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MS. OPPERMAN: We're still missing three of our expected members, including the chairperson. Would we like to move forward with the meeting having the vice chair lead or would we like to continue to hold?

MEMBER SANKER: I'm okay moving forward.
MS. OPPERMAN: Beth, does it look like it should be -- we have four members present so that should be the quorum for any of the cases, correct? MR. BUTLER: That should be correct. MS. OPPERMAN: Okay. In that case, I would say you can go ahead and proceed, Member Sanker.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. I will say I'm not totally prepared to lead the meeting, but I'll give it a go. Do we start with any of the -- like, the saying of the Pledge or anything like that?

MS. SAARELA: Just go through the scheduled agenda. Start from the top of the agenda and read
through that. So you'll start with ...
MEMBER SANKER: Call to order, Pledge of Allegiance, roll call?

MS. SAARELA: Roll call.
MEMBER SANKER: So then, Katherine. Please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly. Member Krieger is currently absent.

Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Present.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you. Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina is currently absent. Member Sanghvi is absent, excused.

Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Here.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson appears to be currently absent.

And Member Verma?
(No audio response.)
MEMBER SANKER: I see him. Does that count?
MS. OPPERMAN: It looks like Chairperson
Peddiboyina has just joined.


CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I'm okay.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Hey, Kate. This is Mike

Thompson. Did you get me?
MS. OPPERMAN: I did not. Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: And, Joe, we were about to approve the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And roll call. Roll call is done. Thank you, Kathy.

And the agenda ...
Looks like we have on the board a quorum.
Kathy, if you can confirm we have enough quorum.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. We have a quorum. Thank you, Joe.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's move on right to a public hearing format and rules. And then, if you can, adjust your phones to be turned off.

And we'll have a public hearing when each cased is called upon and you can raise the Zoom call. We're not on the podium right now. We don't have a podium or anything. And that will be on computer. You can see on the computer at home and as well as the people that is on the Zoom video. Once you come, you can spell your first and last name for the reporter and
the secretary.
And we have on the agenda today, we have a total of nine cases.

Katherine, correct, we have nine cases?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes, correct.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Let us go to the approval of the agenda. Is there changes or anything for the approval of the agenda?

MS. OPPERMAN: There are no changes to the agenda other than it was changed from the typical meeting at the Civic Center to this remote meeting. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Then somebody can move the motion for the approval of this agenda.

MEMBER SANKER: I move to approve the agenda.
MEMBER THOMPSON: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And the minutes of the meeting last month -- I mean, January and February meeting. Somebody can move the motion for that meet, for January and February 2020, please.

BOARD MEMBER: I so move.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER SANKER: Then I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Public remarks, anyone have anything other than the cases in front of the ZBA, you can raise your hand and the Zoom video monitor can take care of that one.

If anybody is there apart from the agenda in the audience?

Okay, seeing none. The public hearing will go. And let's go to the first case.

Today's first case of PZ19-0049 for Bonner Properties, LLC, Beck Road, east of Beck Road and south of Nine Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-33-100-013. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi, Zoning Board Section 3.1.2 for front yard and -MS. OPPERMAN: Joe.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah?

MS. OPPERMAN: Joe, I believe you may be reading from the wrong agenda. The first case for tonight should be PZ20-0004 for Mandalay Circle.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I'm sorry about that.

And PZ19-0032, Marcus Village Apartment --
MS. OPPERMAN: Nope. Nope. The first case
for tonight is PZ20-0004, for Maen Jabboori at 26181 Mandalay Circle.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Got it. Thank you. I'm sorry about that again.

PZ20-0004, M-a-e-n, Maen Jabboori, 26181 Mandalay Circle, east of Beck Road and north of 11 Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-16-300-086. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 3.6.2.iii to remove vegetation from within a wetland setback.

This property is zoned single family, R-1. This case was postponed from the cancelled 3-17-2020 meeting.

Is the applicant here, please?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Is the applicant is present?

MS. OPPERMAN: I don't see that Mr. Jabboori is listed on our participant list as of yet.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Do you want to do something, Kathy, for one or two minutes to see or what do you want to do?

MS. OPPERMAN: I believe you would have to
make a motion to --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Postpone?
MS. OPPERMAN: -- put it until later.
Or am I mistaken on that, Beth? Do they have to just come back to it?

MS. SAARELA: You can make a motion to table it until later in the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I agree and somebody can make a motion for that.

MEMBER SANKER: I so move.
MEMBER LONGO: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And
let's move to the second case.
PZ20-0005, Michael Buca, 1501 Paramount
Street, west of Novi Road and north of 13 Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-378-005. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 5.1.9 to allow the storage of a commercial vehicle on a residential lot. The vehicle is intended to be converted into a personal recreational vehicle.

Is the applicant present? Michael?
(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael, are you there?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Katherine, the applicant is not present? Can you see?

MS. OPPERMAN: I don't see that Mr. Buca is listed either.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Then somebody can make a motion that we put the last call for another date.

MEMBER VERMA: I make the motion to postpone this case, please.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. So I need a second.

MEMBER LONG: I will second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And in that case, moving to case number three, PZ20-0006, Down Home Construction 305 Duana Avenue, west of Old Novi Road and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-03-481-012.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 3.1.5 for a 13 feet, one inch front yard setback, 30 feet required.

And for a 3 feet 8 inches side yard setback, 10 feet required.

These variances will accommodate the construction of a front deck. The property is zoned single family residential, R-4. This case was postponed from cancelled 3-17-2020 meeting. If the applicant is there?

MS. TYLER: Well, I'm the homeowner.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, you are the homeowner. If you can tell your first and last name for me and the secretary and the reporter.

MS. TYLER: Stephanie Tyler. Do I need to spell it?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. TYLER: S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e, Tyler, T-y-l-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Secretary, if you can take a vote, please.

Kathy, our secretary is there?
MS. OPPERMAN: I can act as secretary as Member Krieger is not here.

Ms. Tyler, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this matter?

MS. TYLER: Yes, I do.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, ma'am. You can proceed.

Thank you, Kathy.
MS. TYLER: Well, I'm seeking a variance to get the -- I currently have a front deck, but it needs to be repaired. And in talking to this particular contractor, he mentioned that it is not done -- it's really not correct and he needs to -- it would be best to enlarge the porch or make it wider. Because right now the posts are blocking my windows.

So to make it a little bit wider -- it will not exceed the width of the house. I'm not even sure it will be the same width of the house. The porch may still be smaller than the width of the house but just larger than what it currently is. So I believe that's the reason we're seeking a variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Did you want to add anything, ma'am?

MS. TYLER: Me? Not at this time.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. And I don't have any questions.

I can direct anything the fellow members want to speak of. Members, anybody wants to ask any questions, you can now proceed.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead.

MEMBER SANKER: I was just asking about the City's perspective and then anything from correspondence from neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MS. OPPERMAN: I can speak on the correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: For this case there were 37 letters sent out. We received eight returned. No approvals and no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Kathy, acting secretary.

Okay. And the board, anybody wants to say anything?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes. This is my Michael. I drove by there yesterday, Stephanie, the other day and I don't think you're any closer to the street than some of your neighbors. I don't have any issue with this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER SANKER: I took a look at your application and some of the drives in there. And I agree with Mike, Member Longo. And it looks to be like a pretty straightforward variance and I don't see any reason why we should deny it. So I would be in favor of it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. SAARELA: You still have to open and close the public hearing for each one of these. Even though there might not be any members of the public there, you still have to open and close the public hearing before you vote.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, yes.
Yeah, going back to any other public remarks. Anyone want to speak on this case?

Okay. Seeing none. We can move on. Anybody want to speak on the case, any board members?
(No response.)
MEMBER SANKER: Then, if not, I'm ready to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.
MEMBER SANKER: I move that we grant the
variance in case number PZ20-0006 sought by the petitioner for the front yard setback of 13 feet one-inch and side setback of three feet, eight inches because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring this variance. Without the variance the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because she won't have use of her front porch.

The property is unique because of its proximity to two bodies of water. The petitioner did not create the condition because of the shape of the lot and its location between two bodies of water existed when she purchased it. The relief granted won't unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the deck does not encroach on nearby properties and there were no objections from any neighbors.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and ordinance because even with the addition there is still adequate room between the properties.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. And somebody can make a second? MEMBER THOMPSON: I can second that.


Mile Road, west of Haggerty and south of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-12-200-041. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 28.5 to allow two additional wall signs, 14.2 and 62.6 square feet, respectively, beyond the permitted two. And for an eight feet high ground sign. Six feet high maximum allowed by code. This property is zoned Office Service Technology, OST. This case was postponed from cancelled 3-17-2020 meeting.

If the applicant is there, please?
MR. FIELDS: Yes. Jim Fields with Allied Signs, 33650 Giftos Drive in Clinton Township.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. All set. Our secretary, if you can take a vote, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Um, you would like me to swear in the applicant?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly.
Mr. Fields, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this matter before you?

MR. FIELDS: Yes, I do.
MS. OPPERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And you
can proceed. What do you want to say about your case?
MR. FIELDS: Well, we're approaching the board to see if we can get an extra two feet behind the monument sign ...
(No clear audio to report.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry. Your voice is breaking.

MR. FIELDS: Hello?
Oh, sorry. Of the modified -- hello.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. Your network is very poor.
(No clear audio to report.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Hello?
MR. FIELDS: Do you want try this some other route? I'm limited on what $I$ can do.

MS. OPPERMAN: The audio sounded a bit better at that moment. Could you perhaps repeat from the beginning?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sir, are you on the speaker phone?

MR. FIELDS: Yeah. Let me try to make a little adjustment.

Is this any better at all?
 connection, please.

Okay. Want to fix your phone and we'll give you a couple of minutes time.

MR. FIELDS: Anything? Nothing?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. It's a poor
connection.

MR. FIELDS: That's fine.
If that'll work, I'll call back. I will call in.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You want to fix your line and then call back in.

MR. FIELDS: Okay. I'll be back.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Kathy?
MR. FIELDS: I'll call in on a different
line. I have to find the information on my phone.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Kathy, can you hear me?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. I can hear you, Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to move or put this off on this case. Can you call and fix his phone? What do you want to do on that?

MS. OPPERMAN: I'm happy to put it whereever. You would like to postpone it to later on the agenda?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Maybe we can
put it at the end of the day.
Is everybody okay, board members?
(Affirmative responses.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to make a motion, Kathy, for this one?

MS. OPPERMAN: I'm not a member. So I would not be able to make a motion, but you would be able to open it up to any of the other board members.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Joe?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MEMBER KRIEGER: I'm here. We will call it at the end of the meeting or we can table it until the next month's meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda, please do one thing and table it until the end of this meeting. MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I move.

MEMBER VERMA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Say
"Aye" in favor.
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay.
And let's go to case number five: PZ20-0008, Michael

Noonan, 1019 South Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number

50-22-03-330-006. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code Section 3.32-10.ii.a for a proposed 180 square feet lake front shed, 100 square feet allowed by code. This property is zoned single family residential, R-4.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. If the applicant is there, please?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. Is the petitioner there for Michael Noonan? Are you there?

