought so.

Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

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

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you and good luck. Congratulations.

And moving to case number on Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-31-100-001. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.11 to install a four-foot front yard fence and driveway gate. By code a fence shall not extend toward the front of the lot nearer than the minimum front yard setback. This property is zoned Residential Acreage, RA.

Is the applicant present?
MR. BRICENO: Yes, we are.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.
And please tell your name very slowly, clearly to our
court record and our acting secretary will take it from there.

Katherine, can you please?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yeah. Were both of you going to speak on the case or just one of you?

MR. BRICENO: Both.
MS. OPPERMANN: Okay. Then I'll need each of you to in turn state and spell your name, please.

MR. BRICENO: Francisco Briceno, $B-r-i-c-e-n-o$.

MS. RUESGA: And my name is Marie Ruesga, R-u-e-s-g-a.

MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. And then I'll need each of you to swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you.

MS. RUESGA: I do.
MR. BRICENO: I do.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Katherine.

Thank you both of you. And know you are watching since seven o'clock. I saw that. And you can see what we can help you on this case tonight. You can
speak slowly. Thank you. Go ahead.
MS. RUESGA: We would like to share our screen really quick. I guess I would like to start by saying that we just moved to this property, I want to say like a month and a half ago. Can everybody see my screen?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MS. RUESGA: Okay. So we just moved about a month and a half ago. This property right here, 51285. As you can see, our lot is -- basically, our house is the only one on this sidewalk.

On both sides, basically. We don't have neighbors in the front and our neighbors on the sides are facing the other side of -- I mean, I guess the other road behind us. So we really have no neighbors. And the reason we -- I mean, we would like to install a four-foot fence in the front for security. We -- since the moment that we moved in, the first day, we noticed that a lot of people was using our driveway as a turnaround. And this is because -- likely, because the house was vacant for a long time when they were building it. So, you know, multiple cars every single day, they enter our driveway to turn around. Even

USPS, they go in all the way to here, which is where like our -- basically, our garage doors are, every single time. And other miscellaneous multiple cars.

I want to say a month ago, was it March -April 30th, a car actually -- oh, how can I -- okay. I'm sorry. Let me share again.

Okay. Can everybody see, like, a back yard? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
MS. RUESGA: So can you all see this car right here?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MS. RUESGA: So this car pulled in all the way to our -- like, to the end of our driveway and this man came out of the car. I don't know who he was, but then we do have a camera in the back. So when he saw that camera, he turned around and left. We had to place a report with the police and they even said, like, that's a classic burglar move because if they see a camera, they just back away. They recommended actually that we fenced the front of our house. And we feel that if we're able to fence also like in the front of our front door, that's also going to make it safer
for us.
We have one child and another on the way so we -- you know, safety is, obviously, a priority. And I would like to quickly -- super quickly share.

Okay. So this is, basically, the -- where the fence we're proposing would go along the sidewalk. And there would be a gate here for the driveway. This is more or less what the fence would look like. This is a picture that the fencing company provided. The measurements is just a four-feet fence and this is what the gate would look like.

Do you have anything to add?
MR. BRICENO: No. You pretty much covered everything.

MS. RUESGA: Okay. Yeah. That's from our side at this point. Thank you.

MR. BRICENO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. And I appreciate.

Okay. Coming to the City. Larry, are you there?

MR. BUTLER: Yeah. No comment at this time. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.

Our acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. There were 14 letters sent, no returns, no approvals and no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Any other audience watching in the Zoom call raising their hand, any other persons?

MS. OPPERMANN: There is someone raising their hand just listed as Long.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. He wants to speak. Can you allow him?

MR. LONG: Can you hear me?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MR. LONG: Hi. My name is Derek Long. I live at 22315 Waterland Drive. I'm on the back side of the proposed applicant's property. I strongly disapprove of their fence because of the reason for security to put it across the front. So what's going to stop someone from going and just walking around the fence? That doesn't make sense to me either.

But that's not my main issue that I have. The main issue $I$ have would be the look. And with
their house being brand new, I don't understand why they would be asking for a variance for a security reason for a fence in the front. We don't have any other new constructions that $I$ can think of that has new constructions in their front yard. I don't want to be coming, driving down my street looking across and seeing a fence out in someone's front yard because then it's making a projection to my neighbors or guests that we might have a crime issue. I think that should be something, as she brought up, that she should notify the police and maybe get more patrols or something if she's really interested about security.

