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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good afternoon.
Today is October 11th. Welcome to the Novi City Zoning Board of Appeals. Please stand up everybody for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please
be seated.
Welcome. Secretary?
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Sanghvi is absent,
excused.
Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Here.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Here.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Public hearing format and rules of conduct. We can see what are the cases we have today on the back. There is printout pages. And all the audience and presenters, please turn off your phones in the silent mode. And if we call any cases, please come to the podium and tell your first and last name clearly for the secretary -- for the court record.

And the audience time limit is three minutes. It's not more than that three minutes. Please make a note. Anybody wants to -- apart from the presenter of the case who wants to talk on the case, anybody like audience, only three minutes time allowed. Thank you.

Okay. Approval of agenda, any changes, any modifications? Somebody make a motion on that.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I make a motion we approve the agenda.
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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody make a second, please.

MEMBER COPES: Support.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any changes, any nays?

Nobody. Thank you.

Okay. Meeting of minutes on August, any changes, any modifications? Somebody make a motion for the approval of meetings for the August -- September 2022 .

Somebody make a motion on the September --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'll move we approve the minutes --

MEMBER LONGO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any changes, any nays?

Say aye in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Anybody wants to -- any changes on
these cases, anybody wants to make any modifications from the audience, this is the time to come to the podium and add or modify. Once the meeting starts, I cannot change any planning of the meeting.

Looks like none.
Okay. Let's move on to the first case, PZ22-0045, Ryan S-z-o-s-t-e-k, Parcel

50-22-03-476-006, South Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive. The applicant is requesting a use variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5.B and 4.19 to allow construction of an accessory structure on a vacant parcel without a permitted primary use and a dimensional variance from Section 3.1.5.D and 4.19.2.A to allow the structure to be located within the required front setback. A variance of 20 feet is requested to allow the structure to be placed ten feet from the front property line, 30 feet required. The variance requested will accommodate a changing station. This property is zoned One-Family Residential, R-4. Is the applicant present? MR. SZOSTEK: Yes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please come to the podium and spell your first and last name clearly,
please.
MR. SZOSTEK: Hi.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please and follow our secretary. Go ahead.

MR. SZOSTEK: Yup. So my name is Ryan
Szostek. You want me to spell it, right?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MR. SZOSTEK: First name Ryan, R-y-a-n. Last name Szostek, S-z-o-s-t-e-k.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Excuse me?
MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. SZOSTEK: I am not.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you,
Ryan. And please go ahead and present your case clearly where we can help you tonight. And you want to present anything, you know, any slides, you can use the projector. There is a projector. You can use the
slides also.
And you can speak.
MR. SZOSTEK: I appreciate that. Thank you.
So, yeah. Thank you for the attention today.
So this is a relatively unique property. So on South Lake Drive it's vacant, obviously, as described. It's flag shaped. It's got a riparian lot which is approximately 50 feet of lake frontage with 20 feet of depth. And then across the street there is a 20 foot wide parcel by 96 feet deep.

And actually, I can put that up, but I don't know if you'll be able to see it. We'll see.

As a part of that, it's obviously
non-buildable because the setbacks across the street, you can't build on a lot that's only approximately 20 feet wide. This is from the actual website. And as such, we use it for mainly recreation. We have a dock there. We have a boat. We go in and out.

We want -- the structure in question is a changing room, a small changing room to allow the children or adults or whatever can change. Go across the street --

> (Clarification by the court reporter.)

MS. SZOSTEK: I'll go slower. To go across the street to change. To find some privacy and things like that because we don't have a dwelling on the site. That's the gist of the use.

As far as reasonable use, the idea is around privacy and the physical conditions don't allow for the building of a main structure which would otherwise make the property useable. In excess of that, it can't be used for anything around, you know, like privacy.

As far as character of the neighborhood, just going through the standard number three, it doesn't change the character of the neighborhood. I have a photo of it we can show here.

Which is a matter of opinion, I know. It looks as low as this, but it's not dissimilar from the houses or the structures. Around the thing you'll see pergolas and other structures in either cedar or painted or whatever, around the lake, both on South Lake Drive but also on East Lake Drive and around the lake.

As far as not being self-created. So the nature of the property itself, I didn't modify the usage of the land or create a pool or anything like
that which would otherwise put myself in the situation. It's just the fact of the platted lane.

So I'll pause there. That's what I'm asking for. I actually did not realize, candidly, that the setback from the road was 30 feet. I'm actually not as -- I'm not asking necessarily for that variance as an absolute. It was more around the actual use variance to actually have a structure in temporary nature -- it's not fastened to ground -- that could be used for privacy. It's more the use that's more important to me.

And I'll pause.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other thing you would like to add, Ryan?

MR. SZOSTEK: Not that $I$ can think.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody would like to speak on behalf of you tonight?

MR. SZOSTEK: Oh, no.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. From the city?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the city at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.

Okay. And, Secretary, any correspondence? MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. There were twelve letters mailed, eight returned, no approvals and four objections.

From Dorothy Duchesneau, D-u-c-h-e-s-n-a -hard to read -- o-u, I believe.
"The applicant has two lots. The 20 foot on the south side of South Lake Drive where the outhouse currently sits next to the bike path, and a much longer 50 foot lot on the lake side. For pedestrian safety, this belongs on lake side. Whilst traveling east on South Lake, it does look like an outhouse on the bike path. On the lake side he could have a larger ten by ten by eight building for changing, boat accessories, that. Because he has a fence on the road, it could be secured from passersby."

The second one is from Robert and Judy Thompson. "Objection. We understand you cannot have any structures on the above property. We believe it cannot be used as a place to store items. The prior owner was told he could not put a storage shed on the property."

Third objection from Rob and Chris Czarnecki.
"This property is unbuildable. The changing station that they put on the property looks like an outhouse and they have used the property to store multiple items."

The fourth objection is from Mary Waldrup. "The petitioner purchased the property with full knowledge that the lot was not a buildable lot. The current temporary structure, temporary in quotes, porta-potty is over the property line and encroaches into the wetland on our property. If the board determines this lot is a buildable lot, the petitioner should be required to meet the side and front setbacks. There is no need to waive these requirements as the proposed structure could be placed 30 feet from the front setback and six feet from the side.
"Having a structure that appears to be a porta-potty so close to the sidewalk used by hundreds of people every day is an attractive nuisance, end quotes. The previous owner applied for this same variance and was denied."