MR. NOONAN: Can you hear me?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you Michael Noonan?
MR. NOONAN: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Do you swear or
affirm to tell the truth in this case?
(No response.)
MEMBER KRIEGER: Mr. Noonan?
MR. NOONAN: Yes. I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you spell your
first and last name for my secretary for reporting.

MR. NOONAN: Sure. It's Michael Noonan, M-i-c-h-a-e-l, Noonan, $N-o-o-n-a-n$.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. In this case do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case? MR. NOONAN: I do. MEMBER KRIEGER: Very good. Proceed. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You can proceed.

MR. NOONAN: Okay. So, yeah, we're trying to -- so we had issues with storing stuff in -- in anywhere around here. We're looking to get a, what, a 16 by 20 structure. For instance, two paddle boards each are 12 foot long by three foot wide.

We have four kayaks for us and our kids. Two of them are eight foot. Two of them are 13 foot and both are about three feet long. We've been trying to store, like, life vests, flotation devices, toys, outdoor chairs, tables. They get ruined every year.

Keeping them in there would be a great benefit out of the elements. Our -- we currently have a one-car garage. So keeping one car in that garage and then trying to keep those, the paddle boards, it's very difficult. There's been issues with theft. We
actually got some of our kayaks that were stolen off of our property because we can't keep them locked up.

South Lake Drive is kind of a busy street. People go much faster than the posted speed of 25. Each year we get more and more traffic. Additional storage would allow us to keep all those items over there and from moving back and forth.

I don't feel like we're asking for much. The additional 80 square foot. There's a hundred square allowed now. We're only asking for 80 square foot. And if you look at our lot coverage, that's only 16 percent lot coverage. So we're hoping we can get the additional 80 square foot. And that will help us out a lot and we hope you will consider our appeal.

MEMBER KRIEGER: What's your anticipated height of the building?

MR. NOONAN: Ten foot to the very peak.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You want to say anything, Michael?

MR. NOONAN: The only thing I would like to say is it's not going to be an eyesore. It's not going to be just like an ordinary storage shed. We're going
to make it a storage. We're going to make it match our house. We're going to have like a stone on the outside. So it's going to be a feature -- it's going to look very presentable. It's not going to look like just a storage shed with wood. It will match our house. It'll go nice with the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Is there any in the audience that would like to speak on this case, please?

Okay. Seeing none.
From the City?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Katherine, any
correspondence?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. For this case there were 28 letters mailed out. There were three responses received. We received one simple approval from Heath at 905 South Lake.

We received an objection. The objection reads that: "There are reasons for the zoning codes requiring maximum building size of 100 square feet. This variance request is almost double that size and will redefine the look and use of our lakefront. This would also set a precedence for others to construct
similar size buildings near the lake. If the request was for a small variance of 10 percent accompanied by a good reason, maybe. This is far too extreme and would hinder the view and enjoyment by adjacent property owners. For this reason, I object to the variance requested." And that is from Mr. William Berringer at 109 South Lake.

Then there is another approval from Tamara Murphy asking that we please note their approval to the requested variance. They believe the Noonan's plans for the shed on the lake lot looks like a nice improvement for the property and will enhance property values.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Kathy. And the City? From the City, anything?

MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
And any other on the board like to speak on this case, please?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Do you have any drawings on the building for people that are viewing could see?

MR. NOONAN: So I have a layout of what it would -- like, what the lot is going to look like with
the structure being here. This would be like a patio within a fire pit. Can you see that?

MEMBER THOMPSON: I can. Are the bushes the lot line?

MR. NOONAN: The bushes would be the lot line, yes.

Currently, we have a fence that's pretty beat up. So we were going to try to make it look better with some arborvitaes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Is that the reason you need the variance is because it goes right to the lot line or is it the size of the building?

MR. NOONAN: The size of the building.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board member would like to speak on this case, please?

MEMBER SANKER: Yes. Was the lake on the top part of your drawing there?

MR. NOONAN: Yes. The lake was like the blue part here. This would be the lake. So the lake would be here. This is just going to be, like, a paver, a fire pit and then this is going to be our structure to keep all of our kayaks in.

MEMBER SANKER: And I'm intended to share the concern of one of the people who objected just about the size. So why do you have to be almost double the square footage of what is recommended?

MR. NOONAN: Because you have a 10 by 10 -if you have a 10 by 10 structure and you're trying to put a 13-foot paddle board in there, it just doesn't fit. We had a kayak stolen this year. We actually had a dock section stolen this year. So we're just trying to keep the stuff inside of it. They don't fit as well as -- like I said, lawn furniture, something you keep out there, it just gets deteriorized over the years.

So if we keep them inside, I think aesthetically it would look better and it would keep our stuff from getting stolen.

MEMBER SANKER: If it was just 10 by 10 could you still use it for most of the things that you wanted to use it for?

MR. NOONAN: No. I had a 10 by 10 up until last year there. We can barely utilize it at all. Nothing would fit inside of it.

Yeah, like life vests and stuff would fit in it, but our kayaks and our paddle boards would not fit
inside a 10 by 10.
MEMBER SANKER: And, lastly, about the obstruction. I mean, I guess, could you just speak to that a little bit about the obstruction and what one of the homeowner's most concerned about?

MR. NOONAN: Yeah. I don't know how you have any obstructed views. I mean, everybody that -- I mean, 109 , that's got to be way down the street. That's not even in the vicinity of my house. Right? We're 1019. That was 109. So I don't know -- I don't -- I mean, the people in our area, you know, we know them all. Nobody's ever said anything about it. We kind of mentioned to them we were going to put one up. Nobody of my knowledge disapproved it.

There's several -- I mean, mine is going to be 180 square feet. There's several of them on the lake that are 24 by 24 that are actually two-car garages that are on the lake. So I don't think by asking for 180 square foot is that far off. I think there are a lot of the ones going up are twice the size of that one.

I mean, I'm not -- is it the height or the width that's posing the obstruction?

MEMBER SANKER: Well, I don't know what they're talking about and what their concerns are, specifically. I was just asking you to speak to it, to their concern there.

So the variance itself is only for the square footage of the building. You're within the height. So that's the only thing we're approving.

MR. NOONAN: Right. So before I had a 10 by 10. So if you're going -- so if it's obstruction, the 16 foot is going lengthwise. So it would have very less -- it would be the same. So the obstruction from the road would only be two feet. Because we're only going 12 and we used to have 10. So it's only two foot. So the obstruction would be almost the same. Actually, from their point of view we would only be going two foot more.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. I feel like I wouldn't have an issue for the variance. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And anybody in the board, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. I have a question through the chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Yes, please,
go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: For the variance for the shed is it still eight by eight, to the City?

Is that the minimum for any variance request?
MR. BUTLER: The height is 12 foot.
MS. OPPERMAN: The height would be the maximum allowable for the code for the lakefront properties.

MEMBER KRIEGER: In my -- his request is reasonable. Aesthetically, it's matching the neighborhood and the needs of that area around the lake, so I would be able to approve this request because he's minimizing his height and then he's making it the length. So the obstruction of the view would be minimal. So I would be able to approve it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda. Any other board member who would like to speak on this case, please?

Okay. Michael, I have a question. You mentioned that you would like to make it match your current house, am I right?

MR. NOONAN: Yes. We're going to make it match the house, correct.

Thank you. Anybody wants to make a motion on the board, please?

Linda, would you like to make a motion?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Sure. In case number -where is it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: PZ20-0008, number five.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For Michael Noonan for 1019 South Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel 50-22-03-330-006, I move to approve the petitioner's request.

Without the variance the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of his property because of the current needs of residents along the lake. The property is unique because it is a lakefront and the petitioner did not create the condition. Because everyone going to the water has needs that need to be put away and made to look neat in the wintertime.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties.

He's minimizing to the best of his ability with size and the way it's placed on the property with the longer side of stretching down to the water and the shorter side along the roadside and then the height will be minimized as well.

And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because he said he's going to match what his house is like and this will add to the area.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda. And Katherine, can you call the roll?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I need a second.
MEMBER SANKER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine, can you call for the roll, please?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Approved.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Longo?
MEMBER LONG: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And congratulations, Michael.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Congratulations.
MR. NOONAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Let's move to case number six PZ20-0010, Grissim Metz Andriese Associates, Catholic Central High School, 27225 Wixom Road, west of Wixom Road and south of Grand River Avenue. Parcel number 50-22-18-200-027.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 28-5(a) to allow four proposed ground signs exceeding the number of signs and the height of signs allowed. One ground sign is permitted at a maximum height of six feet. The property is zoned single family residential, R-1.

Is the applicant present, please, Kathy?
MR. TUREK: Good evening. I'm Edward Turek, president of the Catholic Central High School.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. How are you,
sir?

MR. TUREK: Good. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Spell the first and last name. Spell it for CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA record and for my secretary and proceed.

MR. TUREK: Sure. Edward Turek, E-d-w-a-r-d T-u-r-e-k, president of Detroit Catholic Central High School, 27225 Wixom Road, Novi, Michigan.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. TUREK: No, I'm not, but our attorney will speak shortly.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. For you, would you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. TUREK: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda, I have a question. There's one more person joining you in this case?

MEMBER KRIEGER: The attorney. He doesn't
need to be sworn in.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
Yeah. You may proceed, sir.
MR. TUREK: Thank you. I would like to take a quick moment and introduce everyone that's on the call our team to answer any questions. The first person is our president emeritus, Father Richard Elmer, who was the gentleman who led our move from Redford to Novi 20 years ago.

FATHER ELMER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Catholic Central appreciates all that the city of Novi has done and is doing to support our educational efforts. And we hope that we are making --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sir, can you spell your first and last name.

FATHER ELMER: Father Richard Elmer, E-l-m-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
FATHER ELMER: You're welcome. I'll start over. Catholic Central appreciates all that the City of Novi has done and is doing to support our educational efforts. We hope that we are making a contribution to the city. That contribution includes
maintaining the beauty of our campus. We are here tonight with an opportunity to enhance that beauty in a very stunning way. Mr. Turek and the team will now explain that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. TUREK: Thank you, Father.
Ladies and gentlemen, also on the line with us is our landscape architects, Steve Endres and Rich Houdek from Grissim Metz; Andy Wozniak, our civil engineer; and Joe Vig, our assistant manager and legal representation, Tom Ryan. Who I'm going to ask Tom now why we need the variance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Who all is speaking on this call, you need to tell first and last name for spelling for my court record, please.

MR. TUREK: Okay. The only other person who is going to talk is Tom Ryan, so I'll let Tom do that.

So Steve Endres, S-t-e-v-e, E-n-d-r-e-s and Rich, R-i-c-h, Houdek, H-o-u-d-e-k, from Grissim Metz.