I don't agree on her wanting the fence in the front yard. I understand they didn't build the house and there is restrictions that they got variances for before in the past and it is a nonconforming lot. I understand all of that. But to grant the variance to cosmetically make the house not appealing to the next people for resale value would be very tough.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other people raising their hand, Katherine?
MS. OPPERMANN: No. There is no one else raising their hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Appreciate. And open to the board.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Did you just want a fence in the front or not on the side yards? Cause your little kids could go around the side and into the street, too.

MS. RUESGA: Yes. So, actually, around the house there's a lot of greenery and we were -- we're actually starting to plant more, like, evergreens and that kind of trees.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Trees, yeah.
MS. RUESGA: So that it's, you know, a little bit more private and a little bit more, I guess, covered.

And we also -- you know, for the same reason we didn't think of -- we didn't propose building a fence around the house because we didn't want to bother or disturb our neighbors in their surrounding yards. And I think -- so we didn't show it in the pictures because it's not built yet, but we would like to install some pillars on the sides of the fence so that would make it look more aesthetically appealing and more, you know, nicer. We don't want to just, you know -- I don't know how to say it.

MR. BRICENO: Look like a fort or something like that.

MS. RUESGA: Yeah. It's just a short fence. It's four feet. And we want to make it look nice, but we also want to feel safer, at least to a degree. You know, at least to know that a car is not going to -- he just pull in to all the way to our driveway and easily just, you know, be able to grab a kid or just fast, you know. You know what I mean, like?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup. For this case, I
understand -- I -- the house and how it was left and the previous development that the previous owner was able to develop it to a house. That Napier Road is a dividing line between two counties and two cities so that you could have -- actually, it's like the difference between Southfield and Farmington. You know, police departments fighting over who's going to show up and then plus the sheriff as well.

So because it's -- and then Napier is now a thoroughfare so the speeds of the road. I would have -- I would be able to support the request because they're the first driveway to encounter for a turnaround for drivers. So it would be a
discouragement. It would be for safety for future kids playing in the yard. That they had plans for making it aesthetically pleasing with the plants or some kind of -- for side yard.

That it is comparable to other situations in our city where people are putting aesthetically pleasing -- what are you going to call it? Something that deters people from just jumping in a yard. There's other subdivisions that have gated communities. So it would become more just an aesthetic pleasing as you pass by and also create a safety for a family living there. And that was it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda. Any other board member?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yeah. I would like to make a comment. I went and saw this site. When you come, this is the only house that is there on Nine Mile Road. It's pretty isolated. And I understand their fear about the security living in the particular setup they have got. I also understand their concern about the safety of the children. And I have no problem
whatsoever in accepting their request for a fence, as well as a gate. Because people tend to trespass without realizing it any time day or night in an isolated area like this. And as Ms. Krieger pointed out, this is a borderline place. Novi is more or less a no man's land for the police or anybody else to patrol very often. And there is very little other traffic in that area also toward for anything that's going in. So because of the isolation of this site, I have no problem whatsoever and I wholeheartedly support their request. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Mav Sanghvi. And any other board member, please?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I'll quickly say something just to resonate what Member Sanghvi said. That this house -- I mean, the biggest distinguishing factor is that it's not in the subdivision. And it's like Mav was just saying, it sits on an island essentially right off Nine Mile Road. And it's an obvious choice for people to turn around in. And it's an easy target for, you know, trespassers essentially. And since it's not in a neighborhood where other people can keep an eye on the house easily, a fence does make
sense at this property.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Sanker.
Member. Any other board member, please?
Okay. Looks like none. And it's motion time. And Montague, are you able to make a motion? Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ21-0027. Without the variance, the petitioner is unreasonably prevented in use of their property because of their security concerns and their isolation. The property is unique because it sits kind of on an island by itself without neighbors around it to help keep an eye on the house. The petitioner did not create the condition because they purchased the house.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any surrounding properties. There's nobody across the road and actually nobody on either side of them. And I believe the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance in having safe and happy residents of our community.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member
Montague. And Katherine, can you please roll call?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Good
luck and congratulations.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Best wishes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
And let's move on to the PZ21-0028, Joye Harris, 1256 East Lake Drive, West of Novi Road and South of

Fourteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-151-018.
The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 5.14.10.A for a permanent backup generator creating sound over 55 decibels and up to 85 decibels during limited times of charging and while being used during a power outage. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

Is the applicant present, please? Joye?
MS. OPPERMANN: Joye, you'll need to unmute. MEMBER SANGHVI: Unmute.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Joye, we can't hear you.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Unmute.
MS. OPPERMANN: In the lower left-hand corner, Joye, there should be kind of a microphone -MS. HARRIS: I got it. I got it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, there you go.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, yeah. You're unmuted now.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
In early March of --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you and I appreciate.

MS. HARRIS: In early March --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Joye, can you please tell your -- I'm sorry. Joye, can you please spell your first and last name clearly for our court record and our secretary will take it from there.

Katherine, can you please take it?
MS. HARRIS: My name is J.T. Harris, H-a-r-r-i-s.

MS. OPPERMANN: And then do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MS. HARRIS: I do.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Joye. And appreciate. And you can present the case and maybe we can help you tonight on this case.

MS. HARRIS: Okay. In early March 2014 I returned from the Christmas holiday, having spent it with my family. And when I walked into my house, I realized in the basement that the ceiling and the wall were all caving in. And in the -- it had collapsed due to running water caused by frozen, broken pipes. There
had been an electrical outlet -- outage of record while I was away.

It was recommended by my homeowners insurance company to invest in a generator. I consulted the City of Novi. I called to find out what I needed to do to be approved with a generator. And I -- Oak Electric did the installation. I was assured that I was in compliance with all the requests from the City, requirements from the City. And it has been maintained by Oak Electric ever since. And a permit was issued in 2014 upon installation. It continues today to rest on the concrete slab behind my garage.

In the years 2000 to 2005, the City of Novi finally brought city water and sewage to our street, East Lake Drive. Since that time, regardless of the ups and downs with the stock market, our street has undergone much gentrification. We no longer have the 800 square feet cottages of yesteryear. They've been replaced with $3,000,4,000,5,000$ square foot permanent residences built on the same small lots and equipped with all the updated modern technologies of today.

In order to protect -- the main problem that we all suffer on our street is the antiquated power
grid. We've got all these power lines hanging all over us and when we have a storm, things fall down and I don't think it's ever going to be corrected. But in order to protect our valuable investments for which we are taxed quite heavily in Novi, a generator is an insurance policy against electrical outages -- (Audio dropped) -- antiquated system which is our only source of electrical energy. Generators are necessary -- are a necessary commodity in Novi on Walled Lake.

I've had the engineers of Oak Electric review the situation and the fact is, according to them, all generators in my neighborhood -- and there are many -operate at the same decibel output when charging as well as when fully operating during an outage. It cannot be lowered. The generators must recharge once a week for 12 minutes.

I've offered to set the charging time to accommodate my neighbor; however, he firmly rejected my offer.

Many of my neighbors are listening tonight because they either own a generator, are about to purchase one to protect their families and their investments.

I've submitted 40 signatures with addresses on East Lake Drive who stand with me tonight against this, understanding the need for generators. We all have to live with the recharging noises of our generators on our street without having registered a single complaint ever. And this is the first of any complaints. I don't believe the City has ever had a complaint about a generator. But you know what, if our power grid would accommodate the houses here and all the modern technologies, nobody would want to invest in a generator. But until our -- we can -- we have that, what are we to do? Unless the City has a better idea to help us. I mean, you can't leave your property because you don't know what's going to happen. You don't know what you're going to find when you come back.

It's been brought to my attention that there are, in fact, no noise restrictions in Novi designated for generators. You have a noise restriction, but it doesn't say -- it encompasses generators I guess. I don't know.

I would suggest that when one compares 12 minutes of recharging time to revved up
motorcycle engines left unattended, idling in the driveway. Or the noise of loud talk radio blaring from outdoor speakers all day in wintertime when no one's out there. Being forced to listen to Bluetooth amplified personal phone conversations generated from one's car while the speaker is walking around the yard. The noise of airplanes taking off and landing on Walled Lake every Saturday, Sunday, all day. And super loud noise of hydroplane boat races on Walled Lake in Novi lasting an entire weekend. Ladies and gentlemen, all of this is noise. All of it is noise and all of it is louder and lasts longer than my generator.

