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CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I am calling to order the September 12, 2017, ZBA meeting for today. Would you please all join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Please be seated.

Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Present.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Ferrell is absent excused.

Member Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: Present.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Montville is
absent excused.

| Member Nafso is absent excused. <br> Member Peddiboyina is absent excused. <br> Chairperson Sanghvi. <br> CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Present. Thank you. <br> I think you all are aware of the format for the public hearing. Those of you who are not, the information is available near the front door, and I won't go into it again. <br> The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. <br> Madam Secretary, is there any change? <br> MS. OPPERMANN: Yes. In Case No. PZ 17-0039, NSA Architects and City of Novi. They have reduced the number of variances they're requesting to just one which is from the Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.6.2.B for a 40.8 -foot variance for proposed north front yard setback of 34.17 feet, 75 feet required. <br> CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay, thank you. <br> May I entertain a motion to approve the entire agenda as amended? <br> MS. GRONACHAN: So moved. |  |  |
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MS. KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor of accepting the minutes please signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Those opposed same sign.

The next item on the agenda is the minutes for the meeting of August 2017. Are there any changes, deletions, omissions?

The only comment $I$ would make is a couple places there were typo errors. Instead of PZ it is PT and it's of no significance.

MS. GRONACHAN: No other changes?
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No, I don't see any other correction.

May I entertain a motion to approve the minutes as presented?

MS. GRONACHAN: So moved.
MR. BYRWA: Support.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Those opposed same sign. Thank you.

Now is the time for the public remarks. Is there anybody in the audience who'd like to make any comments to the Board about any subject other than the items on the agenda today, this is the time to do it. I don't see any so we'll move further on.

Before $I$ call the first case, $I$ just want to make an announcement that, as you all know, the Zoning Board of Appeals is a hearing body empowered by the Novi City Charter to hear appeals seeking variances from the applications of the Novi Zoning Ordinances, and it takes at least four members to approve a variance request and a majority of the present to deny a variance.

A full board consists of six members. As you can see today, we are a little truncated, and since we are only four members present this evening, all four votes are required. Those of the petitioners at this time who wish to have their cases tabled for the next meeting when a full Board may be present may do so now.

If there is any applicant here who is not happy about the situation, this is the time to speak. Seeing none, we'll carry on and start the public hearing for the first case.

It is PZ 17-0034, and it is located at 45833 W. Twelve Mile Road, and correction on this, it is not east of Napier Road, but it is east of Beck Road and south of Twelve Mile Road, Parcel No. 50-22-15-226-003.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of Ordinance Section 28-6 to allow the installation of a 48-square foot temporary sign, 40 square foot maximum is allowed. This property is zoned Residential Acreage.

Is the applicant here? Will you please come forward, and if you are not an attorney, please identify yourself, your name, address and be sworn in by our secretary today. Thank you.

MS. DEMICO: My name is Marisa DeMico, I'm from Signarama in Troy. Our address is 1017 Naughton Drive, Troy, Michigan 48083.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Mr. Byrwa, swear her in, please.
(Ms. Marisa DeMico sworn.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please go ahead and make your presentation.

MS. DEMICO: We have a real estate client who is looking to maximize the visibility for their future multistory office complex so they are looking to have their sign at a larger scale to showcase the rendering of the new building.

The overall lot is 18.5 acres so they're looking to achieve the maximum exposure to future and potential tenants with the larger sign. With having a larger sign, it is ideal for advertisement and that this will read to a larger group of clientele.

It is being placed on an undeveloped parcel of land. All of the adjacent properties are also land so it's not affecting anybody in the area.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment about this case?

Seeing none, City, any comments?
MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comments.

Secretary Mr. Byrwa, do you have any correspondence?

MR. BYRWA: Yes. The City mailed out 20 letters. Out of the 20 , four letters were returned and there was zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Thank you.

I will open it to the Board for comments. Yes, Ms. Gronachan.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you, Chair Sanghvi. Good evening.

MS. DEMICO: Good evening.
MS. GRONACHAN: This is a pretty unique piece of property.

MS. DEMICO: Yes.
MS. GRONACHAN: And it would be great if it could be sold. It would be a definite improvement to that side of town.

Given the uniqueness of the shape of the property and the way it cuts in, I think that this sign is an appropriate request. It's been vacant for a long time, it needs some help.

Normally I'm not that crazy about huge astronomical signs, but $I$ think that in this case you proved the need for it. Like you mentioned, in regards to the shape of the lot, the location, the setback, and also the amount of traffic that goes by there, you can't catch that small sign when you're doing 50, and they don't travel slow on that road. I'm in full support.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Mr. Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Yes, I was wondering, I read in here that it's a temporary sign. Do you have any idea how long it's going to be out for?

MS. DEMICO: So it is representing the building that is going to be built onto the property so they are looking just to advertise the leasing spaces in the building, so it's kind of hard to tell an exact length of time.

MR. BYRWA: I don't think this Board has the ability, and our City Attorney can correct me, to grant a variance on something temporary more than a year, is it?