Andy Wozniak, A-n-d-y, W-o-z-n-i-a-k, from Zeimet Wozniak. And Joe Vig, J-o-e, V-i-g, from Vig Construction.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You may
proceed, sir.
MR. RYAN: Very good. Thank you. My name is Tom Ryan. I am an attorney with offices at 2055 Orchard Lake Road in Sylvan Lake, Michigan 48320. Thank you for this evening's opportunity to meet with you in this new world we have. So I hope everybody's safe and healthy.

As you know, the Zoning Board is to look at each property as unique regarding its particular individual characteristics.

Catholic Central believes that when the Zoning Board looks at our property in our variance request, you will find that the scope and size of this request are appropriate for the frontage on Wixom Road. The extraordinary circumstances or conditions for practical difficulties of our property is its natural features. And, in essence, its greatest advantages are its natural features in this case the natural features are its greatest challenge.

What I mean by that is there's an existent distance since the Catholic Central was able to have the three homes removed on the west side of Wixom Road, south of Grand River. Now we have -- with the Planning

Commission's approval we have an 1100 square foot vista of natural features of landscape material and trees that are going to beautify the area. And this is consistent with Catholic Central and the City of Novi's use of this property and how it's been treated since we came here some 20 years ago.

So the point is is that with this vista -and Mr. Endres, who did the technical work in explaining it to you, provides a fact that it is difficult because of the setback for the signs in the roadway to actually see what the -- see what is behind these beautiful trees. Because it looks like just a beautiful vista, but there's an educational community right behind it.

Unlike other non-residential uses, which our school is, similar to an institutional use, normally on the street you would be able to see the use, the building or whatnot and you would be able to see the sign. In this case the use of the school cannot be seen as it's 700 feet back or west of Wixom Road. So we need to have a balance in how we can notify people of our destination -- and we're truly a regional destination -- and how we can meet with the natural
features and the beautiful landscaping that we provided along Wixom Road.

So the variance requests are to -- the City allows one six foot ground sign and we are asking to have four ground signs.

The reason for that is is that the signs that -- our signs requested in our packet are two, three, four and five. Two and five are the Catholic Central logo, which historically and traditionally with Catholic Central -- with what they've identified themselves with since they have been started in 1928.

And the other number three request is for a cross. Which is a structure, but it would denote a religious institution, which is a customary accessory to a religious institution, as we are a Catholic school and we have a religious affiliation.

So we are asking to cluster several of the signs at our north entrance, which will make that -- which is where the entrance is now. Which will make that the focal point of the entrance.

We have anecdotal information, which we have shown in our papers that delivery drivers and people somehow can't find our school because, in fact, it's
hidden from -- behind Wixom Road. So we would like to cluster those signs in the front of the school with the cross in the median to show where the main entrance and egress is for the school.

The height's requirement, the three height requirement requests are for the two signs for Catholic Central, the CC at the north and south entrance, and for the cross, which will be in the median.

The other is for the number of signs. And again, we have stated that we're asking for -- the Catholic Central High School sign is already allowed, but we're asking for a sign that indicates what the address of the property is, which you can see is sign application four or five.

And it also contains historical and traditional information relative to the Basilian Fathers when the first Catholic Central was founded. And the traditional support given by many of our alums who is recognized by Mr. Nesmith (ph).

So that is what we are requesting today that along this 1100 foot distance, we're clustering three of the signs and the cross up in the front where the current north entrance is. But we need the variance
for the number of signs and then the height variance for the cross and for the Catholic Central logo, which is about a two-foot variance request, and then for the south entrance.

Now, we don't believe this is -- we're asking for too much. In view of the fact that the signs are all clustered as a designated entrance for the school at the north entrance, to clear up any issues. There's a long stretch of just natural features until you get to the south entrance. And in this way our school will be identified and we believe the public, health, safety and welfare will be protected.

This is not a self-created hardship. The school's been there for many years, but when the opportunity came from generous alumni to finish the front of the streetscape on Wixom Road by removing the houses, this provided a great opportunity. And so it's not like we have a bermishing (ph) sign every 50 feet. We're keeping most of the signs up at the front entrance in the north and the one sign on the south entrance.

So we believe that this is not self-created. That we will not adversely impact anybody in the area
relative to these signs. That we're only asking for the minimal amount of variance request to utilize our property to allow people to actually see where the entrance for the school is as opposed to people maybe not understanding where the school is. And in conclusion, I hope you will find these requests to be appropriate with the scope and size. And because of the unique characteristics of this property and its use we believe the request is reasonable and appropriate and we respectfully would request your positive consideration this evening. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, sir. Anybody wants to speak on this case? Anybody, please?

Okay. Seeing none.
Okay, is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak on this case?

Anybody in the audience?
MR. ENDRES: I would like to add a couple of things, if I might. This is Steve Endres, the designer on the project. Just to be brief to add to what Tom had to say.

Our goal with the design was to create a unified appearance along the frontage because you can't see the school, all the trees block the view. So through a mixture of different design elements, walls, landscape berming, we're creating a unified expression across the front. The desire is to then integrate signage into this expression, punctuating the entry points.

But the request for the additional number of signs is not so that we can broadcast the name of the school five additional times. All signs work together to present a narrative of not just identifying that the school is here, but also to provide information about the heritage, the legacy, the important character of the institution that it is. Really, all five pieces work together to communicate that and I think you'll see from the documents that were presented how these elements work together.

Now, the reason why some of those fit into different pieces rather than all clustered on the one sign speaks to the hierarchy of the messaging such that the larger signs are going to identify the property. You're going to see them from further away.

The secondary messaging is smaller text that
you see as you turn into the site. So there is a different level of how the messaging is received. And, really, the scale of the signs, speaking to the height variance, has to do with the fact that the frontage of the property is 1100 linear feet. Again, solid trees behind it. So it's a long link. Between 70 and hundred feet from the center line of the road. And we've got this tall backdrop of trees. So we can't count on the architecture of the building being a public expression of the institution.

So through these landscape elements and the signage elements, we're trying to make up for some of those challenges. I hope that you guys see that. And thank you for the opportunity to present this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

Anybody in the audience, please? MEMBER KRIEGER: Nope.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Seeing none.
Is anybody there?
Okay. Seeing none. Correspondence, secretary? Kathy? MS. OPPERMAN: For this case there were

122 letters sent. We received 14 approvals through the mail. I believe that the applicants have been in contact with some of the surrounding properties. Most of them sent in similar support message for the meeting. There were no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much. And from the City?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Larry?
MR. BUTLER: Yes. I'm here. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anything from the City, please?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. I want to say the design of the sign and the height and with the background and the foliage, the design would complement the safety of the congregation of guests coming to that location because they would see it from a further distance. They would not have to abruptly brake to try to get in the place. So it is an added safety factor. So, yes, I think it was designed very well.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
I don't have any questions. And I know this school. And my friend's kids also studying in the same
school. The presentation is excellent and I have no question and I'll put it on the board.

Anybody who would like to speak on the board, please?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I would like to say I go by there every night going home. And I think the scale and setting justifies the scale and the number of signs. It is a good safety issue, that people can see it from a long ways away and not get that braking as they're seeing where they are.

Especially, the south entrance, it's very hard to see when you're going down the road. So enhancing those signs, $I$ think, is another excellent idea.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much. Any other board members who would like to speak on this?

MEMBER LONGO: Yeah. I went to the property and I think that -- just to launch off of what Cliff said. It's a lot of property there. The signs are not really that high. If you look at what they submitted as to the design, I think it's a huge improvement. I think they're attractive and I absolutely have no
problem with this.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much. Anybody in the board, please?

MEMBER LONGO: I would like to make a ...
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You would like to make a motion?

MEMBER LONG: Yes. I would like to make a motion. Does anybody else wish to speak?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead and make a motion.

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we grant the variance in case PZ20-0010 sought by Catholic Central High School for -- because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring additional -- requiring exposure and information for the size of the property.

Without the variance the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because of the size of the property, the setback of the facility and the trees that are right on the street.

The property is unique because the school is not visible from the street.

The petitioner did not create the condition
because the property is, as I mentioned, treed, and the location of the school complex is behind all those trees.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because the signs are not extremely large and are attractive.

The relief -- I'm sorry. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the property permits additional signage plus the additional landscape, actually, makes it much more attractive than it's been for the last few years. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

MS. SAARELA: Did we do public comment and correspondence?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. Katherine did already. MS. SAARELA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. We did that one. Thank you.

And anybody make a second?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
All say in favor, "Aye." Page 50
MEMBER KRIEGER: We have to call the roll.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, roll call,
Katherine?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?

MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
and safe.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Let's move it along to our next case. PZ20-0011 Michael Thompson Design, 1310 East Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-151-033 the applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code, Section 3.1.5 for a proposed lot coverage of 26.8 percent, 25 percent maximum coverage allowed by code; and a proposed side yard setback of five feet and 5.65 feet, and 10 feet minimum required by code.

And an aggregate side yard setback of 10.56 feet, 25 feet required by code. The property is zoned single family residence, R-4.

Is the applicant present, please?
Michael Thompson, is it?
MR. THOMPSON: Hello. This is Michael

Thompson. Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Again, if you can spell your first and last name for the record and for my secretary.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. It's Michael Thompson, M-i-c-h-a-e-l, T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n. tell the truth in this case?

MR. THOMPSON: I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. You may proceed.
MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I am the architect as well as the applicant. We would like to have the owner, Robert and Chey Varto, to speak first and describe the project and then I would like to speak to address the design and the variances, if this is possible.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup. Go ahead.
MR. VARTO: Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Hello.
MR. VARTO: Hello.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You can spell your first and last name, please.

MR. VARTO: Robert Varto, R-o-b-e-r-t.
Varto, V, as in Victor, A-r-t-o.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. VARTO: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You may
proceed.
MR. VARTO: Yes. So thank you for your time this evening. I have a presentation. I can show -- I can bring it up on the screen to show the designs or I can flash some pictures of some printouts that I have. What is easier? Would that be okay?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. Go ahead.

MR. VARTO: So I can flash pictures up as we go along.

So my wife and I are looking for these deviations approved in order to grow the back of our house back roughly 15 feet. There were a number of issues with the home when we moved in. The house is, basically -- it's down into the side of a hill. So that our first floor, essentially, is the basement. And in the basement we have our family room, our kitchen and our storage, including utility room. The utility room is a six foot by 11 foot room that houses our HVAC unit, our water heater, washer and dryer, our water treatment system as well as a utility tub. So a lot of things in a very, very small area.

I'll show you a picture of our utility room
to give you an idea.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can hold it up to your phone or something. You can show it like that.
(Document displayed.)
MR. VARTO: Can you see that?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MR. VARTO: So that's just looking straight in from outside the utility room. But please take note of this. This is our HVAC and hot water heater, which is literally wall to wall.

And then a little bit up close you can see right here is the hot water heater, which is literally pinned back by the HVAC unit. So certainly these things are not serviceable. I'm worried about in the future there's going be an issue $I$ have to remove everything if $I$ have to service my water heater.