How do you possibly measure against all of that? Now, will the City of Novi deny its tax paying citizens the right to protect their property from loss due to annual power outages? My generator's currently recharging in the evening during rush hour when the car traffic is louder than my generator. That's what I've chosen to do. And if generators are a form of insurance and are not allowed in Novi, who will want to risk living here?

Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, ma'am.

I appreciate for your presentation. Okay. Thank you. Public hearing. Sorry. City?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Larry?
MS. OPPERMANN: Larry, you're muted.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Larry, you're muted.
MR. BUTLER: Yeah, yeah. I got it. Yeah.
It keeps going in and out. I try to keep it on.
I'm going to defer to our ordinance officer, Maureen Underhill, since she's more familiar with the case than I am. And direct your questions towards her at this time.

MS. UNDERHILL: Hello, folks. Can you hear me?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Hi, Maureen. Thanks for waiting with us.

MS. UNDERHILL: Hi. Hello. Hello everyone. Good evening.

Basically, what Joye said, I mean, I can let you ask your questions of me, but we were called out on a concern about the noise of the generator and indeed -- I'm not sure what to say here other than the generator is -- you know, there's RPMs and things. And this generator has been modified from once a week of
its charging mode to every other week, I understand. And it is 12 minutes a week. However, the generator will run at the 3800 RPMs during times of power outages. So you will have noise during those times.

And those were the two differences, the charging time once every other week versus the time while it's really in use is going to be the louder decibel reading. Which is beyond our -- you know, our normal decibel reading in the city for equipment and things like that.

So feel free to ask me any questions about what we did with the readings and so forth and I'll leave it up to you guys.

MS. HARRIS: May I interrupt and say something?

Hello?
MS. UNDERHILL: Yes. Hi, Joye.
MS. HARRIS: Hi. I just wanted you to know that I have all these signatures from the people on my street, plus others who didn't get to sign my paper and called me and wanted their names added. Most of these people have generators. So it's not like I am the only one. And Oak Electric says they all run at the same
decibel when they're running. When they're charging and when they're running. They can't be lowered. So either we give up having these insurance -- how are we supposed to protect our homes? MEMBER KRIEGER: You have a copy of the letter with the signatures you can give in to the City? MS. HARRIS: I gave it to the -- I gave a copy of it to the City in my letter.

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. It is in the packet, Linda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. We'll come to, Linda, that thing and let's continue the City and we'll come to the correspondence.

Yeah, please go ahead.
MS. HARRIS: That's all. I just wanted to let you know that $I$ am not the only one. And these people are listening tonight and they're paying attention to what's going to happen because it's going to -- it's going to affect everybody in the city of Novi who has a generator. And I think that should be understood.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Joye. Appreciate. Let City people continue.

| Maureen, can you continue or are you done |
| :--- |
| with that? | with that?

MS. UNDERHILL: I think I'm all set, but I'm ready to answer any questions that the board may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. And coming to the correspondence. Our acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. The City sent out 29 letters for this case, none returned, no approvals and one objection.

The objection comes from Stephen Beasley at 1254 East Lake Drive. His objection states, "The generator on the above property is right on the property line and extremely close to our front door. It's sufficiently away from Ms. Harris' house that it does not disturb her. I work from home as a salesman, constantly on the phone and I have to stop my calls when the generator goes off as the study and office is right next to it. We cannot hold a conversation outside our own house when it is going because it is too noisy. The noise decibel, sometimes 84. Is a disturbance for us and therefore we believe it a
reasonable request to ask for the generator to be moved further onto the property and away from us."

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Katherine. I have a quick question. And Linda or somebody is asking, did you get the signed letter and signatures from the client? Can you show that -MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. As -CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: -- one? Linda can see that. She is mentioning she sent a copy.

MS. OPPERMANN: The copy is --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry.
MS. OPPERMANN: -- on the last page of the packet.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, yeah. It seemed like she had more. That's why I was confused.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. HARRIS: I do -- I did. There were people that came forward and wanted to add their -after I had to submit it, they wanted to come forward and sign the paper.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Ma'am, sorry to interrupt you. Let's conclude and we'll give a chance to talk to you, ma'am. I appreciate.

