REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CITY OF NOVI

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2017 7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road

BOARD MEMBERS:

Siddharth Mav Sanghvi, Chairperson

Brent Ferrell, Secretary

Linda Krieger

Cindy Gronachan

Joe Peddiboyina

ALSO PRESENT:

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

Lawrence Butler, Comm. Development, Dep. Director

Katherine Opperman, Recording Secretary

Reported by:

Darlene K. May, Certified Shorthand Reporter

| | Page 2 |
|----|---|
| 1 | Novi, Michigan |
| 2 | Tuesday, November 14, 2017 |
| 3 | 7:00 p.m. |
| 4 | |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Good evening. I would |
| 6 | like to call to order the meeting of the Zoning Board |
| 7 | of Appeals for November 14, 2017. Will you please all |
| 8 | rise and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance. |
| 9 | (Pledge of Allegiance.) |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON: Please be seated. |
| 11 | Madame Secretary, please call the roll. |
| 12 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa is absent, |
| 13 | excused. |
| 14 | Member Ferrell? |
| 15 | MEMBER FERRELL: Here. |
| 16 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 17 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Present. |
| 18 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? |
| 19 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Present. |
| 20 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montville is absent, |
| 21 | excused. Member Nafso is absent, excused. |
| 22 | Member Peddiboyina? |
| 23 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| | |

MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi?

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Here. Thank you.

As you can see, today the total board is not

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As you can see, today the total board is not present and we are shrank a little bit. So I would just like to remind you that since we have only five members present this evening, it is four votes that are required for passing, and those petitioners at this time who wish to have their cases tabled until the next meeting when a full board may be present, they may do so now.

Seeing none, let's go on with the -- as far as the public hearing, the format is the same as before and the rules of procedure, et cetera, are available in the front. And I won't repeat them. Just make sure that your cell phones are turned off. Thank you.

Now, is there any changes in the agenda, Madame Secretary?

MS. OPPERMAN: There are not.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. So may I

entertain a motion to approve the agenda?

MEMBER KRIEGER: So moved.

MEMBER FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

All those in favor?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Aye. Thank you.

There are no minutes available at this time so we'll pass that.

Now, this is the time, if anybody wants to address the board about any subject other than the items on the agenda today, this is the time to do it.

Seeing none, we'll close the public remark section and move on to the first case.

PZ17-0042, Anthony M. Virga, 1607 East Lake Drive, west of Novi Road and north of Thirteen Mile Road, parcel number 50-22-02-355-018. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.32.10, for addition of a proposed pergola to an existing shed, 10 feet by 10 feet allowed; and the Section 3.32.10.A to build a proposed solid landscape stone wall under five feet in height and extending into the right-of-way. One foot minimum off property line is required. No fence allowed by code. This property is zoned Single Family Residential.

And I'll request the applicant to come to forward.

MR. LANDRY: Good evening, members of the ZBA. David Landry on behalf of Mr. Anthony Virga.

We are here tonight seeking a variance under zoning ordinance 3.32.10 and 3.32, sub romanette two, regarding maintaining a lakeside lot in an unobscured condition. We are talking about lots on -- a lot on East Lake Drive between the road and Walled Lake.

I submitted a letter with a lot of photographs of this particular lot. And I want to say at the outset that Mr. Virga started this project and didn't get a variance. He's about 90 percent complete and I would like to explain why he did that.

He bought his house in 2016 and he first built a fence next to the house on the other side of the road. He called the city and he said, "Do I need a permit?" And -- before he did anything.

And the city said, "No. Just follow the fence guidelines." So he did.

Next, he wanted to improve his lot by putting a seawall in. So he called the city and he said, "Do I need a permit?"

Page 6

They said, "Yeah. You sure do, from us and the DEQ." He hired a contractor, obtained the permits to build a seawall.

Well, next he wanted to improve the lakefront lot. Well, what he wanted to do was -- there was pre-existing a wooden shed. There was pre-existing a rod iron fence. There were brick pavers. There was large bushes, a chain link fence and a pergola. He was going to replace the bushes and the fence with a small stone wall, three feet. He was going to move the pergola over next to the shed and replace it with a wooden pergola. So he called the city and he said, "Do I need a permit to do landscaping?" And the city said, "No."

Unfortunate choice of words "landscaping".

This is a little more than landscaping. He asked.

They said no. He called two contractors and they both said, "No, you don't need a permit."

Well, they were all wrong because he does.

Once he was notified by the city, paid all of his

fines, we're here tonight asking for a variance.