I can't service it to deseal it right now. And as a matter of fact, when $I$ was putting together this presentation, I had a leak from one of my water treatments and it was a bear to just go in there and figure out what the root cause was.

So first and foremost, we're looking to -- if we grew the house back, we could improve the situation
by having a separate utility room and creating a separate washer and dryer room keeping everything clean and neat and tidy.

Secondly, on the second level is where our bedroom is. And we have a very tiny master bath and a small closet for a home that I consider to be really nice and more upscale, a certainly beautiful home on the lake.

When we grow the home back 15 feet, not only will we improve the utility situation on the first floor, but we're looking to have a master bath added. Our master bath is very small and our walk-in closet is teeny-tiny as well. So both of those things will be rectified by this.

In addition, we're going to blow out all of the deck that was existing when we moved in off the back of home. It must be about 2,500 square feet of deck that is dilapidated and falling apart. We plan on removing all that, simplifying everything and adding over 1800 square feet of green space, grass and sod, plants and some small trees up close to the home.

In a nutshell, I think this is a major improvement for the home, for the community and it'll
actually make the house look stunning from the back, wall-to-wall window, first floor and a sliding glass out the second floor on to a deck.

From there I'll turn it over to Mike and he can take you through the variance request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Michael?
Michael, are you there?
MR. THOMPSON: Hello.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You would like to speak on this case, anything?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, please.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead.
MR. THOMPSON: To reiterate the shortcomings of the house, the house was built back in the '40s. And it is a slab on grade and pushed back away from the lake further back than the two neighbors.

We need -- or requesting three variances to make this possible, the shortcomings of this house functional shortcomings. One is the minimal side yard setback of 10 feet required. We only have five feet on one side and close to five or six feet on the other side. These are pre-existing conditions that pre-date
even a modern ordinance with kind of a lot of odd lake front houses in that area. So this addition is an extrusion in line with the same house that is only 20 foot six inches wide. So we consider this pre-existing. There's no way to get out of this setback.

And then the second variance we're requesting is the aggregate. The total of both with an attached garage in Novi must be 25 feet. And, again, we only have the five or close to five or six on the other side. Again, these are back from the '40s. These are pre-existing conditions. So it's, again, we're saying to you that this is an oddball area and these are existing conditions and there's nothing we can do with these. This is a true hardship.

Now, the third is the maximum, the 25 percent allowable lot coverage. Now, on this, we'd like to increase up to 26.8. We'd like to go 1.8 percent over and we made this as small as we could to fix the problems with the functions of this house. And that's based on the following things: Three points, I'll go through these quickly.

We have a practical difficulty and this is
why we need to go 1.8 over the 25 percent. It's a hardship. It's -- as Robert said, the first floor is actually built into the side of a rise in the hill and his first floor with his common family functions are compromised. He has tiny windows. He has an obscured view of the lake. And it's a very narrow house. It's only 20 foot, six wide. So we consider this a practical difficulty.

It's all pre-existing environmental
conditions because of the topography and existing building. And it's unique with this property.

The second point is that there's no adverse impact on the neighbors. I would like to show you a sketch of this area.
(Document displayed.)
MR. THOMPSON: So the existing house of the Vartos is in -- the house and the Varto property are both in yellow and the proposed addition is in blue. Now, the Vartos' house is set back about 27 feet away from the lake deep in the shadows of the house to the south and it has limited sight lines because of that.

And it's also further back from the house on the north. So by doing this addition, this proposed
addition of 14 feet out and the full length or width of house the same height, we're just extruding this gable-style house further out to the lake. We're still 13 feet back from the neighbor on the south and we're still nine foot back from the neighbor on the north.

So we feel this is a sensitive and respectful addition to the two sides that will still be quite a ways back from a sensitive sight line with the lakefront property.

Finally, it's designed to minimize the requested variance. So as small as we could make it, if we stayed on the maximum 25 percent, we would be limited with that width of the 20 foot six, of an addition of seven foot six. And as Bob went through his list of shortcomings with the utility room and the living room and the problems with the master suite and the bath, everything's too compact. And a house in this area of that size shouldn't have these limitations.

We're asking the board to consider these three variances to allow us to build this addition. And we appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much.
Anybody that would like to speak on this case?

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this case?

Okay. Seeing none.
MS. OPPERMAN: Joe?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah?
MS. OPPERMAN: I do believe that there's some audience participation from the Bryda family. It does look like they're in the attendee list. I'm not sure if they've raised their hand yet for Damon to put them into the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. We'll pause for 30 seconds.
(Pause.)
MR. BRYDA: Hello, this is Bruce Bryda.
Testing, one, two, three. I was having some functional problems. Is it working now?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MR. BRYDA: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Your first and last
name and the spelling.
MR. BRYDA: Yes. It's Bruce Bryda, $B-r-y-d-a$.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. BRYDA: Yeah. I have this thing that I'll just go ahead and read into the record. I did file an objection via mail and I believe it was received.
"Good evening to the board members and Mr. Varto. I'm Bruce Bryda, the adjoining lot owner to the south. My wife and I have owned a --"
(Pause in record by reporter.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please go slow. Thank you.

MR. BRYDA: "I'm Bruce Bryda, the adjoining lot owner to the south. My wife and I have owned the property for almost 10 years, since July 10th, 2010. I believe our property will be the one mostly adversely affected by the proposed addition if allowed to be constructed as proposed. I would like to note that we did not receive any notification from the applicant that he was proceeding with this project. We did not have an opportunity to review the plans until Tuesday,

April 7th when they were first made available online by the City.
"Our first notification that an addition was being made by the applicant was by the ZBA board's mailing when we received it on April 3rd, 2020. Our questions, concerns, objections and observations have never been discussed or addressed by the applicant or architect. I believe we are hampered in using our time wisely to areas that might have been agreed to, compromised or worked out and explained.
"I believe both of us have suffered because of the lack of discussion and straightforwardness about the project. In short, as the project is presented, we object to any variance being granted that would allow construction of an addition in the area that is protected under the current 10 foot setback from the property line.
"The additional 14-foot extension of the three story, 35 -foot high structure with an extending deck that follows an outdated property setback, creates problems so close to the property line between our existing residences. The increased closeness of the new structure would directly face our kitchen, dining
room, living room areas, reducing, blocking natural sunlight. Possibly reducing air flow and blocking views. We will lose a substantial amount of natural light. This will change our main level from bright and cheery to dull and dreary.
"Presently, we have an open sunlight atmosphere on our main floor. Having an almost 35-foot house, five feet closer, will be detrimental to our existing feeling of comfort and well-being."

And I just might want to add that the previous owner made additions to the property by going upward and maintaining on the original foundation and was granted a variance which created about a 15-foot separation, which is much too close for two houses that are that high.
"With the addition, the higher the residences, three-stories, a steep peak, pitched roof and the choice of a metal roof with no gutters and the closeness of the residences cause increased water runoff and erosion of soil and drainage problems that are evident, when the water is directed toward an already close in property line to the applicant's residence. The runoff is directed to our 10-foot
offset without what would be absorbed by the applicant's property."

Basically, if we only had five feet and another probably half foot roof hangover to our driveway to a four-foot distance that it rolls over on to our property.
"It would appear the applicant contributed to create the situation he finds himself in to expand the current residence by purchasing a smaller residence than they require.
"Obviously, persons can purchase any property they want but $I$ believe it is unrealistic for the applicant to expect that neighboring property owners must accommodate to reduce established setbacks just to fill the applicant's perception of a resident. I would think that there are other expansion options available where the desired square footage can be gained without reducing the current 10 -foot setback. We're asking the applicant's request for a variance be denied."

I would also like to add that this home was built in 1997. And when we purchased the house in 2010, and we spoke to the original owner, Judy Raith (ph), at that time, who was explaining that she did not
want to have the houses any closer than what the setbacks allowed.

If you look at the drawing of our residences, which was --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Sir, I'm sorry. Could you sum up? Because it's going past three minutes.

MR. BRYDA: Oh, okay. If you look at the diagram of our residents, you'll see the south wall, the north wall for us, jogged in two feet to accommodate, maintaining that original setback. I would think that the applicant who has a 60-foot lot could do the same thing.

I'll stop now.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: In this case, the audience?

MR. VARTO: If I could address a couple of Mr. Bryda's comments.

First, we're not going to get any closer to their property lines. We're more than five foot from their home.

Secondly, we don't have gutters on our home because of the metal roof design, which is a more
modern design and more efficient and effective. And we have a French drain instead. So that system puts the runoff on both sides. It doesn't go on to his property.

Third, with respect to sunlight, I went out and I measured the sun at four different times of the day on a sunny day over the past week. The sun -- our houses face directly east and west. The sun always shines on the back of our homes. At no point will my home be blocking his from getting sunlight, and I have pictures to prove that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Anyone in the audience, please, last call?

MR. BRYDA: Yes. Can I respond to a couple of those comments?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You had your opportunity.
Is there anyone else out there?
MR. THOMPSON: Can I speak as well?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, proceed. Go ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: You see this diagram? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So Robert, with Mr. Bruce Bryda, explained the addition -- by the way the Bryda residence is enormous and it sticks out 27 feet further to the lake and casts a strong shadow on the Varto property.

His views are from a side window. So we calculated the views on this diagram from the same window, which still gives a great view of the lake. Because we're not going out as far to the lake as the Bryda residence. And also we're going to have a balcony or a deck with a glass railing. So we feel that this is very sympathetic and we're kind of surprised at someone who has such an enormous house further past all the other houses would object to this. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. MEMBER KRIEGER: From the City.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: From the City, correspondence?

MS. OPPERMAN: For the correspondence for this case, there were 39 letters sent out. We received one objection, which was from Mr. Bryda. So he's already spoken his peace on that. It will also be
entered into the permanent record file. There was also an approval submitted by Mark and Isley (ph) Szetela, S-z-e-t-e-l-a.

They note they would like to approve the dimensional variance of the proposed lot coverage but would recommend splitting the side difference of the side yard setback to 7.5 feet and aggregate side yard setback of 18 feet. Again, splitting the difference between the request and the single family residential code. A suggestion may be to use the newly constructed garage for any necessary needs to stay within the footprint of the property.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Katherine.

From the City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much. Before I speak, I would like to put it on the Board. Board members can you speak on this case, please?

Anybody that would like to speak?
Board members?
MEMBER KRIEGER: From the presentation, it
looks like a reasonable request and they've paid attention to the sight lines on the lake being east to west as they have described. So his request is minimal so I can support the request.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
Anybody on the board, please?
MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I tend to agree with Member Krieger.

But if you could reduce your current construction, would it make -- would it still be a liveable addition or is this the least you can do, given the situation?