MS. HARRIS: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Linda, are you comfortable with what Katherine --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: -- mentioned that we have --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you, Joe.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: -- in our packet?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And you are okay with that, no?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good.
And any other, you know, audience is looking on the Zoom call raising their hand, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. There's Catherine Beasley who is raising her hand.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Only Catherine.
Okay. Any other people, only one?
MS. OPPERMANN: Just the one.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Can you allow her, please? Yeah. She has only three minutes to talk on this case.

MR. BEASLEY: Hello. Good evening. How are you?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good. Thank you. Go ahead, sir.

MR. BEASLEY: It's actually, Mr. Beasley. I'm talking on behalf of Mrs. Beasley and myself. I just got a couple of points, actually. You know, I actually don't have any issue with a generator. I think it's a great idea when you have a power outage. My point is location, location, location. It's six feet from our front door. And it's a brand new house.

It's obtruse. It's a 5,000 feet house and it has a generator outside my front door away from 1256 front door. It's just a matter that they built a brand new house and the generator is a 2014 generation, which doesn't comply to 60 decibels noise monitoring. Therefore, it needs insulation. It needs positioning outside of my location or replaced. That's all I'm saying. Is I agree with the generator it just needs to be state of the art or at least insulated so that it's under 60 decibel. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. BEASLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before I move to this board --

MR. BEASLEY: Oh, could I just say one thing? Sorry. Sorry to interrupt.

You know, a petition with signatures are really irrelevant when you've got signatures from many people, you know, in Pavilion Park when they're 1.5 miles away. I'm talking six feet at 85 decibels. You can only come to me and ask me what the noise ratio is. That's all I'm saying. That's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay. I want to ask you, Joye, if you want to speak before we proceed to the board without any interruption?

MS. HARRIS: I would. I would like to tell --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're allowed to go for a few minutes only, please. Go ahead and conclude.

MS. HARRIS: I will. Thank you. You cannot insulate it. I'm told by Oak Electric you cannot insulate the generator. It is insulated as much as it can be. The hardships are the size of the lots. They're too small. There's no place that I can put it

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other things you would like to add before I close --

MS. HARRIS: I've done everything that I can.
I believe that I have changed the operation of it. I don't think my neighbor hears it now. But I've done everything I can do.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. And I'll request my board members to speak on this case. Anybody would like to speak on this and it's open?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Could Maureen speak more to that, please?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Who?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Maureen.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Maureen, you want to speak?

MS. UNDERHILL: Can you guys hear me all right?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.

MS. UNDERHILL: So should I give you the whole scene of what I've seen? What's happening is, is the charging time that is about 12 minutes a week and $I$ understand it's been reduced to not once per week. But once every other week for 12 minutes, the generator charges, from what I understand. And I met with Oak Electric on the scene. When it was charging initially, it was at 3800 RPMs and then Ms. Harris through her engineers were able to reduce the RPMs of the charging time from 38 to -- 3600, sorry, 3600 RPMs down to 18. So they halved it. That made the decibel level go from about 84 down to --

## (Interruption.)

MEMBER KRIEGER: Can you put yourselves on mute, please?

MS. UNDERHILL: So initially when it was charging once a week for 12 minutes it was coming out at about 84 decibels by our new decibel meter that we took.

I understand and I can't confirm, but that Ms. Harris made adjustments for it to only charge every other week at 1800, RPMS which reduced the decibel to about 72 decibels for 12 minutes every other week.
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But I understood from Oak Electric and they were very knowledgeable people, I learned a lot from them, that if the generator is serving the home during a power outage, it will have to run at the 3800 RPMs which puts it at about 84 decibels. The daytime maximum in our code says 60 decibels for equipment sound, 55 at night. So if it's going to be in use during a power outage, it's going to be about 83, 84 decibels.

I think it's a little more than six feet from the neighboring front door, but it is right on the property line. As we know, these lots are rather narrow up there on the lake. And so it is only about -- it's about five feet from the property line, the generator. So -- but the thing is that the charging time is every other week at about 72 decibels and then during use, it would be about 84 decibels.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So if you add, like, a whole bunch of other neighbors to that, that would just increase the decibels on the whole street.