MS. SAARELA: I don't know, I'd have to
check that. I don't recall that in the Sign Ordinance.

MR. BYRWA: I think after a year she would have to come in and reapply.

MS. SAARELA: Yes, perhaps that's right.

MS. DEMICO: Okay. That won't be an issue, we can definitely do that.

MR. BYRWA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: I am also in support, but
I agree to two years, if necessary, as I agree with a temporary sign to return back and reapply to the Board.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Well, I agree with the rest of the members of the Board, a temporary sign at the most for a period of one year to start with and then go from there.

Can I entertain a motion from somebody?
Go ahead.
MS. KRIEGER: I move that we grant the
variance in Case No. PZ 17-0034 sought by the petitioner for this parcel. Their difficulty as
previously mentioned is the speed on the road for safety and the size of the area proportional to attract the tenants that they are intending to look for.

The property is unique because of its location and topography and it's not self-created. The relief will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent and surrounding properties, and it is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance, and we would grant it for one year. MS. GRONACHAN: So moved. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Second? MS. GRONACHAN: Oh, sorry. Second. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPPERMANN: Member Byrwa. MR. BYRWA: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan. MS. GRONACHAN: Yes. MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger. MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Sanghvi. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion passes.
Thank you. Go ahead.
MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you, good luck.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The next case is PZ 17-0037, Rose Senior Living at 47601 Grand River, west of Beck Road and south of Grand River, Parcel No. 50-22-17-400-046. This, I think, is a part of the Providence Hospital Park complex.

Is the applicant here? Please come forward, identify yourself, give your name and address, and if you are not an attorney, please be sworn by our secretary. Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Michael Stevens. I am with Signarama in Troy, 1017 Naughton, Troy, Michigan 48083, and I am not an attorney.
(Mr. Michael Stevens sworn.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. STEVENS: I'm with Signorama, I'm the sign contractor. We are proposing to do a
secondary ground sign for the Rose Senior Living Community Center, 40 square feet overall with 8 foot from grade. There is a secondary entrance along Providence Parkway where, as you see on the site plan notated, is where we plan on putting the additional ground sign. There's a road that stretches back to the community. There's a lot of traffic that actually goes, obviously, around Providence Parkway there.

In addition to matching some of the existing -- well, the existing size that is already out there for some other directional signage that's on the hospital grounds there, we're also staying consistent with the coloring of the blue and gray scheme that the Providence signs have within the complex as well to kind of keep it more uniform; that's with the color as well as the overall size and height of some of the existing signs out there. That's how we kind of came up with the schematic of the 40 square feet, 8 foot from grade, as well as the color scheme just to give you a little background on that.

> This is just going to provide some
additional identification to the complex. As I mentioned, there is a lot of traffic, heavy traffic that goes through Providence Parkway, that circle there, and again this is just a second entrance into the property.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Do you have what we have got here that was sent here with the packet? You can put it on the table over there.

MR. STEVENS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: So everybody in this room as well can see.

In the meantime, is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment about this case?

Seeing none, City, any comment,
Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: No comment.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: I said no comment. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comment. Very good.

Mr. Byrwa, do we have any
correspondence?
MR. BYRWA: Yes. The City mailed out 58 letters. There were three letters returned with zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good, thank you. I open it up to the Board. Yes, Ms. Gronachan.

MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you. Good evening.

MR. STEVENS: Good evening.
MS. GRONACHAN: My favorite place to get lost. No, actually I think that the complex has done a great job in maneuvering for the several years back when it first started and it really was a maze to get through. I think that the signage that all of the organizations in that complex have done to help identify is very helpful.

In this case, again, $I$ think there is a need for the sign. Is this going to be lighted? You said non-lit.

MR. STEVENS: It's not illuminated.
MS. GRONACHAN: Okay, so that's even
more important because where this is going to be it's pretty dark out there. Normally when we go out and we look at signs, we look at them during the day, and the other night $I$ was driving through trying to get an idea where it was going to be and you almost need the size because of that area and how dark it really is. I mean there are some street lights, but it's a heavily lit area.

For brevity sake, I'm just going to say that I like it and I will be supporting it based on the information you provided and based on the layout of the land. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: I have a question. Were the other signs -- there's a second entrances off of Beck Road; is that right?

MR. STEVENS: Correct.
MS. KRIEGER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Byrwa. MR. BYRWA: Yes, I have a question about the 25 -foot clear vision area there. I see two of them here, one in a red and one in a green, and I was wondering if the locations meet that clear
vision area and it's not going to obstruct any site line of vehicles approaching?

MR. STEVENS: This drawing; is that correct?

MR. BYRWA: Right, that's correct.
MR. STEVENS: I know a couple ways that typically the cities would do that $I$ might just want to confirm because they do do that diagonally triangular type setback or they go 25 --

MR. BYRWA: Right, it's a clear vision area so that you can see the traffic as you approach the intersection.

MR. STEVENS: Correct. We'd be maintaining that 25 foot and then 25 foot over within the setback that we requested which was 1 foot off of the curb, actually, and that was also consistent with the other directional signage that was in the parkway as well.