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Secretary.

Anybody in the public would like to speak on
this case, this is the time to -- your opportunity. And is allowed only three minutes.

Okay. Looks like none.
Thank you, Ryan. And you presented your case and let me open to my board and what they thought and let's continue on more on the decision.

Okay. It's open to the board.
Okay. Go ahead, Mike.
MEMBER LONGO: I have a point of clarification. You made a comment about the distance from the ten foot -- the setback.

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.
MEMBER LONGO: And you didn't see that as an issue, meaning that you could move it and not have that variance; is that correct?

MR. SZOSTEK: That's correct.
MEMBER LONGO: And you would be willing to do that?

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.
MEMBER LONGO: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for the clarification.

MR. SZOSTEK: Yeah, of course. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Jay, go ahead.

MEMBER McLEOD: Question. Just to clarify what I'm looking at in the picture there, is it a four by four wooden building propped up on cinder blocks?

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.
MEMBER McLEOD: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jay.
Any other board?
Yeah. Go ahead.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So where do you live in relationship to this property? You come here and use this property for what?

MR. SZOSTEK: I use the property for accessing the lake.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: And you live in the neighborhood?

MR. SZOSTEK: I live in Novi.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So you just go over there on a periodic basis and use that for recreation at the lake?

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: And have a dock in the lake?

MR. SZOSTEK: Yes.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you. MR. SZOSTEK: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other?
Okay. Linda, go ahead.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Is there any reason why you couldn't put it on the lake side?

MR. SZOSTEK: No. It was just that it would impede the view. I figured it would be a better spot because it doesn't actually impede the view of the lake from any of the housing owners around.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And it's temporary or you want to leave it there permanently?

MR. SZOSTEK: I'd ideally like to leave it there permanently, but we use it usually in-season. So we use it for ice skating in the winter and then for recreation and all -- recreation in the summer. So but primarily it's in the summertime because in the winter it's not -- you usually come fully dressed in your, you know, snowmobile suits and things like that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Linda.

Any other board member?
MEMBER McLEOD: Just a question for the city. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Go ahead. MEMBER McLEOD: So if we're looking at a small, I'll call it a moveable structure propped up on cinder blocks, does that actually count as a building per city ordinances?

MS. SAARELA: Yes.
MEMBER McLEOD: 'Cause I'm thinking -- or is this like, say, a trailer someone could park in their yard?

MS. SAARELA: It's accessory structure.
MEMBER McLEOD: Accessory structure. Okay. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Continue, Attorney, is it taxable, the property, that one? They have to pay --

MS. SAARELA: The property is taxable.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And what about this structure?

MS. SAARELA: If it was approved, I suppose the assessing department would determine if there's any value to that or not.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

Oh. Go ahead, Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Is it just a room -- I see the interior, but is there a toilet and stuff in there?

MR. SZOSTEK: There's a temporary one that we'll bring in occasionally, but it's not a -- there's nothing permanently affixed to the structure. It would be like bring like an RV toilet, if you wanted to bring that.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So there's no like wiring, electricity or plumbing?

MR. SZOSTEK: There's no wiring, electricity or plumbing.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Good.
MR. SZOSTEK: There's an LED light on the outside that just charges.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Basically you're using only summertime to put your stuff in the shed. You want to place your stuff in the shed.

MR. SZOSTEK: We actually don't -- we actually don't use it to store anything, interior wise. We just use it for people to go inside either change, use the bathroom and leave.

So we don't store any other materials or
anything else inside of it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You lock every time and come and go like that?

MS. SZOSTEK: It's got a self-looking door.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Self-locking door. That's good. Yeah.

Okay. Thank you.
And it's motion time. And Michael Longo, please go ahead and make a motion.

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we deny the use variance in case number PZ22-0045 sought by Ryan Szostek for the construction of an accessory structure because the petitioner has not shown or established an unnecessary hardship.

The petitioner has not established that a hardship regarding the current zoning designation of the property, as the property can be used for zone because the lot basically is too small.

The petitioner has not established unique circumstances or unique physical conditions regarding the property because we're simply using a temporary building for temporary use.

The variance requested is based on the
petitioner's personal and economic hardship because the petitioner stated that we need to use this to participate in different activities on the lake.

The proposed use will alter the central character of the area by being a small structure.

The petitioner has created the need for the variance -- excuse me. The petitioner has created the need for the variance by putting in a temporary building.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Secretary, please call the roll call.

MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

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

MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Okay. This issue has failed.
It's been denied. Motion denied.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SZOSTEK: All set?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry?
MR. KRIEGER: He wanted to know if we were done?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, yeah, done. Thank you so much. I appreciate.

Okay. Move to the second case tonight. PZ22-0046, Andrew Falzarano, F-a-l-z-a-r-a-n-o, Crown Enterprises, LLC, 46844 West Twelve Mile Road, Twelve Mile Road east of Napier, Parcel 50-22-09-300-032. The applicant is requesting two variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance. From Section 3.1.19.D. for building a height variance for two silos, s-i-l-o-s, with a proposed building might of 90 feet from the finish grade, building height standard is 60 feet,
variance ever 30 feet. Also from Section 5.4.3 to allow a loading space in the front yard. These variances will accommodate the building of Novi Concrete Plant. This property is zoned General Industrial, I-2.

Is the applicant present, please?
MR. FALZARANO: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please come to the podium and spell your first and last name clearly for our secretary and court record. And after that, the secretary will take the oath.

MR. FALZARANO: Good evening. Andrew, A-n-d-r-e-w, Falzarano, F-a-l-z-a-r-a-n-o.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Excuse me. Are you an attorney?

MR. FALZARANO: I am not.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. FALZARANO: I do.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Thank you. Please go ahead, Andrew, and tonight where we can help you on this case.

MR. FALZARANO: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, come to the speaker mic, so that everybody can hear clearly. Thank you.

MR. FALZARANO: We are requesting two variances tonight. The first variance is to allow loading spaces in the front yard. Our site plan details a twelve foot high brick embossed screen retaining wall. That's this line highlighted in orange here.
(Document displayed.)
MR. FALZARANO: The screen wall will obscure the visibility of the loading operations. Additionally, the screen wall is setback approximately 450 feet from Twelve Mile Road.