MR. VARTO: I can answer that.
Well, go ahead, Mike.
MR. THOMPSON: With the floor plans that -hopefully you have them. The way the first floor is set up it's a shared mechanical room and laundry and a tiny living room. So this creates a separate mechanical, separate laundry room and a separate living -- or a workable living room with a fireplace and it makes the suite upstairs actually useable with a generous master bath and that.

So any compression it would really be a
sacrifice. If we did compress it, we would still need the same three variances because of the -- the side yard setbacks are intact. They're almost impossible to get away with lining that house up with the gable extrusion 20 foot, six wide. So you really can't get any more narrow than that to make a useful floor plate. And then, Robert, can you add anything to that?

MR. RYAN: Yeah. Mike, I think you kind of nailed it. I don't think it's an unreasonable request. We love the area. We love the lake. We love it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yeah, I think you guys did an excellent job on your presentation and also considering and doing your homework in how it would affect the other properties. So most people don't do that and I think you were really considerate with respect to that. So I don't see a reason why I would deny this.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Is that a motion?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Before going to the motion, I have no objections. And anybody would
like to speak on the board, please?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. This is Michael Thompson also.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please go ahead.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm all for progress, but I don't see the hardship. Is the hardship the house that you bought not big enough?

MR. VARTO: No. I think it goes back to the functional of the mechanicals. It's actually kind of scary when you go in there to have the HVAC pinned into that tiny room and it pins the hot water heater against the wall.

With the laundry in there, three water treatment devices, as well as the sump tank and the utility tub, it's a mess. When I had a leak, I thought about what would have happened to my entire first floor on that leak. Let alone, you are supposed to maintain your hot water heater from the back. I don't know how I would actually do that. I had a professional come out and assess it and his recommendation was to blow out that wall. I can't move my wall back. If I do, I'll have, literally, a seven by 20 foot family room.

It'll become, you know, from 14 feet or 15 feet to this tiny little narrow.

So for that purpose, functionally, that's what I'm trying to fix. Long-term I'm trying to just make it a beautiful home for my family. And just nail everything down for what we would ...

MR. THOMPSON: Can I add to that, please? MEMBER KRIEGER: Sure.

MR. THOMPSON: I like your name, by the way. MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. Right.

MR. THOMPSON: The practical difficulty, is my interpretation is all the buildable area cannot exceed 25 percent of the total rite area. So we're asking for 26.8 .

Now, this is unique and an odd condition because of the slab on grade, the 1940s, the original foundation, the way this house has been built, the first floor, the main floor, the living spaces share typical basement spaces where laundry and mechanical would be and it also -- the sides that are coming up, it's a walkout on the lake side. So it's kind of a hybrid first floor that the Vartos are not using as its true liveable space and it's counting against the

25 percent. So we see that as a hardship.
We see that they should be allowed to get more living area because of that because they're being penalized for carrying utility space on the first floor because of the slab on grade and the hilltop construction that they have.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Michael, do you want to continue, anything? Michael Thompson.

MEMBER THOMPSON: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Anybody in
the board, last call?
Okay. Thank you. And there's no objection from my side and you did a very good presentation and a beautiful house.

Okay. And I would like request one of the board member to move the motion.

Kevin?
MEMBER SANKER: I can make a motion.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Can you move, please? Thank you, Kevin.

MEMBER SANKER: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ20-0011 sought by the
petitioner for the additional lot coverage side and aggregate side setbacks. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring these variances.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because they would not be able to add to and improve their existing home in any meaningful way.

The property is unique because it was constructed of narrow block foundation and built into the rise of a hill on the land.

The petitioner did not create the condition because they purchased the property with the original foundation and the current topography.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties. Because of the way they constructed the roof it will present water runoff and because of the way the sun rotates around the houses there they will not have any obstructions to the neighboring houses from the sun or the lake.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it allows the
petitioners to build a larger house while maintaining adequate distance between the houses.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
And, Kathy, can you call for the roll,
please?
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MS. OPPERMAN: Hold on just a moment.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. You can take
your time.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Verma?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I see you.
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER VERMA: Can you hear me?
MS. OPPERMAN: We can now.
MEMBER VERMA: Okay. Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Can I pass and not vote yes or no?

MS. OPPERMAN: You have to either approve the motion or object to the motion.

MS. SAARELA: You cannot abstain from voting. MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm sorry. What was that? MS. SAARELA: You cannot abstain from voting. You must vote. You are required to vote. The only reasoning you can abstain from voting is a legal conflict under the charter and you mentioned that you have any financial interest in the property ...

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. I'm going to vote no.

MS. OPPERMAN: All right. Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

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

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes six to one. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Congratulations.
MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And moving to the next case PZ20-0012, Daniel O'Connor 48315 Nine Mile Road, west of Beck Road and south of Ten Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-29-376-011.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code, Section 4.19.J to allow for a proposed third detached building, resulting in a total of 3902 square foot increased by 1502 square feet. Two detached buildings with a total of 2400 square foot are allowed by code. This property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Is the applicant is there?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you see, Katherine?

MS. OPPERMAN: Hold on. Just a moment. I have to switch screens.

Yes, Mr. O'Connor.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. O'Connor is there.

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm there.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Good. Can you spell your first and last name for my court record and be sworn in by my secretary, please.

MR. O'CONNOR: Daniel, D-a-n-i-e-l, O'Connor, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{r}$.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. O'CONNOR: My attorney recommended that we postpone this, but due to these circumstances with the coronavirus, I think I'm going to just go ahead and do this, because I think you people are going to be doing this for quite some time.

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

MR. O'CONNOR: I do.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You may proceed.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank the board for showing up for this meeting. I know this is some unprecedented times.

But anyways, my name is Daniel O'Connor. I'm 70 years old. I'm a U.S. Army veteran. I'm respectfully requesting a dimensional variance for my property located at 48315 West Nine Mile Road.
(Rustling papers.)
MR. O'CONNOR: My name is Daniel O'Connor. I'm a 70-year-old U.S. Army veteran. I'm requesting a dimensional variance for my property located at 48315 West Nine Mile Road. I purchased the property on September 13th, 2005. When I purchased the property, it was in much needed repairs.

My property is also unique. Just like the Catholic Central property. The land is on three acres, total of 148,000 square feet. The south side of the property is an easement, which is owned by Consumers Power.

There's a major gas line there and I actually maintain the property. I cut grass. I remove dead fall. To the north and the west side of the property, there is vacant property which has not been maintained for the last 15 years -- the buildings consist of three garages and one steel building. Two of the structures are not very appealing to the eye.

Therefore, I took it upon myself to remove the garage, which was approximately 350 square foot;
and the metal building, which was approximately 2480 square foot. I believed at the time I was improving the property and the neighborhood by removing these buildings.

Due to their -- their age and everything. The house was built probably in the '50s. Now although I miss having the storage space and I thought that some day I could afford to replace those structures with a much more desirable and appealing building. The plans are to construct the pole barn at the rear of the property, which would be approximately 900 feet from Nine Mile Road.

I would provide green space so as not to have any issues from any neighbors. The property is located, basically, on a rural dirt road. There are several neighbors that have similar pole buildings. I will provide pictures and addresses at the pleasure of the board. I would like to assure the development department that $I$ will construct a professionally built structure that will abide by all of the City of Novi codes and specifications.

There are three City of Novi standards that pertain to my request for variance. They are as
follows: My property consists of three acres located on a natural, beauty road in a highly wooded area of requiring lots of regular maintenance. The equipment required to do this maintenance needs to be housed to get it out of the weather and enclosed for security.

In addition, I need a building to house my
small RV. The amount of personal equipment that I plan to house in this new building and the height of my RV requires a larger footprint in a slightly higher mean.

A 14-foot restriction causes the walls to be too short for my RV and square footage of 1,500 square foot is not enough to accommodate my equipment.

Therefore, $I$ am requesting a variance of 14 foot to 16'4", as indicated in my attached drawings. And a variance of the requirement for limiting square footage from 1,500 to allow for my new 2,400 square foot building. My existing house takes up 440 square foot. My house garage I should say.

And, obviously, only leaves 1,060 square foot of storage for my entire three acre parcel. This means I need a slight variance to the building footprint that I'm requesting for specific housing of my equipment and my RV.

This size building is consistent with many of the other buildings in the area. Please see the building attachments, which I provided to the board. In keeping my equipment secured inside and out of sight is much more environmentally conscious and neighbor friendly. Restricting my building size so much in a property of this size seems unnecessarily burdensome. Again, storing personal property. Please take into consideration the fact that I have owned this property for 15 years. At that time I have already made many improvements including taking down a deteriorating 2,400 square foot metal building. I was hoping to replace it with a newer building that is comparable to neighborhood buildings and would look much better for property appreciation in viewing by the neighbors.

In addition, the existing second building is used for partial storage of the existing equipment and will not be necessary going forward with the new building. So if the board would recommend for me to take the one building down, that would not be a problem.

Now, standard number four is the minimum
variance necessary. The dimensional variance that I'm requesting is the minimum $I$ can request because of the height of my RV and the amount of equipment to be stored.

Keeping the seasonal equipment protected and out of site is much more appealing -- and aesthetically appealing to the community and neighbors.

Now, going on to my final issue was the City of Novi standard for number five, which was the adverse impact on surrounding area. This building that I am requesting is a sizeable investment for my property. I have already removed -- removed two previous buildings from my property that were old and a bit worn down and created a berm with green space. This new building will certainly enhance the view of the property and the overall community view as a whole.

Also given the size of the property, three acres, this new building is sized proportionate and in good taste for viewing by the people in this country-setting neighborhood.

Now, also included in the image of my property, prior to dismantling the 2,400 square foot building, I sent that to the board.

So those are my issues and I appreciate your concern and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Mr. Daniel, and appreciate for your service for the country and thank you for that. And would you like to add anymore?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
And anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case, please?

Kathy, can you see anybody in the audience?
I think, seeing none.
Correspondence, Katherine, can you see any correspondence?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. For correspondence we sent out 20 letters. There were no approvals. No returns. There was one objection from the Falks F-a-l-k-s, at 48371 Nine Mile Road.

They say they are opposed to adding fourth or third detached building on this residential property. They note that several times of the week the back portion of the land has been used for the running and storing of industrial equipment. They're concerned
about the duration this equipment is run. They say it's very loud at times and often lasting for long periods.

They'd like there to be less noise not more noise, which they're concerned may be the case if this additional building is permitted. They say the fact of the matter is this is a residentially zoned property which is likely to be used for commercial or industrial processing repair and storage purposes. Which is likely the motive of the need for a third building.

They say while they're a hundred percent supportive of area small businesses, they feel that this is turning into a commercial construction zone and there should be a limit. They understand the inconvenience cause and believe that the applicant should follow the commercial requirements for these types of activities.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Katherine, for that. And I'd like to give the opportunity to the board who would like to speak on this case. Any others?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Does Larry have anything from the City?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. Yes, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: Yes. I have one comment. Due to the fact that the gentleman has stated that he was willing to remove one of the buildings to put that new building down to possibly ease the conscience of the persons that were complaining, because it would be one less building. That would be something you might want to take into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Anybody would like to speak to this case on the board, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Could the applicant speak to the neighbor's concern?