MS. HARRIS: Yes.
MS. UNDERHILL: During a power outage if other neighbors have that type of generator or if
they're that close to -- we take the measurement from the neighboring property line. And we took measurements from both property lines. The other side of Ms. Harris' property is currently vacant but eventually there will be a home built there I'm sure.

So, yeah, during charging times, it's about 72 decibels which is, you know, about seven or eight decibels over our daytime maximum according to code. The code says 60, but it gives you a variance of six decibels. So it is over during the charging time for that 12 minutes every other week.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So that's a permanent one. So if I ran to the Home Depot or Lowe's and I bought myself a generator and then all the neighbors bought a generator and we all started them up, the one that's permanently installed could end up being louder?

MS. HARRIS: Un-unh. They're all running at the same decibel.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, at the same decibel. MS. HARRIS: They all run. And when a power outage happens, that is exactly -- you can open your front door and you can hear all of them on the street.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So this one is rechargeable per electric versus others that are gas powered?

MS. HARRIS: Not necessarily.
MS. UNDERHILL: Right.
MS. HARRIS: They're permanent also.
MS. UNDERHILL: This is a permanent --
MS. HARRIS: They're a lot of them that are permanent and there are a lot of them gas powered. It all depends.

MR. BEASLEY: I think --
MEMBER KRIEGER: And then firework -- and comparable to fireworks, like people shooting it off now that it can be any holiday, the sonic booms --

MS. HARRIS: Minor.
MR. KRIEGER: -- the other machinery that creates similar decibels, $I$ guess the major thing is where it's located. And I guess you're trying to appease as much as possible. Doing it during rush hour seems a wise and fair and kind option versus I hear neighbors in the apartments revving engines and it's at the -- any time day or night. So, I mean, ways of irritating neighbors can occur in many different ways and you're trying not to. So that should be
appreciated.
On location, that you've looked for other locations and this is what is the best which is unfortunate, but you're on the lake. So it seems a terrible quandary. So I'm still thinking I'd like to listen to the other members. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda. Any other board member, please?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member
Sanghvi, please go ahead, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: And I went and saw this site. And I realized there is such a tiny lot you can't put it anywhere without somebody able to hear this generator being charged or being used. There is no way you can prevent that.

And I understand Mr. Beasley's problem because they are not too far from that place. But this is such a tiny place and it is such a small generator where it is located, it would be very hard to relocate it without making quite substantial noise when it is being charged. And of course, when there is power outage, unfortunately, that would be unnecessary evil.

You can't get away without it and you do need a generator in this area. I know this area very well. And all those wires hanging there. And when there is an ice storm, those wires come down and there is a power outage and then you need a generator. And with all the sympathy to Mr. Beasley, but $I$ think this is a necessary evil and we need to grant them variance to continue using this which they have been using it for almost eight years. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi. Any other board member, please?

Okay. Looks like none. And I would like to call for the motion. Member Linda?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, I wanted -- okay. Well, then $I$ can add that into it.

I move to grant the request in case number PZ21-0028 sought by the petitioner for the generator. The petitioner has shown practical difficulty being on the lake. That the lake's lots are all smaller and unique and different topographies. That placing a piece of equipment on the lot can -- is a difficulty in and of itself. That the power outages, everybody is going to be running a generator so the sound will be
the same. So the request would be to as she's already done, that the running of the generator is going to once every other week and is at a rush hour when noise can be minimal. Otherwise, it's less -- so it's less obtrusive.

The variance is -- will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of her property because of the destruction that's already occurred on her property from water damage from lack of electricity and broken water pipes. It's unique because of its location. The -- she did not create the condition because the homes are on the lake and it's more humid and better -- or more water percentage.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because even though it's close, it's as far away from the property line as can be, it's run at a time when it's not inconvenient. That it's not an all day occurrence. It's for 12 minutes, I believe she said, and it's every other week. That is a minimum time request. And is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it minimizes. The decibels are as small as she can make them and doesn't interfere
with greater time for neighbors.
MR. SANGHVI: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay.
Katherine --
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do I need anything else?
Can I ask -- should I add anything else for Beth or legal counsel?