Reconfiguring the layout of our yard would just simply expose other yard operations. And it can be noted, this was supported by the planning department.

The second variance is for exceeding the maximum building height. An integral part of the plant is two cement silos that happen to exceed the building height. The silos extend beyond the roof to an
elevation of 90 feet from the finish grade. The silos convey cement powder via gravity to the mixer drum below.

The silos are setback over 800 feet from Twelve Mile Road. And we generated a rendering of those silos from a view of Twelve Mile and from West Park Drive.

You can see from West Park drive they're actually -- you can't even see them with the existing trees and topography over there. And here's from Twelve Mile. So this is off of the Google street view. It's rather hard to see, but this is the building that in white which is in compliance. It measures approximately 50 feet and just next to it there's a blue cement silo. And they're staggered off. You'd only be able to see one from Twelve Mile. And that's what exceeds the maximum building height.

I would like to note that there's a similar use off of Grand River with significantly less setbacks. There -- it's not showing well on the screen, but we have approximately a 280 foot setback from the road and we estimated their silos are extending between 83 and 85 feet in elevation.

AIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Our Secretary, any correspondence?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: 47 letters mailed. Zero returned.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh. Thank you.
Okay. Anybody in the audience would like to speak on this case, this is the time. Allow three minutes.

Okay. Looks like none.
Okay. Andrew, a nice presentation. And let me put on the board and let me see what we can help you on this. And open to the board.

MR. FALZARANO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay, Jay. Member Jay, go ahead.

MEMBER McLEOD: Thanks. So I was hoping you could speak a bit to why this request is here? Is
this -- I guess, like, how long has this location been in business? Is this to support a new product or service that you're creating or are you simply modernizing? What benefit does the company have from the silos? And if the proposal is denied today, what is your next best alternative? I'm trying to understand much more about the business prospects behind this request.

MR. FALZARANO: Sure. So the screen wall, I'll start with that, also serves to contain our aggregates as well. That's the piles shown in gray. So that's the aggregate storage and loading. The aggregates would be loaded onto -- this brown triangular shape there. There's two hoppers and this was what we saw as the best layout for the site.

So altering the site, now, that screen wall now has to be moved. Screen wall/containment wall is moved somewhere else and it would show other plant operations. Trucks would now be queued in the front of the plant as they're waiting to be loaded versus the back how we're proposing. The section in blue there is a truck wash. That's for the trucks to rinse out. So additionally that would be screened with our current
layout. Adjusting it, it would be a whole other new site plan layout.

Now, as far as the silos go, they're required to be elevated due to the way that they're -- that the cement powder is conveyed into the plant operation itself. It's all done by gravity and the silo itself needs to be up higher than the mixer drum. The mixer drum is just elevated above the truck loaded itself. So it's a figure that -- isn't an engineered feature that there isn't much other option. It's not a good workaround.

MEMBER McLEOD: But I guess my question is, what -- sorry. Is this a new operation?

MR. FALZARANO: Yes, this is new operation.
MEMBER McLEOD: So the entire company right now is new going up in that location?

MR. FALZARANO: Correct.

MEMBER McLEOD: So if this motion were to be denied, you -- the company would need to find a new location to exist, to do their business?

MR. FALZARANO: I'm not entirely -- I'm not sure if I'm in the position to speak what the next move would be if it was denied.

MEMBER McLEOD: All right. At least personally, I understand the wall completely. The question was mostly around the height of the silos. Thank you.

MR. FALZARANO: And that's where -- that was the reason we had generated the rendering. I'd like to show it before and after as well. So this is with current site conditions. And I would also like to point out, so this is current. That's the street view off Google. And here's what's proposed. Now, I would like to add that in this rendering, it does not include -- it doesn't show the screen wall and it does not show any of our landscaping improvements that we will be adding to the site as well.

So here, let me see if $I$ can get this side by side here a little bit. Existing versus our proposed here.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Jay, do you want to speak to any other thing?

MEMBER McLEOD: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: All done? Thank you.

Go ahead, Thompson. another site on the Grand River. What is -- what is to the -- that would be the west of you. What type of business is to the west of that.

MR. FALZARANO: To the west is a landscaping supply.

MR. KELLEY: No. It's a concrete crusher.
MR. FALZARANO: Oh. Okay. Concrete crusher
Sorry. To the east is the landscape supply.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. So they have something similar, yes?

MR. FALZARANO: We'd be a concrete producer and they're taking in broken up old concrete debris from demolitions.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So I've been at the driving range before. I remember there being a silo or tower or something over that way, yes?

MR. FALZARANO: Yeah. They have a conveyor system that stacks their aggregates.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Do you know roughly the height of that?

MR. FALZARANO: I do not, no. I think it was mentioned in planning that they an estimated 60 foot
pile of concrete there existing right now.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Mr.
Thompson, would you like to speak any other thing?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Not right now.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board member? Yeah. Go ahead, Clift Montague.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: So on your site plan, where is the entrance to the site?

Trucks will be coming in in that corner and going around to here?

MR. FALZARANO: (Pointing.) Yes.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Okay. All right. I think in my opinion, the siting is very nice. It's back off the road. I like the screen wall. So I think I'm in support of this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other board member?
Oh. Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yep. To the city, the height of that other silo, is that 85 feet?

MR. BUTLER: The existing silo?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, on Grand River. MR. BUTLER: I'm not sure the height on that
one.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. I looked up the height of the water towers that are 165 feet from what I understand, so in comparison I understand that. So I guess though for to go from 60 to 90 feet, is it the diameter you need or does it increase speed? What does the increase in the 30 feet, 60 versus 90 feet to -that you want that extra 30 ?

MR. FALZARANO: This is -- with Hercules Materials.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You can spell your first and last name clearly. Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. KELLEY: My name is Gary Kelley, G-a-r-y K-e-l-l-e-y.

I'm the vice president of Hercules Materials Holdings.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. KELLEY: Excuse me?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?
MR. KELLEY: No.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth?

MR. KELLEY: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. KELLEY: So we're excited for this new opportunity and we feel that it's zoned accordingly in the heavy industrial zone. We're very proud of the site plan and the layout and the landscaping and working with the city and it's been a good process so far.