MR. O'CONNOR: I believe -- can you hear me? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. MR. O'CONNOR: I believe the neighbor's concern is a bit justified because the equipment that I use to cut the grass on the gas line, I use a tractor and I use it just for the mowing of the gas line. Plus I use a riding mower on my property. I have three acres. I have to use a riding mower. And, actually, the building where $I$ want to position the building is
at least -- at least 2000 feet away from the residence of the neighbor.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So it would just be a building for storage?

MR. O'CONNOR: It's a storage building, correct. It's just a storage building. It's not commercial.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then would you have any lighting on it for nighttime?

MR. O'CONNOR: If the City wants me to, I
would have it. If not, I probably would not.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then the
neighbors, do they have any buildings in the area where you want to place this addition?

MR. O'CONNOR: Not at all. They're not
even -- the property, my property on the west end, it is not even adjacent to their property. It's an entirely different portion of land.

There's four acres behind me. There's wetlands behind me and the property where they are at, it is actually, like I said, at least 2000 feet away and they're not even adjacent to my property, as far as the back of the property. I go back a thousand feet
where I would put the building. Their property is not even back a thousand foot.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So wouldn't that impact you as well, then? Would water get into that storage area? MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, no, no. I was just saying behind me is four acres and behind the four acres is wetlands. It's the City of Novi wetlands. You guys use that property there to make it a rural -- it's not a wetlands. It's -- you use the that property there to build the ballparks on Napier and Eight Mile. So you actually traded that property.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then as Larry was talking about, would you be willing to consider moving this other building?

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry. You broke up a little bit.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Larry's request about the building, that you would be willing to remove. So you would be willing to remove it?

MR. O'CONNOR: If it's possible, I can
utilize the building until the new building was completed, yes, I have no problem taking that building down. And that building is actually closer to where
the people that made the complaint is. I would be nowhere near them.

MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody in the board, please?

Thank you, Linda.
MEMBER SANKER: Yes. I just have one comment
related to what Mr. Larry just said as well and to Mr. O'Connor's comment about taking down the building. There are two buildings currently, right, that are used for storage?

MR. O'CONNOR: There's one -- there's one two-car attached garage for the house and only one building used for storage, currently. It's only 18 by 19.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. So it says here that there's a proposed third detached building. I guess what I'm wondering is do you know which building you're going to -- of the two currently detached buildings which one are you going to take down?

MR. O'CONNOR: The one that's -- the two and
a half car garage, which is by the house, that stays. The one behind it to the west of the garage, $I$ would take that down.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay.
MR. O'CONNOR: And then I would only have two existing buildings other than the house.

MEMBER SANKER: Which would be within the zoning requirements --

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, sir.
MEMBER SANKER: -- from a number of building perspective. I don't know about the square footage.

But I would be okay to approve that with the condition of taking down that building that's to the west of the two and a half car garage.

MR. O'CONNOR: That's not a problem.
MEMBER SANKER: And that's it for me.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the board, please?
Seeing none, do I have somebody who would like to make a motion?

MEMBER LONGO: I would like to make a motion. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Go ahead, Mike. MEMBER LONGO: First of all, Daniel, thank
you for your service.
I move that we permit the variance in case number PZ20-0012 sought by Daniel O'Connor because the petitioner has established that not replacing the buildings causes a principal difficulty related to the property and the maintenance and so forth. The petitioner has established that the property is unique because of the size of the trees, the gas line that runs through there. And the physical condition of the property creates the need for a variance because he needs to house his equipment to take care of the property.

The need for the variance is not self-created because the property existed before he purchased it with all the trees and so forth. Strict compliance to the dimensional regulation of the Zoning Board -- the zoning ordinance, excuse me, would be unreasonable in case for the petitioner from using the property for what he intended do with it.

The petitioner has established that the variance is a minimum variance necessary because the lesser variance would not permit enough space for him to maintain that equipment.
$\square$
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The request of the variance will not cause adverse impact to the surrounding property. The property values, the enjoyment of the property and the neighborhood or zoning district because the buildings -- there are buildings in other places surrounding him and this is way, way off the street and really doesn't seem in bother any tangent properties.

The variance is granted subject to the condition that the takedown of the existing storage building after he completes the construction of the new building.

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

And, Katherine, can you call for the roll, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Hold on just a moment, please.

Member Verma.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?

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

MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Congratulations.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Next case. Moving to the next case: PZ20-0013, Eric Lewandoswki, 24326 Wixom Road, east of Wixom Road and north of Ten Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-20-301-042.

The applicant is requesting variance from the
City of Novi Zoning Code Section 5.11 to install a 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. The property is zoned residential acreage, RA.

Is the applicant present?
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, I'm here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can spell your
first and last name for our court record and be sworn in by the secretary.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: So first name E-r-i-c.
Last name Lewandowski, L-e-w-a-n-d-o-w-s-k-i.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Secretary, Linda, can you take the vote, please.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm not.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Proceed.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Proceed, please.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Sure. So requesting a variance, exactly as you said, for a front fence and a front gate. I have two small children. So two children under two as well as a dog. And really want
to protect them from running into Wixom Road. As well as a very busy intersection to Wixom and Ten Mile as well as a lake, which is directly across the street from the property.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Do you have anymore?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The only other thing I
would add is the property frontage is just under that 200 feet. So if it had hit that 200 feet mark, it would have been exempt from this process. It's at 178 feet. So it's very close to that exemption, if that helps at all.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Anybody in the audience? Katherine, do you have any participating in the audience to speak on this case?

MS. OPPERMAN: It does appear there are two individuals with hands raised in the attendants.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Let's wait for 30 seconds.

Okay. Seeing none.
Correspondence? Katherine, do you have any correspondence on this case, please?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 26 letters sent out. I do believe I received one via E-mail just a minute ago. Just give me just a moment so $I$ can pull that up to read.

Hmm.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You don't find it?
MS. OPPERMAN: I thought I saw it a minute ago, but now it's not pulling up. My apologies. It came in after the typical deadline, but I wanted to still read it off.

There it is.
This is from Arul, A-r-u-l, forgive me for this pronunciation. Thirumoorthi, T-h-i-r-u-m-o-o-r-t-h-i.

They say they had several questions and concerns: How tall the fence will be and what materials will it be constructed of? Will it extend to sides and, if so, how far back on the property and how far from Wixom will the entrance be?

Their concern is that the driveway is between the fire station -- (Unintelligible) -- Wixom.
"If cars entering the property do not pull easily and safely on to the driveway waiting for the
gate to open, then it will obstruct traffic and be a safety hazard. The gate must be recessed further from the street than the minimum distance of the city code. Even if remaining fence not on driveway is minimal distance by the code."

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other correspondence?

MS. BASHI: I'm on the line. The line where we speak.

MS. OPPERMAN: You are.
MS. BASHI: This is Adele Bashi. So, yeah, I had a second and agree with what Arul's comments are.

You know, we are in the two homes that are going to be backing up to the side of the home.

So, hello, neighbor.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Hello neighbor.
MS. BASHI: My name is Adele. I'm the second house in and Arul's the first house in. My concerns are, because there's a sidewalk there and a pathway --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Ma'am, can you hear me? Can you spell your first and last name slowly, please.

MS. BASHI: Sure. Adele, A-d-e-l-e. Last
name Bashi, $B-a-s-h-i$.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. You may proceed.

MS. BASHI: So my concern is, as Arul was indicating, how far is the gate? If the gate opens in versus out -- so let's say you're pulling in, you and your wife or visitors or UPS, FedEx, you know, delivery, is there going to be enough room for the car to go into the driveway with the gate -- waiting for the gate to open without it interfering with the walkway and the road?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Absolutely. So if you look at the document $I$ submitted on page seven, we can start there. Does everyone have a copy of that? It's also posted online, if not.

But you can see that my property line -- and it might even be easier to see this on page six. My property line is 28.5 feet away from the sidewalk.

MS. BASHI: Okay.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm sorry. From the street. So just my line at the starting point is already nearly 30 feet away from the street. The gate itself will then be placed even further back from that.

And so there'll be plenty of room, as you can see, in this document, for a car, for UPS, moving truck, whatever, to not be on the street or the sidewalk in this matter and be in front of the gate. And the gate does open towards the house. So just getting that much more room, if that helps.

MS. BASHI: Oh, perfect. So is that gate -because I saw the photo. I have everything there.

The fence and the gate, is that going to come around the entire house or is it just going to be towards the front along with the privacy trees?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah, sure. So the fence will go on three sides of the house. So the focus of today is really the front of the house. The side is already approved just based on City code, but they will extend to the side of the house as well.

MS. BASHI: Perfect. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody who would like to speak on this case from the audience?

MR. THIRUMOORTHI: Can you hear me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. If you can spell your first and last name, please, for CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA record.

MR. THIRUMOORTHI: Yes. My name is Arul, A-r-u-l. Last name is Thirumoorthi, T, as in Tom, H-i-r-u-m, as in Mary, O-o-r-t-h-i.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You may proceed.

MR. THIRUMOORTHI: Thank you for reading my questions.

And, Eric, thank you for answering them.
That addresses our major and primary concern. So it sounds like it will be about 30 feet, as I gather, from the sidewalk -- or from Wixom Road?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: From Wixom Road.
MR. THIRUMOORTHI: Okay. That was my primary concern. That just with the setback from the fence there going to be enough distance so there's no obstruction to Wixom Road from the sidewalk.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah, absolutely. And the fence is -- just to be clear. The fence will be even further back from the property lines. So that quote for the 28.5 feet is just the property lines. The fence will be further back from the property line and the gate will be further back from that. So there's even more than that 30 feet, if that helps.

MR. THIRUMOORTHI: It does. You've answered the question. I couldn't get the dimensions when looking at the drawings so $I$ wanted to have that addressed on the record. So thank you, Eric.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah. Sure.
And just for everyone's information as well, the driveway does curve. Which means that even though from the street to the line it's 28.5 feet, you do gain extra feet just because the driveway curves, if that helps at all.

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

Okay. Thank you. From the City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the City at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much. And I'm open for the board. If somebody can speak on this case, anybody would like to speak?

MEMBER LONGO: I visited the site. It's going to be a beautiful home, Eric.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.
MEMBER LONGO: What I don't understand, the front yard really has a pretty severe pretty dropoff
and then there's abrupt comes up and you have the sidewalk and then Wixom Road. It's up on top of that hill?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah. So the house is setback from Wixom, if that helps.

MEMBER LONGO: Right.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: And it's a little elevated from Wixom Road.

MEMBER LONGO: Right. But then you have to go up. Your property -- well, your lot goes up to where the level for the driveway -- I'm sorry. From the walkway and the street?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah.
MEMBER LONGO: And the fence is up there?
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah. So the fence won't be in the dip, if that's what you're talking about. It will be behind that dip further into the property.