MS. SAARELA: No. I think that's fine.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Beth.
And thank you, Member Linda.
And Katherine, can you roll call, please?
MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. Chairperson
Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine. And congratulations, ma'am. And good luck.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And for the last case, PZ21-0030, Vijay Ghadge, 27668 Hartwick Circle, West of Wixom Road and South of Grand River Avenue, parcel number 50-22-18-201-055. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance 3.32-7 for a proposed deck seven feet from the rear yard property line, 17 feet minimum required, a variance of ten feet. This property is zoned low-density multiple family with a PRO, RM-1.

Is the applicant present, please?
MR. GHADGE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Vijay, please tell your name very slowly and clearly for our court record and our acting secretary, Katherine, will take it.

> Katherine, can you take it, please?

MR. GHADGE: Hello, zoning board members. I will spell my first name. It's V as in Victor, i-j-a-y. Last name $G$ as in George, $H$ as in hotel, A apple, D David, g-e.

MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. And are you an attorney?

MR. GHADGE: No, I'm not. I'm the house owner.

MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you. Then could you please swear or affirm to tell the truth in the case before you?

MR. GHADGE: Absolutely, I do.
MS. OPPERMANN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Katherine.

Vijay, how do you want us to help and where we can help tonight for this last case. Please present. This is your time.

MR. GHADGE: Of course. I'll try to be as quick as possible. It's been a long night for you also. First, I greatly appreciate you all taking time out of your busy day for these long calls. And second, I would like to apologize at once if you feel I'm not
prepared. And like all of the folks before me, I have never faced zoning board before so I didn't know what I should prepare for.

But having said that, this variance request is for you to please allow me to build a deck that goes 28 feet in the back yard which is only ten feet beyond what I would be otherwise allowed for the current zoning laws. And compared to the neighboring lots, unfortunately, my back yard is relatively small which kind of brings my back wall very close to the swale. And half the limitation of how far I can go before getting into trouble with City.

So, and as you can see, you know, I did not create this condition. This is how the property was when it was built. And without your approval to this variance request, it could create -- or you can say it creates a practical difficulty with that area of property cannot be reasonably enjoyed or used by building additions like that with the existing zoning laws. And I have beautiful woods in the back yard preserved area behind my house. Hence, the humble request to approve my request.

And last thing I'll say is, this request for
variance is in the rear yard. And it's not visible at all from the street. There is no house behind my property facing my back yard. So it will have zero impact on anyone's privacy. And also, this request, the side of the deck, will not cause any adverse impact to the surrounding property or property values. In fact, the impact may be positive in terms of, you know, the property values. So once again, you know, the humble request to please, you know, grant my request for this variance.

And that's all I would like to say.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Vijay. I have a quick question on this case. Do you have any presentation or do you have any diagram to show our board members tonight or you can share anything?

MR. GHADGE: Well, I had attached one diagram with my application package. I can share my screen to show that. But as I said earlier, if I knew that I would have to, you know, be so well prepared, I would have definitely made sure.

So let me --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please
present whatever you have. I know. So that the fellow board members can look into that.

MR. GHADGE: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And you mentioned there is no, nothing -- you know, back yard you explain. So that way we can see what you are saying in the back yard.
(Document displayed.)
MR. GHADGE: Absolutely. Absolutely. So let me zoom out of it. So this is what I have.

And I don't know if this helps the board members. But what $I$ can do, I will just pulling up while others we're talking. You can see this is the -sorry. Whether anyone is trying to say something.

This is my back yard. You can see it's all like in the woods and preserve. There is nothing behind. And this is my house here.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Okay. This is your deck for the -requesting for the -- how many feet you are requesting total?

MR. GHADGE: 28 by 28, please, yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
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MEMBER KRIEGER: The material?
MR. GHADGE: What was that? I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

MEMBER KRIEGER: The --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: What material are you using?

MR. GHADGE: Oh, what material. Sorry. So it's not wood. It's like composite, Trek. Composite wood.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Trek.
MR. GHADGE: We're going to use that. So it's easier to maintain, plus less overhead and all of that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Do you want to add any other thing before we move on this case, Mr. Vijay?

MR. GHADGE: Well, I mean, I did say what I wanted to and I would really appreciate if the board members approve this. As you can see, the back yard is so beautiful. I have like a small kid who can enjoy and it will really help us enjoy. And plus, the neighbors are awesome. You know, it's not going to cause anyone any issues or any challenges or any
concerns. So that's all I would like to say. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Vijay. We'll come to the point where neighbors involved. I appreciate.