MR. BYRWA: I thought the 25 foot started from the curb.

MR. STEVENS: 25 feet over and then 25 foot -- it was not 25 foot setback from the curb. This sign -- to your point, this sign is particular
just because it is on a corner. All the other directional signs, $I$ would say a majority of the directional signs that are within there down the street are just literally off Providence Parkway and they're all set back a foot off the curb there.

MR. BYRWA: Okay. This is going to be subject to the City's approval on the clear vision area.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I am quite familiar with the Providence Hospital complex and I know where you are and I saw this in the development stage long before it was approved by the Providence Hospital Board, so I know what you're going to do and I like what you are doing so I have no problem with the request of your sign.

If there is no further discussion, I will entertain a motion.

MS. GRONACHAN: I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ 17-0037, Signorama, Rose Senior Living, at 47701 Grand River, Novi, because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring this variance. Without the variance, the petitioner would be reasonably prevented or limited
with respect to the use of the property because of limited size and ability for patients to find the building.

The property is unique because of its vast size and unique shape, and for lack of a better description, winding roads and visibility even into the late evenings or winter when it gets dark early.

The petitioner did not create the condition because of the layout of the organization and campus. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because, as the petitioner stated in his testimony, this sign is consistent with the flow of the other signage throughout the property.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it grants the petitioner to continue to do business in Novi without any limitations for their clientele to locate them, thus having a successful business. Therefore, I move that we grant this variance.

MS. KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has
been made and seconded. Is there any further discussion?

Seeing none, Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Sanghvi.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Congratulations.
MS. KRIEGER: Before we move on, I just wanted to let you know that we have had a Sign Ordinance amendment, and the pretty comprehensive limitation on the temporary signs is not in here anymore.

MR. BYRWA: So they're not a year anymore?

MR. KRIEGER: No, there's nothing that
limits it, so put whatever limitation on it you think is reasonable under the circumstances.

MR. BYRWA: And who determines if it's reasonable or --

MS. KRIEGER: You just have to listen to the facts of why they need a variance and you make a determination. If you feel it's two years because the building's not going to be constructed for two years, then a two-year limitation that there's no --

MR. BYRWA: Well, I think on that one we agreed that she'd come back after a year.

MS. KRIEGER: Sure, that's fine. I just wanted to let you know that that's not in the ordinance.

MS. BYRWA: Good, thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Moving on to the next case. PZ 17-0038, for 49781 Leyland Circle, west of Wixom Road and north of Eleven Mile Road, Parcel No. 15-22-18-426-014.

The applicant Paul Mruk is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a 4.5 foot rear yard setback of
30.5 feet, 35 feet allowed. This property is zoned Single-Family Residential, R-1.

The applicant is already here. Please identify yourself and state your address, and if you're not an attorney, be sworn in by our secretary.

MR. MRUK: Sure. I'm not an attorney. My name is Paul Mruk, I live at 49781 Leyland Circle, Novi, Michigan.
(Mr. Paul Mruk sworn.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please go ahead.
MR. MRUK: We purchased this property many years ago with the intention of using the back yard space for our enjoyment. We found it to be buggy back there. We put a deck on, put a screened-in porch in the back of it, and we felt it would be interesting at this time to go ahead and put a more secured structure back there harming no one; no one can fully see the property on either side of us.

We are fortunate enough to have our neighbors approve this. Also the association has graciously approved it as well, so we are here today
to ask for a 4.5 foot variance.
What this really does is it takes the structure and puts it at the end of the deck. If I may show you, I think you already have this visual, the structure as designed by the builder -- I'll put this on here if that's okay so everyone else can see it -- it goes right there, I think. Anyway, the structure with the variance that's not allowed would be 4.5 feet or so less than the deck in the back, therefore, making the deck, rest of the deck useless for us. So we thought we'd put this screened-in porch and still be able to utilize our deck. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment about this case?

Seeing none, City?
MR. BUTLER: In reviewing the prints with the corner, it looks like that he really tried to utilize the best space that he could to put that porch and we were kind of in agreement with the design and how it looked.

It is kind of a uniquely shaped lot so
he's working with what he has to work with. He did a very good job with it in that situation.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Mr. Secretary.
MR. BYRWA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the City mailed out 26 letters. There were zero letters returned. However, there were one approval and zero objections.

The approval was from it appears to be a neighbor, Kevin McCarthy of 49769 Leyland Court, and he claims that he reviewed the plans, Paul reviewed the plans with him in detail, and the plans for this project be fully approved.

MR. MRUK: He's our next door neighbor, yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Very nice, thank you very much.

I'll open up to the Board. Go ahead, Ms. Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you for your presentation, and I can understand bugginess because it's the same in my back yard area so to surround it in and do it the best that you can, I'm in support
of this motion.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
I went and visited your place on
Saturday and looked around. In the back you have not a lot of room and it is quite the woodland, a lot of trees and all that, so I understand your need to escape from the mosquitos and to cover the place and I have no problem with your application.