Now, the zoning ordinance provides that with respect to waterfront lots, the yard is to be

Page 7

maintained on the water side in an unobscured position.

Except, you're allowed a shed. Well, what's unobscured? I think in this case, the key is the effect of the stonewall and the effect of the pergola. And I would suggest that we begin with what is obscured. That's a relative word. And that's exactly why the ZBA exists, to make sure the zoning ordinance is applied fairly and consistently. I would suggest we start by looking what was there before he did anything to this property.

Here's a photograph of what existed when Mr. Virga bought the property. You can see there was a shed, a very large, deciduous tree. There's a pergola. There's a large bush on the south side. On the north, there's a rod iron fence across the middle of it.

Here's a picture taken in the wintertime and you can see on this picture that tree is still there.

You can see the rod iron fence and the large bushes.

With respect to the pergola, in the summer, there was a canvas part that could be pulled to one side or the other.

What Mr. Virga did was, he took the tree down.

Page 8

And I have some photographs here of what the property looks like now.

Currently, the property looks like this. You can see the shed is still there. He changed the roof slightly. He didn't make it any higher. Just sort of raised one part.

Instead of the bushes, he's got a small stone wall. There's a stone wall in the front. The main part is three feet high. What I'll call pillars are 3.6 feet. As you can see, he removed the tree. So there's no longer the large deciduous tree.

Here it is from another angle. You can see that this three-foot stone wall where there was a large bush gets smaller as it goes to the road. And he replaced this chain link fence with a stone wall on that side.

He took the pergola down, which was an aluminum pergola, and he built a wooden pergola off the edge of the shed. So there's a couple other photographs here of what it looks like.

Does this obscure the vision anymore than what was there before? That's really the question.

Again, these are three feet tall with 3.6, three feet

Page 9

six inches, on what I will call the pillars and what was an aluminum pergola is now a wooden, but it's an open roof. It's not a solid roof. There it is.

And this is what the condition looks like today. We attached a letter from one of his neighbors, his next door neighbor, Mr. and Mrs. Jarvis, who specifically indicated in the letter that they did not think it obstructed the view. And, in fact, they reported in their letter, which is attached as Exhibit F, that they believe the property looks better now than it has ever looked and they have been there for 30 years.

So with the tree gone, I would suggest that this does not obscure anymore than what existed before.

And, in my opinion, for you to decide, obscures less.

Well, the next step, I think, in examining what is an unobscured view is to compare what is there with other properties along East Lake Drive. I'm going to show you some photographs of his neighbors' yards. And these photographs show some rod iron fences right up next to the road with significant trees and other shrubs along East Lake Drive. There's sheds, fences, trees. There are play structures. There are other

313-962-1176

sheds. There are garages. There is a shed with a pergola attached to it, just like his.

Now, I'll point out, this is not a seasonal pergola. This stays up all year round. In fact, it has a solid roof, not just a wooden, slatted roof.

Here's another photograph of the same pergola attached to a shed which is significantly larger than Mr. Virga's. Here's a photograph of a totally different pergola with, next to it -- now, that just looks like a frame. I don't know what they do, quite frankly, in the summer with that.

But this is a solid-roofed pergola on their property with a rod iron fence right up next to the road.

And finally, I have some other photographs with respect to the wall that Mr. Virga placed there.

Here is a photograph of a very similar brick wall as Mr. Virga's. Here's a photograph of a solid hedge row. Here's a photograph of a rod iron fence with four-foot bushes there.

This one, I got a couple of photographs.

These are huge. These are over six feet tall, a solid row of vegetation along the lots.

Here's a couple of photographs of white picket fences around sheds.

And, finally, I took this photograph today.

Quite frankly, I don't know what that is, but it's huge. They may have a variance. I have no idea. I just point it out to show you -- give you some context of whatever that is currently on East Lake Drive, and it is huge.

Now, I don't point these out to be critical. They're all very tastefully done. All of these properties are very tastefully done, and I submit that's why people bought these properties; to enjoy the lake, to put fire pits, to gather with their children and grandchildren and friends, to enjoy food, to enjoy drink. That's why they bought the lots. So when we talk about "unobscured", I would suggest that we have to be able to afford people the ability to use the lots for the purpose they purchased it for.

Now, I want to address one thing finally because I think the administration raised this, and that was the proximity of his wall to the street. I've got a photograph here that I took. This wall -- which is three feet tall, three feet six inches there -- this

edge is 21 feet from the center of the roadway.

And the other thing that I would point out is: Note the telephone pole. Now, naturally, if there's an easement running -- and I don't know if there is. I could guess there probably is right there. There may be a utility easement.