MEMBER LONGO: Oh, down by the dip.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No. It will be a little bit closer to the house. So there's a dip. It won't be in the dip, it will be setback from that, further back closer to the house.

MEMBER LONGO: Oh, wow. Okay. I have no
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further question and no reason not to approve this.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the board, please?
Okay. Looks like none. And, Linda, can you make a motion.

MEMBER KRIEGER: (No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda, are you
there?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yup. Yup. Yup. Sorry. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER KRIEGER: For case number PZ20-0013
for Eric Lewandowski on 24326 Wixom Road, the applicant is requesting a variance from section 5.11 to install a front yard fence and driveway gate. And move to approve the request for the variance. The petitioner has shown a practical difficulty and will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because of having the small children close to major roads where an accident can happen. And it's unique because it's also located near a lake that's got a lot of water -- a larger lake.

The petitioner did not create the condition because of the location. The relief granted will not
unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because, as he stated, that the gate will be farther back and not interfere with regular traffic flows on Ten Mile and Wixom Road. And the spirit is consistent with -- the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of the -its similarity in other neighboring homes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
And somebody can move on a second?
MEMBER VERMA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Ramesh.
Katherine, can you call the roll.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations,
sir. Thank you so much.
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And going back for the other three cases. One case was tabled and the other two cases did not show up.

I'm recalling the first for our board. The first case PZ20-0004, M-a-e-n Jabboori, 26181 Mandalay circle, east of Beck Road and north of 11 Mile Road. Parcel number 50-22-16-3000-86.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Code, Section 3.6.2.M.iii to remove vegetation from within the wetland setback. This property is zoned single family residence, $R-1$. This case was pose postponed from the cancelled 3-17-2020.

Is the applicant present, please?
MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, I'm here.
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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, thank you so much, sir.

Can you spell your first and last name for CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA record and the secretary will take this one on the book.

MR. JABBOORI: Sure. First name is Maen
M-a-e-n. Last name Jabboori, J-a-b-b-o-o-r-i.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. JABBOORI: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to
tell the truth in this case?
MR. JABBOORI: Yes, I do.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Proceed.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Proceed.
MR. JABBOORI: So I submitted the plans.
What we're attempting to do, ultimately, here is build an additional three-car, attached garage. I believe all of you have the plans and pictures and drawings and site plans.

What -- I guess what we're here to do today is be able to work within the buffer. So my first step is to remove the vegetation and then go ahead and start with the site plans and pull the proper permits and
make the garage, actually, match the home. So it wouldn't, obviously, anything that's not going to be correct.

Matter of fact, I've talked to the president of our subdivision. He's real enthusiastic about it. As you know, this is Mandalay Circle. It's an upper end subdivision. All the homes are million plus homes. So it would not be a cheap job to do.

The hardship comes from us having seven vehicles in the home. I have four children, we're two adults and all of our cars parked right now in the driveway. We have to maneuver.

And I don't know if any of you have passed by at this point, but if you look at our driveway at the end right now, like we're stepping on the grass. We all drive larger vehicles -- Dodge Rams and SUVs. So with our plan we want to extend the driveway as well as build the garage and all this is going to require us to work within the setback.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Do you want to add anything more, sir?

MR. JABBOORI: Just really, it's tough. We cannot really utilize -- we have only one vehicle
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parked in the three-car garage right now because we cannot park the vehicles in the garage at this point because for us to pull out we would have to move the vehicles around and we're trying really not to park in the street. At this point we have one or two vehicles that park in the street right now. And the subdivision that we're in, we're the only home that parks in the street. Most of the vehicles are all either in the garage where you may find one or two homes that actually park in the driveway. And we just -- we don't want that image in this beautiful subdivision that we're in.

And that's pretty much it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case?

Katherine, are you able to see anybody raising their hand?

MS. OPPERMAN: No. It does not appear that there's any attending audience for this particular case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much.
For the City, Larry, would you like to say anything on this case, please?

MR BUTLER: The only comment $I$ would have to make is after they remove that vegetation in that wetland if it's going to serve in the interest of the public. I don't believe he expounded on that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Correspondence, secretary. Katherine, can you say the correspondence, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. There were 16 letters sent out for this case. One letter was returned undeliverable and we received one approval from a Balbou (ph) family at 26128 Mandalay Circle. They've only circled approved and no context to the letter beyond that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Kathy. And correspondence is done.

Okay. Yeah. I would like to put it on the board, anyone who you would like to speak to any of the board member on this case, please.

MEMBER SANKER: I had a question about how far into the wetland setback you're going to go? I
couldn't figure that out from the drawings.
MR. JABBOORI: We haven't done any drawings right now because I wanted to get this approved with the City to be able to remove the vegetation. Because I don't know if you have driven by the lot right now, but it's full of vegetation. So once we clear that, I was going to have a person come out and just survey the land and draw us a plan of whatever the City would approve for another additional three-car garage.

So whatever the setback is required by the City, we were going to make it fit. And I believe it's, what, 15 feet from the setback line?

MEMBER SANKER: So my understanding there is a wetlands and wherever those end there's an additional 25 feet that you're not allowed to go into, according to the ordinance.

MR. JABBOORI: I'm going to move my phone to a site plan that you should have.
(Document displayed.)
MR. JABBOORI: I don't know if you see that. So this is my home here currently right here now. This is my driveway and this is the proposed removal right here.

MEMBER SANKER: Okay.

MR. JABBOORI: This is right here, this is the setback. So this is the 25 foot setback that the City requires. This is the only part that we're interested in, the gray shaded area, that we're meeting here today to remove. So this has to be removed. I have to operate in there to build the additional three-car garage.

MEMBER SANKER: I got you.
MR. JABBOORI: And I believe you should have those plans, the site plans, submitted already.

And I believe I provided some sample pictures of ultimately what the goal is to achieve out of this -- out of all the work that we're doing here.

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. So it's just that little -- basically, the etched out or shaded area?

MR. JABBOORI: Correct. I'll show you it again here.

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah. I brought it up online. On the screen. Or I can see it now.

I see.
So it seems relatively minimal compared to the amount of wetlands that are there. It's not like
you're taking out the entire 25 foot buffer that's required.

MR. JABBOORI: No.
MEMBER SANKER: You're taking out a relatively small chunk of it.

MR. JABBOORI: Yeah. And, honestly, obviously, we're not touching any wetlands or anything out of our property line. I mean, I paid for a site survey. I paid for a wetland survey. I paid for a wetland delineation. So I really spent quite a bit. I, you know, bent over backwards to really get this done and it's going to make a big difference on the neighborhood as well as improve the neighborhood. And I do believe -- I think the City would really benefit from it as well, too, with taxes and permit fees.

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah.

MR. JABBOORI: That's what it's really about, isn't it?

MEMBER SANKER: Yeah, right. Except for that one corner there, you know, you're really not that close to the actual wetlands.

MR. JABBOORI: No. Because if you look at the actual wetlands, it's past my property. But
because of the buffer, it really encroaches.
And really when we had, $I$ believe -- was it Pete Hill, I think?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
MR. JABBOORI: We had him come out and he actually pushed the lines even further than what my wetland delineation person put in. So your person was even more generous.

MEMBER SANKER: Hmm. Okay. And as far as have you considered other alternatives to -- from a building -- or, I guess, design -- no, I guess building the additional space without destroying as much of the buffer? Does that make sense?

MR. JABBOORI: Honestly, you know, there's a few large trees in there that are right in the middle of it and with all the vegetation, it just really needs to be cleared. I was going to put all the necessary trees that is going to be required of me to put back again. I believe, it's one to one ratio. I'm going to probably put one and a half to one ratio.

So it's going to be well designed. Like I said, we're in an upscale neighborhood. Believe me, I don't want to do anything that's going to make the
property value go in reverse.
Whatever we're going to do there is going to be positive for the neighborhood. Like I said, you even have one approval and I don't even know the neighbor. So ...

MEMBER SANKER: Okay. That's good for me. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sanker.

And anybody in the board, please?
MEMBER LONGO: Yeah. I would like to expand on Kevin's point. I went by the site and, actually, it's kind of unsightly, the part that he's taking out up against the street. There is still a lot of wetlands behind and the side and all that that he's not messing with. Some of it is on his property. Some of it isn't. So I don't have any problem with this.

MR. JABBOORI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody in the board, please?
Okay. As long as board members what dimension and what you're saying, the City, is needed for increase, your needing to do what is the one to one, the ratio?

MR. JABBOORI: Correct. Whatever is going to be requested of you, I mean, I will put that back.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. And the garage and all the same brick and everything, the color and all.

MR. JABBOORI: It is going to definitely match the home. I have a wife that will not have it any other way.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I have no issue with that.

And Linda, can you make a motion on this case, please?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You're picking on me. You got another volunteer?

All right. Well, first I'd like to say that Ed, the developer, when he first did it, that buying a house next to vegetation you're paying more. So taking that into consideration. The land where the water is at, I guess you probably have to do fill-in so the garage foundation doesn't have any future breaks in it. And then the trees you said you're going replace. I don't know what the diameters of those trees or if they're over what, but all that in appreciation of
those things.
I do see, though, that by doing what you're going to do, by building this attached garage or addition to the house, that you're improving the neighborhood and improving the revenue. So I would be in support of this.

So now I can continue with my motion.
And that would be the -- for PZ20-0004, for Maen Jabboori -- did I say that right?

MR. JABBOORI: Maen Jabboori.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Maen Jabboori.
MR. JABBOORI: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. That for 26181 Mandalay Circle, the applicant is requesting a variance from the City Code 3.6.2.M.iii to remove vegetation from within a wetland setback.

I move to grant the request. The petitioner has shown practical difficulty. With a good family size you're going to have vehicles. You need to take care of those vehicles and make the neighborhood more appeasing. So your intent is that, which is also with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

And you will be unreasonably prevented or
limited with respect to the use of the property because such said vegetation really is not intruding too much on the wetland. It's a minimal and it's unique because of its location. And you did not create the condition because of its already said location.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it will enhance the neighborhood with the addition. And, as I said, the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it's a minimum intrusion into the wetland.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda, I appreciate it.

And somebody can make a second, please?
MEMBER SANKER: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine, can you call for the roll, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
MR. JABBOORI: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And we move to the second case that is before the board, previously, what we discussed in the beginning. We would like to recall for the PZ20-0005, Michael Buca, 1501 Paramount Street, west of Novi Road and north of 13 Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-378-005. The applicant is requesting the variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance Section 5.19 to allow the storage of commercial vehicle on residential lot.

This vehicle is intended to be converted into a personal recreational vehicle. This property is zoned single family residential, R-4. This case was
postponed from the cancelled 3-17-2020 meeting.
Is the applicant is present, please?
MR. BUCA: Yes, I am.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much, Michael. You can spell your first and last name for our court records and also sworn by our secretary.