Any other comments from anybody?
MS. GRONACHAN: I concur with my Board members. I think this is a minimum request and I'm a big fan of screened-in rooms in Michigan.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I'll entertain a motion.

MS. GRONACHAN: And with that, I will attempt a motion.

I move that we grant the variance in
Case No. PZ 17-0038, Paul Mruk at 49781 Leyland Circle, west of Wixom Road and north of Eleven Mile, for the 4.5 foot variance in the rear setback of 30.5 feet, 35 feet is allowed.

Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with
respect to use of the property given the shape of the lot, the size of the lot, and also the surrounding woodland area.

The property is unique because of the aforementioned shape and topography. The petitioner did not create this condition because of the lay of his subdivision and wooded area. The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent and surrounding properties based on testimony given by the petitioner as well as the approval by the neighbor.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the petitioner requested a minimal variance to resolve his issue and, therefore, $I$ am supporting that we grant this variance.

MS. KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made and seconded. If there is no further discussion, Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan.

identify yourself and state your address.
MR. MUCK: Good evening, I'm Jeff Muck, I'm the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director for the City of Novi. I'm actually joined tonight by Frank Ray from NSA Architects, Engineers, Planners, and Steve Sorenson from PEA who has been acting as our consultants on this project.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. (Mr. Jeff Muck sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.
MR. MUCK: I'll be very brief. The Lakeshore Park Project has been in development since it was identified in an independent 2016 Parks and Recreation Cultural Services capital needs assessment as a priority.

The initial conceptual plan has evolved based on citizen, Parks Commission and City Council feedback. The plan has been reviewed and developed by PRCS and facility staff, architects, city planners, landscape architect and public safety personnel.

We have received feedback from citizens both in favor and opposed to the project and have
adjusted the plan throughout the design process.
The new building is intended for Parks and Recreation programs, children's camps, senior citizen programs, a library presence and to serve as a voting location for two precincts.

The parking lot will be paved. The large shelter and front playground will be replaced and the volleyball courts will be moved to the active area of the park and the soccer field.

The overall plan will provide safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists using the park and make the park more accessible to those with disabilities.

As indicated on the agenda approval and in your packets, we have worked with the planning division to modify our project negating the need for variances on the east side setback and bike rack location distance. We are here this evening requesting a variance for the north setback and we will stand by to address any questions that you have on that matter.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make
a comment about this case? Please come forward, identify yourself, give your name and address, and be sworn in by our secretary. Thank you.

MR. THOMOPOULOS: Good evening, my name is John Thomopoulos and I tend to follow Jeff when he does a presentation at these meetings. I live at 425 South Lake Drive which is the house immediately to the east of the proposed building.

Do I need to be sworn in? I'm not an attorney.

MR. BYRWA: Yes. One thing, could you spell your name for the record, please?

MR. THOMOPOULOS: It's $\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{l}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{s}$.
(Mr. John Thomopoulos sworn.)
MR. THOMOPOULOS: So thank you for taking my comments tonight. My family is most affected by this zoning request because we live right next to the proposed building that's going to go up.

We had received two notifications in the mail, but we just submitted one with some comments and some drawings and observations. We
didn't want to be redundant. We have a double lot so we got two letters.

We submitted an objection to the variance request, and the reason is that we feel that the zoning that's being requested is inconsistent with the homes in that area and the results of some errors in the zoning request, and we've tried to identify some of the errors that we spotted.

The request states that this variance will positively impact the immediate area. We feel that it will not. It's a park. It's going to replace parkland that's often used by lots of families with a large building and an even bigger asphalt parking lot. I don't view that as an improvement. Many families currently enjoy that green space and it's going to be replaced by a building and a big parking lot.

The front yard variance is going to create a structure that's much closer to the road than our home. It's going to stand out, not blend in. I believe that the data packet that was submitted by the City said that it was consistent
with the surrounding buildings. If you look at the drawing that we submitted, it juts out pretty far in front of our home. If it was set back 75 feet, it would be consistent with our property.

The zoning request also states that the existing building that's in the park is only 35 feet from our property line. That's incorrect. It's actually 180 feet away. The new building that's going to be put in is approximately 75 feet from our property line. So there is a lot of privacy and noise issues that we're also going to be trying to deal with, and I'm going to continue to try and work with the City to mitigate that as best I can.

The park is almost 400 acres, so if you think about it, it's a zoning request. They've got 400 acres to work with. I recognize that some of it is going to be swampy, some of it's very tree covered, but it's 400 acres. Why do you need to have a zoning request? The only thing I can think of is that the building is either way too big or it's not in the right spot and it needs to be moved. And then final thoughts. If a developer had come in here with a similar request,
you know, I'd like you to consider would you grant it? I recognize that this is the City of Novi that's asking for the variance, but I'd like you to reject the variance and take into consideration the negative impacts it's going to have on my home, my neighbors and the people that currently use the park.

Thank you very much for your time.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Anybody else? Please come forward, identify yourself.