So to speak to your point earlier of the need for concrete. There's currently a concrete construction material shortage facing the state of Michigan and the whole Midwest and we don't see an end to that coming anytime soon. There's also a lot of improvements that are happening within the city of Novi and the surrounding areas on I-96 and also the future Twelve Mile Road. And we intend to be a part of those improvements. Hopefully if approved with this development, we'll be bringing utilities of water across the span of Twelve Mile Road also to incorporate them into our site.

But the concrete plant in general, the way it
works is the silos hold the cement powder that as Andrew had mentioned, feeds the cement into the drum and the conveyors bring in the sand and stone into the concrete plant.

Speaking of the concrete plant, the plant is a fully enclosed concrete plant. It's different than most concrete plants that you'd be familiar with, maybe. There's a concrete plant every 30 miles in the United States. For example, most them are not enclosed. Were are very conscious of the environment. We're doing things -- it's a very -- we're doing things a little bit different. We're trying to be state of the art. We're trying to be eco friendly. We're introducing carbon captor technology into our concrete. So we're trying to be very proactive and grow the business and be a part of the city and the community.

The 90 foot on the silos, the difference is to hold a full load of cement. They come in 50 ton loads. To hold a full load of cement we have to have that volume to hold the powder. And to keep up with the daily business, you need have a volume on hand so that you don't have short loads and more trucking coming in and out than normally required in that
circumstance.
I hope that helps clear it up a bit.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Member Krieger, you want to continue?

MEMBER KRIEGER: So it's the volume fits what you're -- like put in order request for a certain volume and that fits that. So that's why you need the extra 30?

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. And there was mention of some other structures in the area that may be tall. There's a large cell tower to the back east, I believe right at the back of the tree farm there. That's a hundred plus feet tall. Just to give you an idea of some other structures in the area.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then the facade of it, is it going to be cement color, white, blue? What was the intent for -- since it's going to be taller and viewed from a distance, what is it going to look like after?

MR. KELLEY: On the concrete --
MEMBER KRIEGER: The silos.
MR. KELLEY: Oh, the silos?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah.

MR. KELLEY: So the silos we are going to go with a sky blue color. So they actually they blend in very well. So if you're looking 480 feet away from Twelve Mile Road and you're looking towards the silos, you would have to really look for them to really have them stand out. They're -- they blend in in the environment I guess you could say.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah. I happen to be at Providence Park today and I was looking out the window from the fifth floor so you can see a distance so $I$ was imagining you could see what the towers from there 'cause you can see the cell towers. So I couldn't see the 165 foot water tower so imagine that with the trees it's going to be easier to see in the winter versus now. They'll probably blend with the trees.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. And from the distance, again, you'll really have to be looking for it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right. Okay. Thank you.
MR. KELLEY: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member?
Okay, Thompson.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Can we take a better look at the site plan? I'm trying to help you and when we compare the two instances to what it looks like now to what it's going to look like, there wasn't a big difference in the picture. But the site plan I think would clear some of that up.

MR. FALZARANO: Yeah. Let me see if I can zoom.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I don't know if that zooms in or not.

MR. KELLEY: And I think the intention of our rendering was just to add the concrete plant back at the distance to show just that. So it really doesn't incorporate much of --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can zoom it.
MR. KELLEY: -- the pond or the landscape or the wall --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can zoom it on the side. On the top of that one. On the side, yeah. Try that one. Yeah.

Yeah. It's clear. Now we can see, Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. So there's the one lane with the 280 foot setback of trees into a fence
that's going to blend in. There's an industrial site on the other side of it.

And the silos are where on the property again?

MR. KELLEY: So --

MEMBER THOMPSON: Just in that --
MR. KELLEY: Kind of where the conveyer points in.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. KELLEY: It would be more toward the center of that large rectangle. And they sit -- I guess they would be facing north/south so you're only going to see --

MR. FALZARANO: Yeah, facing north and south.
MR. KELLEY: You'll see one of them looking at it.

MR. ONIFER: If I could.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead. You can spell your first and last name clearly and the secretary will take the oath.

MR. ONIFER: Dan Onifer. D-a-n O-n-i-f-e-r. I'm with Crown Enterprises also.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Are you an attorney?

MR. ONIFER: No, I'm not. And I swear to tell the truth.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
MR. ONIFER: And if $I$ could, the silos would be like that.
(Drawing.)
MR. ONIFER: And to answer your question further about the height. As Gary described, it's a matter of volume and it's also since they are cylinder, it's a matter of diameter and height. And the diameter is determined by -- you can see these are aligned with a drive-thru lane. And that drive-thru lane feeds one loading lane to the trucks and then it's kind of modular. You know, 12 feet or 20 feet over there's another lane. So these two silos fit above that one lane. So that determines the diameter and then the volume determines the height.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. And that ends I think. Yeah, nice presentation. Andrew and Gary and team, thank you for the good presentation and always welcome new businesses in Novi.

And it's open. And now the time for the motion.

Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. I approve that -- I move that we grant the variance in case PZ22-0046 sought by Crown Enterprises. There's two variances, though, right, Joe?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Yeah. Height and -- two variances, yeah. Right.

MEMBER THOMPSON: There's two variances. Because the petitioner has shown difficult in requiring the height variance for the silos. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property from the silos height and their use that was explained well.

The property is unique because it is zoned general industrial and fits in with the neighbors around it. The petitioner did not create the condition because it was a 60 foot variance for a 90 foot piece of equipment. The relief granted would not be -- would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. And no one had phoned in or wrote in
complaining about it, the neighbors. And the relief is constant with the spirit and intent of the ordinance being in the general industrial zone.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.
MS. SAARELA: Is that for both variances or are you making two motions?

MEMBER THOMPSON: For both. One motion for both variances.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So we're allowed the front loading space?

MEMBER THOMPSON: For the height variance and
the front loading space.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Very good.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Okay.
Somebody can make a second, please.
MEMBER COPES: Support.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Say all
in favor.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. And good luck. Congratulations.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Welcome to Novi.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And welcome to Novi.