And, obviously, the City is concerned with what happens if we have to dig up the water line.

Well, I'm going to suggest that before they get to

Mr. Virga's wall, they're going to have to take this telephone pole down before they ever get to the wall.

Mr. Virga is absolutely prepared to sign an indemnity agreement, a hold harmless agreement to the city. If that wall, any portion, ever needs to come down, he'll hold the city harmless, and they can bill him for it if he doesn't take it down. He will sign any contract the city attorney drafts.

So we are here tonight requesting a variance that it is maintained in an unobscured matter.

And the second one, the 3.32 romanette two, I believe there is a question whether or not the pergola attached to the shed renders the shed larger than 10 by 10. I would suggest it doesn't. But to the extent it

Page 13

does, we are asking for a variance. Again, we don't think it renders the property obscured.

I'm analyzing this from the standpoint of practical difficulty. Unique physical condition of the property, it's lakefront property. Not self-created. We didn't put the lake there.

Strict compliance prevents use for permitted purposes. That's the whole key. People buy these lots to be able to use the lake, to access the lake, to have fun next to the lake.

Variance, minimally necessary and not adversely impacting surrounding properties. You have a letter from his neighbor specifically indicating it does not, and I believe there are conditions on East Lake Drive that, if you want to use the word "obscure", probably obscure more than Mr. Virga's. But, again, they're all tastefully done.

We would ask permission from the ZBA by way of a variance to do three things. Four, actually. We would like to leave what is there and not have to take it down. We would like to finish the stone wall.

There's one missing gap piece in there. It is intended to have the stone wall with a stone cap one-inch tall

on top. We would like to put those decorative caps, which would make the wall three feet one-inch in the middle and three feet seven inches on the end. And finally, he would like to install solar panels on the roof of the shed, but they would be flush. They would not be those solar panels that stick up 45 degrees. They would be flush.

But we're coming clean and telling you right now this is everything we would like on this property. We wouldn't add anything else to it. And so I'm happy to answer questions, if there are any, or we'll stand by if there's any additional questions.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board regarding this case?

Seeing none, we close the public remark section for this case.

Mr. Butler, any comments?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. I just wanted to make note that the pergola attached to the shed does add to the overall dimension of the shed. So it's much larger than what is allowed, which is a 10 by 10 shed. Also,

that the wall extends four feet into the right-of-way, which he would have to get permission to allow that.

But that's not through the building department.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, do you have any correspondence?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair. There was 60 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals, and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Thank you.

I came and saw this property. I mean, I have seen it a few times. And again, I went back and looked at it. From my personal point of view, it's really nicely done. I looked around, went on back and forth, to the north of it, south of it, and I didn't find any major problem about obstructing the view. But this is my view. I will open it up to the board now.

Yes?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Some questions. Can you tell me, does --

Or maybe Mr. Landry knows. What is the actual size of the finished building, then? Everybody said it's not 10 by 10, but nobody told us what it is

| | Page 16 |
|----|--|
| 1 | with the pergola. Do we have that information? |
| 2 | MR. LANDRY: The dimensions of the pergola |
| 3 | roof are 13 by 14. |
| 4 | MR. VIRGA: That's the overhang, too. |
| 5 | MR. LANDRY: Well, that's the total edge of |
| 6 | the upper roof of the pergola, 13 by 14. |
| 7 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So with the pergola and |
| 8 | the building it's 13 by 14? |
| 9 | MR. LANDRY: No. It extends. |
| 10 | How many feet out towards the lake does it |
| 11 | extend? |
| 12 | MR. VIRGA: It extends 14 feet out |
| 13 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'm sorry, can you come |
| 14 | forward? |
| 15 | MR. VIRGA: Sure. |
| 16 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So we can get you on the |
| 17 | mic. And I'm sure there's people at home. |
| 18 | And if we could swear you in, that would be |
| 19 | great, please. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Would you please state |
| 21 | your name and address. |
| 22 | MR. VIRGA: Anthony Virga. 1607 East Lake |
| 23 | Drive. |

| | Page 17 |
|----|--|
| 1 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: And you will be sworn |
| 2 | in by our secretary. |
| 3 | MEMBER FERRELL Raise your right hand for me. |
| 4 | Do you swear to tell the truth in this case? |
| 5 | MR. VIRGA: Yes, I do. |
| 6 | MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: You may respond. |
| 8 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So without the pergola, |
| 9 | how big is the building? |
| 10 | MR. VIRGA: The building itself is 12 by 8, |
| 11 | which is one hundred square foot, that is allowed by |
| 12 | this building. The footing in here is 10 by 10, but |
| 13 | the actual roof top goes 13 by 14. It overhangs. The |
| 14 | ground in here is just 10 by 10. |
| 15 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: For the building |
| 16 | department, so you mentioned the four feet into the |
| 17 | right-of-way. |
| 18 | MR. BUTLER: Yes. |
| 19 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Who would the petitioner |
| 20 | have to go to? It's not in our |
| 21 | MR. BUTLER: I believe that's the county that |
| 22 | he would have to get that permission to keep it out of |
| 23 | the right-of-way. |
| | |