MR. ZACK: My name is Gary Zack, I live at 359 South Lake Drive. I'm the next door neighbor to John so I'm two houses away from the park.

Do I need to --
MR. BYRWA: Could you spell your name for the record.

MR. ZACK: $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{k}$.
(Mr. Gary Zack sworn.)
MR. ZACK: I have the same points as John, but I'll add to them. Again, I think that the front setback does not allow for the building to be aligned. It's going to be very much in the front of
the park very close to the road, and I think as far as the look of the neighborhood, the building is already a much more commercial looking building and a very large one at that, bigger than any of the houses around. I think to minimize that impact it should have to meet the north or front setback at least.

And I also agree with John that given the park's size, it seems like it could be relocated and not have any of these issues. The existing building where that footprint is which wouldn't require cutting all the trees down that this will, this is going to take out a lot of trees in the front of the park that are mature trees. If it were going where the existing building is, there wouldn't be any of those problems and it could easily be made larger in that spot.

I also have a concern and it also relates to the trees because this project in total is taking about 140 trees out of the park which is a very large number. Out of the area that's there, it's about half, that portion. And because this building is so close to the road without the
setback, there's no room and there's waivers required for the landscaping and the trees that would normally go in front of the building to soften the impact again. So that's another reason that I don't think that it should be allowed to be less than the required variance.

It was also stated to the citizens that this building would be built without the -- would follow all the ordinances, so I guess this one sort of slipped through.

And I would like to say when this was presented to the voters, the building, before the millage last year, it was shown as a 4,800 square foot building with a 2,400 square foot footprint. It has since changed to a 9,400 square foot building with an 11,450 square foot footprint, so it's gotten a lot bigger, and $I$ think if it's going to have to be this size, it shouldn't be right up in the front where the houses are making it look like a commercial area. So I object to the variance for the north front yard setback. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I appreciate your offering. Thank you very much.

Anybody else?
Seeing none, any comments from the City?

MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comments. Is there some correspondence?

MR. BYRWA: Yes. The City mailed out 33 letters, four letters were returned, zero approvals and five objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Could we have the applicant come back to the front here? Perhaps you would like to put the picture of the building on the screen and maybe enlighten us about what you plan to do with it.

MR. MUCK: The site plan or the elevation?

MS. GRONACHAN: I think the site plan.
MR. MUCK: The request for the variance is to reduce the front yard setback. Our primary issue that we have here has to do with the topography on the site. So the 75 -foot setback and the 40 -foot reduction that we're asking for is because of a severe grade situation that we have
from front to rear in the front area of the site. We did study other locations on the park and this was ultimately the location that we selected on the park. So what I'd like to do also is show a site section through the front of the site to show the issues.

If you look at the dashed line on that site, this section runs north to south through the arrows that we have here and we're looking to the east, and the solid line that you see on that sketch is the new proposed grades, the dashed line represents the existing grade. And you'll see from Lakeshore Drive, which is on the left side here, and then as we get to the back this is the pond area that you see right here. When we run into this rear south side of the site, the grades in that area just make it really hard for us to compress and get the site on there, the site plan on the site.

As we work the site plan and we work the building plan north to south, we have to accommodate pedestrian traffic, we have vehicle traffic through the -- around the drive, and the north-south dimension is compressed as much as we
can get it to maintain safe pedestrian walking grades and vehicles going around the parking lot.

The other accommodation was on the north side of the building where we're replacing the existing structure with new-like restrooms and those restrooms are accommodated on the north end of the site. That's one of the other points to make regarding why the building is on this side of the site.

So the grades in that area both east and west and north and south make it such that the building in this location is really the right location to put the building. We're trying not to take property away from the actual park, and the farther south we locate the building, the more park area we take away as well.

The pedestrian walkways are on the north and we connect into Lakeshore Drive. We also connect to the underpass that goes underneath Lakeshore, and the grades in that area are very steep. We finished the design and were able to do it without any ramping or any stairs, and that was really important to us to keep it very pedestrian in
that area, and that's one of the reasons why having that proximity where it has allowed us to maintain a balance on the site, both on Lakeshore where the pedestrians are there and as we transition to the actual park, and make that grade kind of a balance.

As you see on our diagram, again, for every -- I think we calculated for every 5 feet, we push this building back -- even as it is today, we have a retaining wall that's about 6 feet high at the south end of the parking lot right here, it curves around, and if we moved this back even 5 feet, that retaining wall gets 5 feet taller.

So we really tried our best to compress the building, compress the parking lot, compress the pedestrian sidewalks without encroaching into that low area that's there against the new pond as we're trying to mitigate stormwater management as well and accommodate grades there without having too severe an impact on the green area in that area as we're providing a new pavilion back there and we wanted to have some flat areas back there and that's where the retaining wall was put in to help with those grades. MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you.

building as you stage them for voting.
So while, yes, there was an initial plan that was put out in 2014 and it was exactly what we've been saying from the get-go, it was a conceptual plan. The plan has evolved to the point where we're at today for 9,400 square feet.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good, thank you.