Today our third case. PZ22- -- excuse me. Today's case number three, PZ22-0048, Joseph Yono, 1401 East Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and south of Fourteen Mile Road, Parcel 50-22-02-329-027. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.32.10.ii.a for a roof height of 11 feet-6 7/8, maximum roof height 8 feet allowed by code, variance of 3 feet 6-7/8 inch. The
applicant also requesting a variance from Section 3.32.10.ii.b for a lot coverage of a shed to be 7.54 percent, maximum allowed 5 percent, variance of 2.54 percent. The variance would accommodate the building of a new lakefront accessory structure. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

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

MR. YONO: Joseph Yono. J-o-s-e-p-h
Y-o-n-o.
MR. SCHAUER: And I'm the architect. My name
Raymond Schauer. $R-a-y-m-o-n-d$ S-c-h-a-u-e-r.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Secretary, can you take the oath, please?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'm sorry.
Are you an attorney?
MR. SCHAUER: No.

MR. YONO: No.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the
truth?

MR. SCHAUER: I do.
MR. YONO: I do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and where we can help you tonight on this case.

MR. SCHAUER: Okay. So if you guys recall, we've been here a couple of times in the past. Most notably in February. We were approved for this same footprint. We were approved on the size of the footprint, but we were not approved on the lot coverage percentage. So we haven't increased the size. It's the same footprint as previous. It's just kind of a formality to get that. We should have asked for it at the same time. I didn't realize that.

Additionally, we have an eight foot max accessory structure height, but in this case, we're kind of in a hybrid scenario because we're not using this as a shed. We're trying to put a finished ceiling in it and not have it be a flat roof. I'm going to pull the elevations up in a second here. But right now, Mr. Yono has a home under construction directly across the street and this accessory structure is going to be like a miniature version of that or an accented version so that as you're driving down, they look like they belong together and it's not, you know, an obscure thing that doesn't fit in the environment.

So I would just like to point out, we have not increased the size since it was approved back in February, we're just kind of asking for the formalities of the lot coverage and then as well as the roof.

I'm going to show you the elevations here real quick.

One thing that we did change since the last time in February when it was approved is we had an 8/12 roof pitch prior. We have a 6/12 roof pitch now. And I would also like to temporarily just show. This is Mr. Yono's house that's under construction across the street. That's a 12/12 roof pitch. So, you know, it wouldn't make sense and it wouldn't fit to have something that has a flat roof. And, again, if we want to have a finished ceiling in there, that's at seven feet with doors that can swing and people can use it safely. This is essentially as low as that roof can be without having it, you know appear too low of slope. We don't want something that has like a $2 / 12$ pitch and it frankly wouldn't work. We'd have to have it be a flat roof for it to be occupied, you know, as originally intended when we asked back in February for it.

So we made that concession. We've reduced the height. And like I said, the drawings that we presented before even though we weren't asking for the roof height and the lot coverage per se, it was approved in terms of the overall size which we have not changed.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to speak any other thing? Do you want to add anything?

MR. YONO: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. From the city?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the city at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Correspondence, please, Secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: 29 letters were mailed.

Two returned.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Any other audience would like to speak on this case tonight? Three minutes time allowed.

Okay. Looks like none.
Okay. Yeah. Nice presentation.

It's open to the board.
Anybody would like to speak on this case, the board members?

Okay. Looks like none.
Okay. Motion time. Jay, please go ahead.
MEMBER McLEOD: Sure. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ22-0048 sought by Joseph Yono for the South Lake Drive property because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring a compliance size and a matching roof.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because board prior approved it. The property is unique because of the small size of the lot and that it was approved without recognizing that the lot size was as small as it was for the variance.

The petitioner did not create the condition because the lot sizes were much smaller back when these were created versus the properties today.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because the variance is relatively small and the structure itself was previously approved.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the requester will continue to have appropriate use of their own property. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Somebody can make a second, please?

MEMBER LONGO: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Say all
in favor. Any changes?
Okay. Roll call, please.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.

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

MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Good luck. MR. SCHAUER: Thank you, Board.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Tonight's
final case, PZ22-0050, Dan and Wendi Williams, 1419
West Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive and south of West Pontiac Trial, Parcel 50-22-03-204-021. The applicant is requesting variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a side yard setback of five feet, ten feet minimum required, a variance of five feet; an aggregate total side yard setback of 17.75 feet, 25 feet required, variance ever 7.25 feet; and a proposed lot coverage of 32 percent, $25 \%$ maximum allowed, variance of 7 percent. Section 3.32-7 for a proposed deck 13.5 feet from the rear yard property line, 17 feet minimum required, variance of 3.5 feet. Section 4.19.1.E(i) for the construction of a 1,008 square foot garage, maximum of 850 square feet allowed by code, variance of 158 square feet. Section 3.1.5 for a third story, 2.5 stories allowed by code. These variances would accommodate the building of a new home and deck. This property is zoned Single Family Residential, R-4.

Okay. Is the applicant present, please?
Yeah. Please come to the podium and spell your first and last name clearly for our secretary for the court record. And our secretary will take the oath if you're not an attorney.

MR. WILLIAMS: Dan Williams, D-a-n W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.

MS. WILLIAMS: Wendi Williams, W-e-n-d-i W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s. Neither of us are lawyers.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MS. WILLIAMS: We do.
MR. WILLIAMS: We do. I do.
MS. WILLIAMS: We do.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dan and Wendi. Please go ahead and present your case where we can help you tonight.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Does this still zoom? I don't know how to work this thing. Is this the zoom?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, that's the zoom.


We actually came before the board twice last
year where we received unanimous approval for this identical design. We've made no changes. The first time was in July and it was unanimously approved. And the second time we came was because of an unprecedented rehearing request. And in that second rehearing there were no changes made to the case that was presented initially that was unanimously approved and we went through all the detail of it and then at the end of it we were told that it was approved again unanimously. So we haven't made any changes to it.

The reason we're here today is because of the timing on it. We had to be in -- you know, break ground by November 14 th and we can't do it. There's just not enough time to get it done. The existing house has to be demolished, the existing garage has to be demolished. So we're here because we couldn't get it done fast enough.

So I'm going to go ahead and step through these.

MS. WILLIAMS: I have copies of this if the -- would the board like copies of this document 'cause it's kind of the key of our case?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know if you can --

MS. WILLIAMS: I don't know if it's very legible up there.