Please go ahead.
MR. BUCA: Yes. Michael, M-i-c-h-a-e-l,
Buca, B-u-c-a.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. BUCA: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. BUCA: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. Proceed.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. You may proceed, please.

MR. BUCA: Yes. My wife and I bought E450 commercial --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael, if you go slowly, so she can record. If you can go slow, please. Thank you.

MR. BUCA: My wife and I bought a
noncommercial vehicle, E450, basically, shuttle bus and plan on converting it into a little RV. And my property at the house, the width of the house, I only have about six feet on one side to get through and the other side with the neighbor's fence I maybe have six and a half, seven feet.

I just don't have access to my backyard to park it back there. And the little neighborhood that we're in, we're a street behind the lake. So there are a couple of other RVs that are parked in other people's yards, but I guess that's considered their backyard, but it faces the street that I'm currently on. And I just -- I, basically, don't have any access to put this thing in my backyard and I would like to be able to park it in my front.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to add anymore, please?

MR. BUCA: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Anybody in the audience would like to speak?

Katherine, can you see anybody raising their hand in the Zoom?

MS. OPPERMAN: There is no one raising their
hand on this matter.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much.

MS. OPPERMAN: Would you like me to read the correspondence?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Please go ahead for the correspondence.

MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly. There were 53 letters sent out. Three were returned by the Postal Service there were no approvals and no objections to this case.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

Mr. Larry, City?
MR. BUTLER: The only question $I$ have on that was I believe it is stating that the vehicle that is going to be allowed to stored, a commercial vehicle, on the lot is intending to be converted into a personal recreational vehicle. My comment would be how long is that vehicle going to actually be sitting there before they convert it to a recreational vehicle?

MR. BUCA: I plan to have the renovations completed by the end of June and then I would submit
the permit -- or the title to get converted to RV status.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much, Mr. Larry. Appreciate it.

Anybody in the board would like to speak on this case?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Hmm.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Linda?
MEMBER KRIEGER: I can understand from -- I have drove by and there is no way to put it in the backyard. So it would be in the front yard. So my question would be is if you can get it -- so it's waiting until June and you wanted to do -- get this changed from commercial to $R V$ for it to be parked on your property?

MR. BUCA: Correct.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So if it's commercial, you would have to move it. So if it's not switched by June, then you have an offsite location where you can move it to?

MR. BUCA: Well, I would get it switched sooner, but with the difficulty in getting to the

Secretary of state and everything --
MEMBER KRIEGER: Right. Yes.
MR. BUCA: It's kind of delayed that.
Otherwise, I would have had it converted by
now.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BUCA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Linda.
Anybody would like to speak on this case?
Board members?
MEMBER SANKER: I guess my only concern is that, you know, essentially commercial vehicles aren't allowed there and I feel like it would be pretty easy to find a temporary home for this until it was converted. Because if it was converted at this point, you wouldn't even be here; is that right? From what I understand, right?

MR. BUCA: That, I'm not sure of. I mean, I can't speak on that. I'm not sure.

MEMBER SANKER: So my -- I would prefer to have it stored somewhere else and then once it's converted, that would be fine. Especially, if it's only for three months. I don't think using the Zoning

Board of Appeals to fit that, that doesn't make sense to me. So I would be in -- I would deny the motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Member Sanker.

Anybody in the board members, please?
MEMBER LONGO: Yeah. The conversion, are you planning on doing -- is this the vehicle that was sitting there yesterday at the end of your driveway? MR. BUCA: Yes.

MEMBER LONGO: By the way, it doesn't look all that commercial. It is, but it doesn't have signs and it doesn't look real commercial to me. But are you converting it right there at your home?

MR. BUCA: It's first going to go over to a diesel mechanic in Wixom and they're going to do an over. They're currently closed. So I'm unable to get it over there. Once that opens up, it's, basically, going to go off my property. And then once I get an okay on all the mechanics, I'm going to bring it to another location to get some of the other conversion work done.

MEMBER LONGO: Okay.
MR. BUCA: Long-term, I don't plan on keeping
the vehicle stored here at this property. But I would like to be able to have it here, you know, for a couple of weeks at a time or a month time to load stuff up or do stuff with it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Longo, anything you want to say?

Okay. Anybody else in the board members, please?

MEMBER THOMPSON: I am a class B dealer. I can agree to this. The Secretary of State is moving very slow right now. So I feel bad that he is having the problem getting the title converted from one to the other. That's probably he didn't see that coming, right?

MR. BUCA: Yeah. I didn't.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board members who would like to speak?

Seeing none, somebody would like to make a motion on this case, please.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I'll go ahead and make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Linda.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For case number PZ20-0005, for Michael Buca, 1501 Paramount Street, he's applying to allow the storage of a commercial vehicle on a residential lot, but he's converting it to a personal recreational vehicle. So considering the COVID interference with getting anything done, that it would allow him until December for it to be converted to a recreational vehicle. I think it should be over by then.

So to grant the request for without the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of his property. The property is unique because of its location. He's unable to put the vehicle in the back of the property. The petitioner didn't create the condition because of the location of the house on the property.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. They're similar and in the neighborhood of the vehicle locations.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because he's intending on getting it switched over as soon as possible.
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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. If somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER LONGO: I second it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Katherine, can you roll call, please.
MEMBER LONGO: Katherine, you're muted.
MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Sorry.
Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: No.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes six to one.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

Congratulations.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. There you go.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And I think, Katherine, today with the last case, this is the one, I believe, PZ20-0007.

And the board members as well because of the bad network for the applicant. I would like to request the applicant to be ready for this case.

I will read the case number. PZ20-0007, Allied Signs, 40255 Thirteen Mile Road, west of Haggerty Road and south of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-12-200-041.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 28.5 to allow two additional wall signs, 14.2 and 62.6 square feet respectively, beyond the permitted two; and for an eight foot high ground sign, six foot high allowed by code. The property is zoned Office Services Technology, OST.

This case was postponed from the cancelled 3-17-2020 meeting.

Is the applicant ready, please?
MR. FIELDS: Yes, I am.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And, again, spell your first and last name very slowly for the secretary of CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA record and my secretary will swear you in. Please go ahead.

MR. FIELDS: It's Jim, J-i-m, Fields, F-i-e-l-d-s. And that's Allied Signs, Clinton Township, Michigan.

We're seeking board approval for the new hotel construction at, basically, 13 and Five.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR. FIELDS: No.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in this case?

MR. FIELDS: Yes.
MEMBER KRIEGER: All right. Thank you. Go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Proceed.

MR. FIELDS: So what we have is is we have -- the monument sign is on the north side of the property along 13 Mile. There's a double entryway and right there at 13 Mile splits to go across Five. So we're trying to get an extra two feet to get that sign to eight feet in height rather than just the six foot.

It's setback off the roadways. The extra couple feet will get their logo to go up. The additional signage we're looking for is on the west elevation, which is along Five.

So you want to catch -- you know, the goal here is to try and catch the traffic on Five with their branding with this hotel chain. We're not dealing with a lot of letters or long linear segments. They have a nice, round, clean logo.

So, really, square footagewise. Everything is within compliance. The problem that they have is with such a large building and where it is, trying to get the visibility on the different elevations with the size of the hotel itself and its placement.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. And you want to add any more thing, please?

MR. FIELDS: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very much.

Okay. And, Katherine, correspondence?
MS. OPPERMAN: Certainly.
Let's see. There were seven letters sent out for this case. One was returned. No objections and no
approvals.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. City, Larry?
MR. BUTLER: No comment from the City.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you very
much, Larry.
Okay. Board members, anybody would like to speak on -- sorry.

Before that, anybody in the audience?
Katherine, do you see any in the Zoom raising their hands for the audience?

MS. OPPERMAN: No. There's no one raising their hands at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you very much. And seeing no correspondence, then.

Anybody would like to speak on this case on the board members?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yeah. I would just like to say for the scale, the building, I think the signage size and number is probably appropriate being as it's on a busy freeway and a pretty large scale building, actually.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Anybody in the board members?
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MEMBER SANKER: I agree with Clift's comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Sanker. Okay. Anybody?

Looks like none. Mr. Sanker, can you make a motion on this, please?

MEMBER SANKER: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ20-0007 sought by the petitioner for the two additional wall signs and the two foot -- extra two foot height ground sign because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the additional signs.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the property -- to the use of the property because it will not be able to direct the patrons at the property and they won't be able to see the signs as clearly.

The property is unique because of the lot size and shape as well as the size of the building. It did not create the condition because they purchased the property as it is.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties

Pa
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because the signs are scaled so that they fit to the building and they provide direction.

They fit discreetly on the building while providing visibility and direction to patrons. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because they will promote safety and provide visibility.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody say second, please?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I will second.
CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. And please roll call, Katherine.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?
MEMBER SANKER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes.
MR. FIELDS: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations.
MR. FIELDS: Thank you for your patience.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I think we have all
the cases for today.
I would like to say to some of them because of bad connection and I would like to apologize for that.

And I would like to welcome Michael Thompson for the new board member.

And thank you, Michael, for showing interest.
And also who the Zoom is created or operating, I really appreciate any followup for all the people on how to connect.

And thank you, Kathy, all the board members. For this COVID-19, we took a longer time today than we intended. And everybody, I really appreciate about that.

Apart from that, any other thing you would
like to talk on this, board members?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. How are you going to sign your papers, now?

MS. OPPERMAN: I'll be sending Chairperson Peddiboyina a copy of all of the pages that he can either print out and sign or he can sign them digitally so we'll have them for the record file.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. So I can do that tomorrow?

MS. OPPERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And thank you, Linda, so much for the reminding of the signing of the documents.

Any other board members who would like to recall anything that we've seen?

MEMBER KRIEGER: No. This was a good meeting. I'm glad. It seemed to have worked without any -- I mean, there were a couple of glitches, but overall it seemed to have gone okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
And, Mr. Thompson, how are you?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm well.
Hey, I've got a question for you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MEMBER THOMPSON: This is -- I have been in front of these boards before for different cities. If I had a few questions on the thoughts and direction, would this be the time to ask them or is there other people beside the board still on?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Go on.
MS. OPPERMAN: You might want to close the meeting so that our court reporter doesn't need to record this section, unless you want it to be on the record.

MEMBER THOMPSON: No. It's just a couple of questions. Could we do that? When the meeting's closed, could we sit down for just a minute?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. Mr. Thompson, we'll have an opportunity. As soon as the close of business, then we can go on that.

Is it okay?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. That's great.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody would like to talk any other thing on the business?

MEMBER LONGO: Everybody stay safe.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay.

And anybody? Mr. Verma?
MEMBER VERMA: Everything is fine. Stay
safe.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr. Verma.

And Mav Sanghvi, I hope he's doing good.
And thank you, everybody. And whoever want to say a motion to adjourn and all in favor.

MEMBER SANKER: Motion to Adjourn.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

MEMBER VERMA: Thank you.
(At 9:50 p.m., meeting concluded.)
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