Before I open up to the Board, I've been going to this park for over 40 years and upgrading has been overdue for a long time. Notwithstanding the objections of some of the residents, $I$ think this is moving in the right direction and personally I have no problem with your plans. Thank you.

I will open it up to the Board. Oh, do we have any correspondence?

MR. BYRWA: Yes, we did it.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: May I hear any comments from anybody on the Board? Yes, Mr. Byrwa.

MR. BYRWA: Yes, this was already at the City's Planning Board. How was it modified or you came to this final design; how was it modified
at the Planning Board?
MR. MUCK: That would be in regards to the side setback. We've listened to the residents. We noticed that we did need to improve that, and we've been trying to work, especially with Mr. Thomopoulos, in regards to the issues in regards to his side of the building and the screening, so that was something that we did shrink the footprint of the patio so that we could meet that side setback, and then also in regard to that we did address the bike rack issue as well.

MR. BYRWA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Yes, Ms. Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: Since it's closer up to the road, it's up where the berm is at, is that right, where the road goes up before you turn left into it and where those tennis/volleyball courts are at; is that where the building is going to sit at?

MR. MUCK: Correct.

MS. KRIEGER: So you'll have
landscaping to the east for the residents to address the concerns of trees and buffer area between the
two?
MR. MUCK: The existing -- what we're trying to do is we want to maintain the existing vegetation that's in that area. There's a lot of heavy vegetation so we're trying to stay out of that area and not disrupt it, and then we're going to supplement probably during our (inaudible) space with the neighbor, we're going to walk the site and make sure any open areas will be filled in with any additional landscaping as required. That was the commitment we made in Planning Commission.

MS. KRIEGER: And then how would people using -- would there be directional signs to keep people using the beach area bathrooms from the people going into the building for --

MR. MUCK: Yes, absolutely, we'll have a full signage plan for directing traffic throughout that. As we've mentioned before, moving people through this park in a more safe manner and providing that disability/handicap accessibility has been a key feature of this project right from the get-go.

> If you look at the existing layout of
the park, we have basically the drive passing through the park, bisecting the park. We're eliminating that and trying to provide those safe pathways and so we'll have plenty of signage in regards to directing people to the trails and the shelters.

MS. KRIEGER: And then the old building used to have an area where the police could stop. I don't know if they have that open now. Would they also be able to participate in this new building?

MR. MUCK: We haven't really discussed that option with the police, but they've been very good partners with us on every project that we do and so we could definitely have that conversation with them.

MS. KRIEGER: And then for noise as it is now sun up to sun down, is there a concern about the time somebody needs for sleeping, the residents' concerns?

MR. MUCK: So there's been a lot of misconceptions about what this building is supposed to be. The term banquet center and reception hall has been thrown out numerous occasions, but not by

City staff since we've had these in discussions with City Council and came forward to Parks Commission, Planning Commission and now to you. So this is not a reception hall, it's not a banquet center. This is strictly for Parks and Recreation programs and usage for all ages. So we are very cognizant of what level of noise those kind of activities generate and will be very cognizant of the neighbors.

MS. KRIEGER: Thank you. And as brought to our attention in our packet that it's zoning, so it's mostly for Planning and the City, and that our address is for the residents to go back to Planning and City Council and then also your department for concerns and then we address the zoning part of it?

MR. MUCK: Yes.
MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good.
Anything else? Yes, Ms. Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you. Wow, what a project and congratulations.

So I understand that there's quite a
lot of heat, if you will, a lot of discussion, and $I$ actually got contacted by some of the residents at that end and I'm going to share these answers with them because I think it would help some of the people here.

This is a very well thought-out long-run project. Our job tonight is to make a recommendation to the City Council. It is not to vote on if this passes or not. We make a recommendation, it goes to City Council, and then they make the final approval. Is that correct?

MR. MUCK: That is correct.
MS. GRONACHAN: So I'm glad that you clarified a lot of things because I'll be honest with you, the banquet hall, it's not going to be -it's actually going to be a great building for that end, for the north end of town, and it's exciting for everyone.

My first question for you, though, is -- and this comes from the residents that I talked to this weekend -- on the other side of the street, there is a bunch of trees. Are those coming down?

MR. MUCK: We have no intention to take
those down unless those are needed due to disease and that would be determined by our forester.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. So those trees on the other side of the street, and I hope these residents are listening, they have nothing to do with this project and it will not affect that project?

MR. MUCK: Absolutely, thank you. The beach has nothing and the beach side has nothing to do with this project.

MS. GRONACHAN: That will bring a lot of peace, let me tell you.

MR. MUCK: Great.
MS. GRONACHAN: My second question is to clarify again because we're all talking and I want this to sink in, maybe this will calm some nerves, is that there is not going to be any bands playing or wedding receptions or that kind of stuff; that's not what the purpose of this building is, correct?