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know if you can read that or not.

MS. WILLIAMS: Can I give you these copies or no or?

MR. WILLIAMS: Do you want -- we have copies for everybody if you want them.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Please go ahead and present. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's a lot easier to -- if you have --

MEMBER KRIEGER: Is it in our packet?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
MS. WILLIAMS: It's the same thing.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I think that
we --

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, same thing.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. We do have the -- thank you, ma'am.

MR. WILLIAMS: So there's a lot of
information on there. The first row is the lot coverage on the top of this and then it just progresses
down with all of the variances that are being requested.

The first column refers to what the code is. And then the second column and third column relate to the historical precedents that's been set with approvals with regard to the largest and then the mathematical average of the variances that have been approved.

And the sequence is always the same. I know that it's obscured on the lower right-hand side there because of the projector details. But in all cases the variances that are being requested are not only below the maximum that have been approved, but also substantially less than the average, you know, with regard to the math, the dimensionality of it. 'Cause these are all dimensional variances.

The first one -- and I ratchet right through these is the lot coverage. Where the code says 25 percent, we're at 29 -- no, I'm sorry. The code is 25 percent, the largest approved is 29 percent. The average approved is 12 and we're looking for seven.

So that just kind of points out that first row where what we're asking for is way less than what
the maximum approved is and way less than what the average approved is. Where the maximum was 29 and the average was 12 and what we're asking for with regard to the lot coverage is seven.

What we're asking for is less than the max, less than the average. And then I know there's a lot of variances here. I wanted to point out that we are not asking for a variance for a front or rear yard setback.

And that's really the big thing on the lake, especially what we call the rear yard setback and that would be the relative position of the house with respect to the lake where people get crazy about obstructing views. The code is 35 and out of respect for the neighbors, we are holding at 39 feet away from the lake so as to minimally obscure their views on either side of us.

We know that some of the neighbors are not happy. In fact, we know that, you know, one of our neighbors has threatened to sue the city of Novi twice in this same meeting. It is noted in the meeting minutes of August 10th, 2021, on pages five and six. Then a separate threat on line eight of page five. On
lines 20 and 21.
That's from the August 10th. So we're aware that we have some neighbors that are opposed to this. We have modified the design in an effort to accommodate the best we can for our neighbors. We have around $\$ 25,000$ in architectural design costs. More than half of that is for design changes to accommodate the neighbors.

We've -- when we make a change to accommodate a neighbor thinking that we have a solution and a resolution, all we get is another complaint. You know, so that kind of got clear that we weren't ever really going to get any kind of blessing from all the neighbors.

MS. WILLIAMS: It's kind of like whac-a-mole. You take care of one thing, somebody else brings something else up, somebody else brings something up. So we did try.

MR. WILLIAMS: And I can elaborate on that, but, you know, you don't want to hear it all, you know, what details, dates, E-mails, invoices from an architect and all that kind of stuff. You don't want to hear all that.

MS. WILLIAMS: But we did have a lot of support as well.

MR. WILLIAMS: On a positive note, the city has on record 20 letters of support of the protect.

You know, the big thing here is this is for the -- it's for our benefit, but it's for the benefit of the city of Novi, for the Novi residence, and property owners on the lake. And that's why we're asking for reapproval today, this evening, to go ahead with our enhancement plan. Basically to tear down an old house that was constructed in 1929 as a duplex and along with an associated three and a half car garage and build a nice proper contemporary home.

So I ratchet through as fast as I can here on these variances. This first one relates to the lot coverage. And it is 7 percent variance, below the max granted, below the average that's been granted. Since our approval, the averages have been going up with regard to the variances that have been granted. And I don't have a problem with that. I'm just bringing that to your attention.

So this diagram illustrates the existing house and the new house where the existing house is the
gray region and the new house is the heavy black. So you can see, $I$ have to point on this a little bit. In this region right here is the garage. And the existing garage is this gray square. What we've done is we -in a new design, is we've connected the house to the garage. And in doing -- there's currently a three and a half car garage. It's a nice garage there. It's three cars, not three and a half. So that's how we go to this four car garage, two doors on it. Just like what they're doing all over in Bolingbrooke. Just like you'd do with a house, you know, that's over a million dollars, you want to have a lot place to park your car. And we can because we've got -- despite the fact that there's hardship with this irregular kooky lot, it comfortably absorbs this design.

One of the details there relates to the distance of this house to the nearest house to the north. It's 40 feet, which is unprecedented. And it's afforded by the luxury that we enjoy because of the city of Novi because a very large 165 foot vacant lot that separates us from our neighbor to the north who is an expert at making legal threats in this room about why this project should not go, which is very confusing
for me. 165 feet deep, 22 feet wide. So the nearest structure after the new house is done would be that house, it's 40 feet away.

So the proposed lot coverage which is the focus on this bullet right here, just getting right to that, is real -- actually, it's quite similar to what we have now. As you can see, the gray garage, the gray house and then this gray here is the huge deck that's out in front. And we'll get to the deck, but -- and everything gets demolished and rebuilt, but the rebuild is real close to what's existing. So the existing is all the colored, the new is the square box. Very similar lot coverage when we include the deck.

There's a lot of these so $I$ have to kind of ratchet through. The next ones relate to the side yard setbacks. And then on our table in the bottom we have the code, you know, the ten, the 15 and the 20 , which you have in front of you. And the current design -the current home is two feet eight inches away from the lot line on this side. So there's an air-conditioning unit that's on this side right about where the tip of my pen is. And I can't walk between the air-conditioner and the fence because the house is 2.8
feet away from the. Okay. So that's one of the things we're doing is we're going to double that. And that's a variance required to -- you know, 'cause we want five foot yard setback on that side. And it's a proposed five foot side yard setback for that side where we would be doubling the distance.

The original design, we wanted to go five foot yard setback on the other side as well. But we had some objections from our neighbors and more than one of them, two of them. And so we redesigned and narrowed up the house and that's how we're so far from the lot line on the left side. We basically went from a five foot side yard setback request to now we're 12 foot nine on that side. So we skinnied up the house. And that was what was presented before and approved before. No changes have been made.