And coming to the City. Larry, any other comments on this case, please?

MR. BUTLER: There's no comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Correspondence, acting secretary, Katherine, any correspondence on this case?

MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. There were 31 letters sent, none returned, one approval and no objections. The approval is from Komal (ph) Khot, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{t}$. And it's just a simple circled approval.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you. And any of the public raising their hand on the Zoom call?

MS. OPPERMANN: There's no one raising their hand on this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you so much. I appreciate, Vijay. And I see there is no -- nothing on the presentation, what all
you haven't shown. And I have no objection to grant this thing. And I will request my board members to, you know, whatever they want, they can present. And it's open to the board.

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

MEMBER SANGHVI: I went and visited this site. Behind, nothing else but some woodlands and wetlands. And there is no other visibility for anybody else.

And my only question is, is that going to be just enough? Otherwise mosquitos will eat them up before long and maybe they will have to cover it up before it is long. Because I don't know whether Mr. Ghadge has a covering up the deck in mind or not, but that will come in the future. If they don't, * no doubt. But I have no problem approving his request for the ten feet variance. Thank you.

MR. GHADGE: Thank you so much, sir.
Appreciate it.
MEMBER KRIEGER: The question is, 28 by 28. How did you come to that? Is the water -- is the
ground wet a lot that kids can't go out and play?
MR. GHADGE: Well, in a way it is wet, obviously, because there's a swale running across my property. But the reason behind like the area of 28 by 28, that seems like a decent size minimum that would help us enjoy the back yard, the woods behind and the scenery. So that was -- we would say that kind of made sense. Like, because if you go more beyond that, you will probably be crossing or getting as much closer to the end of the property and we didn't want to do so. MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. MR. GHADGE: Thank you. MEMBER SANKER: And I don't have a question, but overall it seems like a relatively reasonable variance request and there's no objections to it I didn't think. And then there is, obviously, the shape of the lot and wetlands that $I$ think would cause an issue that would make -- it looks like it makes the back yard a little bit smaller than some of those surrounding areas which may cause the setback to be greater, the setback variance to be greater than maybe other property owners. And so I would say it's a little bit bigger than your approaching the edge, but
overall, you know, it seems reasonable. There's no objections. So overall, I think there's no reason to -- I would approve it.

MR. GHADGE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Before I close, any
other board member would like to speak? (No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. It looks
like none. Member Sanghvi, can you make a motion, please?

MEMBER SANGHVI: Sure I can make a motion. No difficulty.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I move that we grant the variance requested with case number PZ21-0030 requested by Vijay Ghadge at 27668 Hartwick Circle. The request is for a ten-foot variance in the back yard to build a deck. The applicant has shown practical difficulty requiring the need for this variance. And this variance is not likely to cause any problems with the neighborhood or any of the neighboring property. And the property is unique because it is pie-shaped and the size of the back side -- back yard is different than
that of the front.
The relief granted will not interfere with anybody else. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Thank you.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Sanghvi. Okay. Who was the second?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, Linda. Member
Linda. Thank you. Okay. And call for the --
Katherine, for the roll call tonight.
MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanghvi?
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: And Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations,
Mr. Vijay. Good luck and enjoy the deck in the summer. Thank you.

MR. GHADGE: Thank you so much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Thank you so much.

All the board members, is there any other matters, the motion to adjourn or, you know, any other things before I say all in favor?

MEMBER SANGHVI: So moved to adjourn.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you so much and --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Katherine? Wait. Katherine said something.

MS. OPPERMANN: Sorry. Just reminder that this is considered our last Zoom meeting unless --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, we get to meet in council chambers. Thank God.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. We made it. Thank you. Good news for all of us. Thank you, Katherine.
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MS. OPPERMANN: And then one other item. I did send you all a letter that we received from a HOA concerning a case we had heard back in April. Did anyone want to speak on that or did you choose to, you know, not?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda, do you want to say --

MEMBER KRIEGER: No.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I didn't see it.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I don't know which case.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah, I didn't look at it.
MEMBER KRIEGER: No, no, no. I have nothing
to say.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. She sent an
Email also on the April thing.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I said yes, if we need to, we can do it next time. Thank you.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. In person call, we can do it. Motion is adjourned.
(At 9:19 p.m., meeting adjourned.)
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