MR. MUCK: Correct. We've been specifically directed by City Council to not rent this building for those type of purposes.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. And then
finally, anyone within the city of Novi, will they be able to come and use that building for their personal use? Will they be able to rent space or use it for other than like a wedding reception or -MR. MUCK: The direction we have from City Council is nonprofit organizations. So homeowners' association meetings, scout groups and such would be able to use it for those purposes, but not for private events.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. So that clears up a lot and I appreciate that, and I did that with a purpose because I know that there's people at home watching tonight and those were the questions and the rumors if you would.

So I think that if you continue to work with the resident that's next door, that's my number one concern, and with the rest of it, I think that you did your homework, and with the map that you showed, thank you for that, for showing us that there really isn't anyplace else to put it without taking up more land because the other part of it is -- and you all know this, that once they go in
for construction, it's going to use more property; it's not just going to be 2 acres, it's going to be 4, and so I appreciate the fact that you want to do minimal damage to a 400-acre park, and that's what we definitely need in Novi.

So I'm in full support of this and my recommendation will be to move forward. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I know it has nothing to do with this project, but I just want to make a pitch.

Will you please make provision for some handicap people, wheelchairs to go across to the sand when you do this?

MR. MUCK: We have heard that request and that is on our radar.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Well, I'll entertain a motion for recommendation.

MS. GRONACHAN: Give me a minute. I may need help.

In case PZ 17-0039, NSA Architects and the City of Novi, at 601 South Lake Drive, west of Old Novi Road, south of South Lake Drive, I move that we recommend to City Council that the variance
requested by the City of Novi for Ordinance Section 3.6.2.B for a 40.83 foot variance for the proposed north front yard setback of 34.17 feet, 75 required, be approved by the City Council for the following reasons:

1. The petitioner indicated on their site plan that thorough investigation minimal impact on the property was done; topography, safety was taken into consideration.
2. Safe walking grades for the residents will be continued, and the petitioner indicated that if this building was placed other places it would take up more space or eat up more parkland and that would have a negative impact on the park.
3. That the petitioner indicated they have been working with the neighbor to reduce the negative impact for that neighbor and indicated also that they will continue to work with that said neighbor.
4. That there will be connection to the underground passage to the beach. There will be no ramps and no stairs and easy access and a smooth
transition to this building. That they confirmed that this building would not be used as a banquet center or restaurant of any type, they clarified the use of this building.

Therefore, this Board is showing a positive recommendation to the City Council.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: A second?
MR. BYRWA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. The recommendation has been made and seconded.

Seeing no further discussion, Madam Secretary.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Sanghvi.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Good luck.
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Moving on to the next case, PZ 17-0040, Mr. Andris, at 1103 East Lake Drive, south of Fourteen Mile Road and east of East Lake Drive, Parcel No. 50-22-02-126-001.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4.1 for a proposed 49 square foot variance for the full 466 loading area and 515 square feet is required for location in the front yard setback. This property is zoned General Business, $B-3$.

If the applicant is here, please identify yourself and state your name and address.

MR. SEIVER: My name is Cliff Seiver representing Theodore Andris, the owner. My address is 100 Main Center, Suite 10, Northville.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Are you an attorney?

MR. SEIVER: I am not an attorney.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Will you please be sworn in by our secretary? Thank you.
(Mr. Cliff Seiver sworn.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.
MR. SEIVER: This case has been before
you at least once before. About three years ago, Mr. Andris was trying to reconstruct his parking lot, expand it. Currently there's a problem with the site. It has been there for many years, actually since before 1949 , where vehicles have parked at the restaurant, backed into East Lake Drive and the back end of Fourteen Mile Road when they exit their parking spaces.

Well, this project is proposed to eliminate that problem thereby increasing safety. We are before you tonight asking for a variance on the loading setback in the loading area which, actually, I'm a little bit surprised that I'm even here before you for that because that loading area location has been there and the size has been essentially the same since 1949 long before you had a Zoning Ordinance and long before the City of Novi was a city, but in any case, we're here asking for those variances.

Failure to secure such variances would really terminate the parking lot project because if we were required to move the loading area to an area other than next to the kitchen where it is now, I
would put it in the dining area and require materials to be loaded and hauled through the dining area and bar area into the kitchen.

So for that reason, we're asking for the two variances, one for the setback, one for the area, and really what we're asking for is to maintain the existing loading area where it has been for over 68 years.

So with that, I'd be glad to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the Board regarding this case?

Seeing none, we will close the public remarks. City, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: After reviewing, it's not really self-created because it's been in existence for so long. It's kind of practical that he would ask to do that. He really has no place else to be with it coming in trying to offload trucks in there so we kind of support it.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Mr. Secretary, do you have any correspondence for
us?
MR. BYRWA: Yes, we do. The City mailed out 26 letters, two letters were returned with zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Good. Yes, I went and visited your place. I realized that I've been there before a few times and I know you have a very special kind of problem. Thank you.

Open it up to the Board.
Ms. Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Is the only reason why this came about now is because the change of whatever it was to the driftwood; is that what brought this about?

MR. SEIVER: No, this is the variance required because we're reconstructing the parking lot. We're deleting the parking spaces next to the building and adjacent to the roadways and moving it to the back of the parcel.