Next the deck. And the deck is kind of significant in the regard that it's huge. It's ginormous. So there's no other deck like this aside from the one that the city of Novi has in the southwest corner of the lake and bay side where the deck is parallel and adjacent to the lake and actually hangs out over the lake. And it's about 70 feet of deck that
physically hangs out -- it's to the water's edge and hangs out over the edge. It's pretty cool. It's nice, but it's old. And the deck specification is 17 feet. The current is like zero feet and we want to do it at 13 and a half feet. So we want to add a green belt between the lake and the deck where there is none. And that green belt would be 13 and a half feet, not the code of 17 feet. So that's where we're asking for the three and a half feet as we did before. As we approved before. Nothing changed. Nothing different here. This pretty -- this rendition kind of illustrates what we're talking about with regard to the deck where the top view, you can see it spans all the way to my boat launch. The bottom view, it's short of the boat launch substantially. And the top view is straight to the water's edge. The bottom view is 13 and a half feet away from the lake.

And then the existing railing is a rugged, heavy wood. The new stuff would be, you know, more contemporary pipe and cable so you can see through it a little better. Less maintenance. Low maintenance or no maintenance. Low or no maintenance.

This diagram is from West Lake Road -- West

Lake Drive, I'm sorry, looking to the east. And this is the 165 foot vacant lot that the city of Novi owns to the north. And the fence separate us from that 22 foot vacant lot. And you can see the deck here right up to the edge of the boat lunch. Where here, this picture does a better job of it where the deck follows the house, which is only -- it's about 20 feet less wide. Maybe 19 and a half feet.

This has some glare on it, but that's the current and the proposed design. And this does a pretty good job showing that open space between the proposed new home and the existing home.

We're still talking about the deck variance where the 13 and a half feet with a green belt here and the house placed 39 feet from the lake, it just illustrates what we're trying to do. This would be like a countermeasure of ours. The gentleman earlier asked, well, you know, what would you do if it wasn't approved, we would come back with this as a countermeasure where we would -- if we didn't get the -- and the only reason $I$ talk like this defensively and you have to -- I have to apologize, right, it's because I'm getting hit with objections. Due to the
inherent design of the meeting, I have to present what I'm asking for and why $I$ think it's fair and reasonable. But that would be the countermeasure with regard to not getting that particular variance is that we would say, oh, okay, we're going to be compliant on the deck. We're going to make our little green belt area 13 and a half feet. We'll increase it to 17, but then we're going to take the house, you know, closer to the lake which would not require, you know, any kind of a variance because there's no dimensional problem with it being a 35 foot setback.

So the design we're asking for is in fact more favorable for the neighbors, not for us. And if you want to test us on that, please feel free. It's not like some veiled kind of threat or something like that. I'll come back. And I'll come back next month and I'll come with the one that's 35 foot on the house. Okay.

All right. So let's keep on rolling here. I apologize for my defensive nature, right. It's due to the inherent design of the meeting where I have to present and defend all at once.

So now we're to the last part, the three
story thing. And we're complaint on the overall height. So what we're asking here is for a variance on the number of stories. The code is two and a half stories, we're asking for three stories. And what pushes that third story is the elevator and the fact that we don't have a basement. As you may know on the lake, especially on this side of the lake, we can't have basements because we hit water at about 42,46 inches. So this attic, it would be our upstairs basement. And this is the doctor's note, the proverbial doctor's note saying, yeah, you know, elevator's good. And that's on record with the city of Novi with additional detail being that this public forum. We're just keeping it to the minimum.

And here you have your design comments from the elevator company where they're stipulating -- and it makes sense, you have to have a full third floor if the elevator is going to get you to the third floor. You can't have like a two and a half story floor. When the elevator door opens, it has to have the eight foot to clear.

So that's kind of the summary. And then people say, oh, why do you need the upstairs basement.

And it's because we have so much junk to store. We have pallets of halloween decorations and Valentine's decorations and every holiday's decorations. St. Patrick's Day decorations. We have hearts for Valentine's decoration. We would be forbidden from living in most condo complexes.

So anyway, that would be the end of the talk about the height. Where we're compliant on the height, but we're -- it's not too tall, but because the way it's chopped up, it's qualifying as three full floors so we're asking for that.

The next one relates to the garage. We want to have a thousand square foot garage. Tons of them in town bigger than that. And on the garage thing I'm just pointing out to you that the new garage is basically going to go where the existing garage is. The huge difference is that the new garage will connect to the house. It's so cold in Michigan, you know, snow, ice, rain, that we would really like to have the garage attached to the house.

So that's the summary on the garage size.
And this is a summary of the community considerations with regard to changes in the design and
whatnot that we did prior to our first approval in July of 2021, last year.

And I apologize for not starting the protect, but there's a lot of factors beyond my control. I would like to have broken ground by now. Just couldn't get there. And we do want to proceed with the project. And so that's what we're here for this evening is to ask for your support and your approval.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dan and Wendi. Good presentation. Who did that presentation, is beautiful. Okay.

From the city?
MR. BUTLER: No comments from the city.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Larry.
And correspondence, Secretary?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: 33 letters were mailed, three returned, two objections and one approval.

There was an objection from a Tim Richardson. I object to one of the variances. I think the five yard -- it says five yard -- it's probably five foot -setback is not necessary as they have a large lot. Why crowd the neighbor.

The second is just circled objection from a

Michelle Wood.
And then from Danielle and Justin Weinger, W-e-i-n-g-e-r. Approval. We feel that any improvement to the neighborhood is great.

MS. WILLIAMS: Could I just quickly
comment --
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Secretary.
MS. WILLIAMS: -- that we were told that we did not have to go get these letters again 'cause we had 20 letters of support at the meetings last year so just letting you know.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, yeah. We could have expanded this to 25 or 30 . We didn't make any effort on that, but we're prepared to do that if necessary.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. In the audience, anybody would like to speak on this case? Yeah, please come. You have three minutes time limit. You can proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is there any time limit on the next speaker?

MS. WILLIAMS: He just said that, three minutes.

MR. CONDON: You had 23 minutes, Dan, so.
MS. SAARELA: Just to clarify, the applicant doesn't have a time limit. There are three minutes on the public comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yep. That's what I told at the beginning.

Okay. Thank you. And spell your first and last name clearly.

MR. CONDON: Michael Condo, M-i-c-h-a-e-l $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}$. I swear to tell the whole truth.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Michael. Please go ahead.

MR. CONDON: Thank y'all very much for your time here tonight. I come before you -- when I go to the city's website and $I$ look at what gets a variance, okay. The elements of unnecessary hardship. Okay. There -- when you look at this lot, these are self created hardships. This is a gigantic lot that doesn't really require variances.

And, yes, we've been here and it's been frustrating because nothing -- you know, if we go through three stories on the lake it becomes precedent setting. There's not a three-story house on the lake.
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We're changing the entire lake neighborhood. It's not like a different subdivision that goes three stories. Okay.

And then also, you know, the gigantic garages. Okay. There's a reason the city has ordinances and they somewhat need to be followed because I would have never built the house I did if I ever dreamed that the house being built to the south of me was going to end up changing my sunshine, my view, my look. The most expensive window in my house is going to have a total different look than the city ordinances ever said initially. Okay.

And so the point is, you know, there's been a lot of frustrations in the neighborhood about this. Okay. I mean, people are talking about it. They're in disbelief. And, yeah, it did get approved, but there also was a lot of weird things getting there because, you know, at one time we were all at a meeting and Dan asked for an adjournment and he didn't ask in advance, but it was waited for different -- delayed for different members would be at the board.

But bottom line, you know, Michael said right at the beginning of this, well, can't we just slide the
garage back and have a little bit of three story and move it back from the lake and that will solve all the problems. I ask you to take a fresh look at this. We're not asking for anything major here. We're saying just pull the deck back three and a half feet so that it doesn't change everybody else's, all the neighbors. Their deck will still be out in front of everybody else's. Okay.

And then the garage, one of the other things about the garage, all the neighbors have one-story garages with an angled roof above. This is proposed to be a two-story garage with the angled roof. So it really looks different when you put a two-story garage and the roof above it, versus all the other neighbors having one-story garages. Okay.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Can you sum it up, please.
MR. CONDON: Thank you, very much.
MEMBER KRIEGER: You're on your three minutes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Three minutes,
Michael. Thank you so much.
MR. CONDON: And so, you know, a couple of the variances are one thing. Six of the variances is
way too much so I ask you to reconsider this. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much.
Okay. It's open to the board. Any questions can ask the board?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Two questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, Member
Krieger.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Mr. Williams?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you be on the podium, Mr. Williams.

MEMBER KRIEGER: For the water side where you're going to build your deck, the -- you have the lattice $I$ think where the deck is at and then you'd remove it. Is it -- oh, I forgot the word I wanted. For the water side, to protect the earth from being washed away, are you putting in stone or what are you?

MS. WILLIAMS: Right. Yeah. That's a good question. And the question is related to the seawall.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Seawall. Thank you. MR. WILLIAMS: On the lake side. Currently there's a kind of a hobo looking lattice kind of stuff
across the whole face of it to conceal -- you know, to hide, you know, what's below and behind. And so, yeah, that will all get ripped out and then a proper seawall would be installed there.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. And then I guess for the second question, the height or three stories, I don't know if the city would be answering that.

MS. WAGNER: That's the height.
MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. There's no height -MEMBER KRIEGER: You can't have a basement so --

MR. WILLIAMS: Right. There's no height -we're within the height requirements.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Right.
MR. WILLIAMS: We're not asking for anything extra high. To me it's kind of kooky that there's even a code on it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So you can call it three stories but it's -- if your in the height, then that's what you're --

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Yeah. Why would --
(The Court Reporter asked for clarification.)

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry.
MEMBER KRIEGER: Well, anyway. So the three stories is within the height so you don't have to call it three stories, just call it you're at the height request and that was it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you, Member Krieger.

Any other board member? Yeah, Member Jay.
MEMBER McLEOD: So sorry. I'll be completely
transparent on this one. You lost me a lot in your presentation when you commented that, quote/unquote, this was already approved. I'm a little bit lost now in what specifically are you requesting now in this meeting versus what you've already been approved for? What is new in this discussion --

MR. WILLIAMS: So thank you for asking. Nothing new.

MEMBER McLEOD: Nothing new.
MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair?
MS. SAARELA: I can clarify. This was here a
year ago. Because they didn't start the project, their variances expired.

MEMBER McLEOD: Oh.

MS. SAARELA: So it's the same proposal, it just has to -- they have to re --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Reconsider.

MS. SAARELA: Well, no. Not reconsider, but they have to propose the whole thing over again and it has to be reapproved because it expired.

MEMBER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SAARELA: So it's nothing different than it was before.

MEMBER McLEOD: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jay.
And, Larry, do you have any questions?
MR. BUTLER: No. That just ...
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, okay.
Attorney. Okay.
Any other board member, please?
Member Thompson, you have any questions?
MEMBER THOMPSON: I do not.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Good. And it's the time for the motion. Montague, Member Montague?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ22-0050, recognizing that
it was previously approved and the proposal has not changed. The petitioner would be prevented from using a contemporary structure for his residence. The property is unique because of the irregular lot. The petitioner did not create the condition. The property existed in its current configuration.

The relief granted will not unnecessarily interfere with adjacent and surrounding properties because it is consistent with new developments in the area and the lot coverage is very similar to what's sitting on the site now.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it will be an attractive addition to the neighborhood. And I think -- remembering from before, they did a significant effort in trying to satisfy the neighbors and going around and talking to people.

The variance, it was previously approved and was basically a timing issue because of construction and there were no changes to the previous approved approach.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can somebody make a second?

MEMBER LONGO: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Yeah. Roll call, please.
MS. WAGNER: Chairperson Peddiboyina?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.
MS. WAGNER: Member Krieger?
MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Longo?
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member McLeod?
MEMBER McLEOD: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Montague?
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Thompson?
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. WAGNER: Member Copes?
MEMBER COPES: Yes.

MS. WAGNER: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
And good luck. Congratulations.
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. And that is
the final of today's cases and that's the end for
today's agenda meeting. Before I adjourn, any say aye in favor, any changes or anything?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to adjourn.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Somebody make a second.

MEMBER COPES: Support.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Support. Thank
you.
Say all in favor aye.
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.
Meeting is adjourned.
(At 8:20 p.m., matter concluded)
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