MS. GRONACHAN: Okay. This is, as you say, a very unique piece of property. They seem to do a great business and the parking is definitely an issue, and $I$ have no problem being that this is a
longstanding business in Novi, and the two requests that they are making are minimal in my book, and for a business that's been around -- or this piece of property, since 1949, I'm going to let sleeping dogs lie and I'll be supporting those requests.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Yes. MS. KRIEGER: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Yes, Mr. Byrwa.

MR. BYRWA: Is there a net gain or loss of the parking there or is it a wash? Are you keeping the same amount of spaces?

MR. SEIVER: No, a very large increase in parking. The parking now actually meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements for a restaurant which in its current condition it does not, so it is bringing it up to the current City standards for parking.

MR. BYRWA: Any estimate on how much it would increase the parking?

MR. SEIVER: 40 percent, perhaps. I'm just guessing offhand, but $I$ think probably in that range.

MR. BYRWA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: And I have no further comments. I'll entertain a motion. Ms. Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ 17-0040 for 1103 East Lake Drive, south of Fourteen and east of East Lake Drive.

This property is very unique. For the request they need the setback for 449 square feet variance for 466 loading area. And the second request that the variance is -- the petitioner will unreasonably be prevented and limited with respect to the property which has been there since 1949 so it is also not self-created because of its own existence.

The relief will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. There is enough buffer from the residents and the petitioner not to interfere, and it is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a minimal request and is consistent with an already existing restaurant.


Commercial and therefore most of the people -- these are the premises next to the district court.

The applicants are here. Please go
ahead. Both of you are attorneys?
MR. DARGA: No.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please identify
yourselves and make your presentation.
MR. DARGA: Michael Darga with Giffels Webster, 28 W. Adams, Detroit 48226.

MR. HOLDSWORTH: Oakland County
facilities management director, address 4350 Savoy Trail, W. Bloomfield, Michigan.
(Mr. Michael Darga and Mr. Holdsworth sworn.)
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please go ahead.
MR. DARGA: Essentially the project is
a security upgrade for the courthouse. We've been doing these projects throughout the county and it is just a way of hardening and securing the employee parking and separating it more from the public parking.

So there is an addition of parking in the back as one of the variances that there's six spots being added along the north fence line, one on
the west fence line. Those are following the existing line of parking, so the setback there has already been varied from so we're just extending that, not making that condition any worse, and that's along the north side.

On the west side, we are running a security fence along the north property line and the west property line which abuts the ITC property transmission line corridor and that extends past the front of the building, hence the variance for bringing a fence past the front setback of the building, and there it connects into a retaining wall which will separate that from Grand River so that basically it's securing the employee parking from any intrusions from the three sides facing it.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment about this case?

Seeing none, we close the public remarks session. City, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: No comment.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comments.
Mr. Secretary, is there any correspondence regarding
this?
MR. BYRWA: Yes. There were 15 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited this and $I$ admit it is the first time ever $I$ went on the property, but anyway, yes, I looked at it and I understand why you would need this. Thank you.

I will open it up to the Board. Any comments by anybody? Yes, Ms. Gronachan.

MS. GRONACHAN: I have never been there. That could always change. I might work there some day, and if I did, I would want to be safe and I understand the security upgrade and I'm in full support. And I like your presentation, by the way, very good job.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody? Yes, Ms. Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: On the west side where the fence comes, it's not going to come on Grand River, it's just going to face north-south?

MR. DARGA: Correct. It's basically
securing the border along the ITC transmission line. It stops shy of Grand River, and then a retaining wall landscape comes along the Grand River frontage. MS. KRIEGER: I've been in there, but for the Citizens Police Academy.

MS. GRONACHAN: Really?
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. GRONACHAN: Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Mr. Butler?
MR. BUTLER: I don't have anything.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No, I know you haven't been there either.

Anyway, there is no further discussion, I'll entertain a motion, please.

MS. KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ 17-0041 sought by Giffels Webster for 48150 Grand River, east of Wixom and north of Grand River.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the City to extend the fence into the front yard. I move that we approve, and also for the 15foot reduction in rear parking setback. It will
unreasonably prevent and limit the respective use of the property as they had explained in their presentation for the securing of the court, that this is necessary, it is unique because of the property and its location and abutments and it's not self-created because of those.

The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. It's a matter just of safety for employees, and relief is consistent with the intent of the ordinance because it is a minimal request, it doesn't go the entire area of the court.

MS. GRONACHAN: Second.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. If there is no further discussion, Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMANN: Member Byrwa.
MR. BYRWA: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Gronachan.
MS. GRONACHAN: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Member Krieger.
MS. KRIEGER: Yes.
MS. OPPERMANN: Chairperson Sanghvi.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. OPPERMANN: Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.
Congratulations.
Do I have a motion to adjourn?
MS. GRONACHAN: So moved.
MS. KRIEGER: Second.
CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: We have a motion and it has been seconded. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
Chairperson SANGHVI: All those opposed same sign.

Seeing none, we can adjourn. Thank you.
(Meeting concluded.)
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