Page 18 1 MEMBER KRIEGER: So that has nothing to do 2 with us tonight? MR. BUTLER: Nothing to do with us, right. 3 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So what exactly are we 4 5 granting this evening, the variance for the actual finished wall once completed or do we have to spell 6 7 something out here? I'm a little confused about -- I'm 8 a little confused about the specifics on the ... MS. SAARELA: On the solid wall. 9 10 MR. BUTLER: On the wall, we really cannot grant the finished wall because it's four feet into the 11 right-of-way. If it wasn't four feet into the 12 right-of-way, then we could say, yes. If we was going 13 to go ahead and let him have the wall, we could say 14 15 that, but we cannot approve that portion that is in the 16 right-of-way. MR. LANDRY: Can I ask for clarification, 17 Madame Gronachan? 18 19 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Sure. MR. LANDRY: Are we only talking about that 20 21 portion of the north wall that I showed a picture of, 22 not the south wall?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

Page 19 MR. LANDRY: Just for that clarification. 1 2 Thank you, Mr. Butler. MEMBER GRONACHAN: So can we even grant 3 4 anything this evening being that they needed to get 5 county permission first? MR. BUTLER: On the wall, I don't believe 6 7 that we can. 8 MEMBER KRIEGER: Would that be a question for the city attorney? 9 10 MS. SAARELA: I guess, my understanding is that we are here for a variance that is separate from 11 the right-of-way permit because that would be a 12 right-of-way permit issue. 13 14 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. 15 MS. SAARELA: So the variances, as I understood them, were for not obscuring the view and 16 whether or not this is obscuring the view. And if it 17 is obscuring the view, in your opinion, the variance 18 standards have to be met to be able to, you know, 19 obscure the view. And then for the size of the shed. 20 Those are the two variances, as I understand them. 21 22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay.

I'm going to put my view out there. Given

2.2

Page 20

the size of the lot and the existing challenges, being living on the lake, I don't see -- I am in support of the request of the building as well as the wall, with the exception of what was stated with the four foot right-of-way.

I think that the size and shape of the property presents the hardship and I think that based on the miscommunication that you've received, it is unfortunate, but things happen. We all live in the real world today. There's errors out there and I don't think that the petitioner should be held responsible because of it. I think that the petitioner proved that he has been a very investing resident. And with all the improvements that he's made, I feel that this is his home, he takes great pride. And I don't think that this is an, "Oops, let me ask for forgiveness," because it's easier to do that then ask for permission.

So I don't feel that there's anything obscured at all. So I'm in support of that.

I'm not clear on the pergola and the shed. I don't see the purpose of the pergola. And if that is going to -- If not everybody is in agreement with

Page 21 1 that, we can discuss that further. And I think that if 2 we do grant a variance this evening, if we are all in agreement, that we should talk to the city attorney 3 4 about the indemnity agreement and hold harmless 5 agreement, if that is something that we need to 6 address. 7 MS. SAARELA: I mean, you could make that a 8 condition of your variance, but it would also get, I guess, flagged at the time they request a right-of-way 9 10 permit. 11 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. So based on those facts, that's where I stand in this case. 12 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: 13 Thank you. 14 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Ferrell? 16 MEMBER FERRELL: I thought we weren't here 17 for the walls. So that really doesn't affect this. 18 MS. SAARELA So, no. I mean, you're not 19 really here for the wall being in the right-of-way. You're here for the wall obscuring the view and the 20 size of the shed. 21

MEMBER FERRELL: Two different things?

MS. SAARELA: Right.

22

1 MEMBER FERRELL: Okay.

MS. SAARELA: So if you believe that the whole harmless is, I guess, an issue with respect to the obscuring issue, then, you know, that would be the condition that you would attach to that variance. I don't see how it's related to the size of the shed, necessarily.

But as I said, that's an issue that's going to get caught when they apply for having an obstruction in the right-of-way. Whether it be a city engineering division or the county, I'm not sure which one -- whose role that is.

MEMBER FERRELL: So the shed is supposed to be 10 by 10, that's what is allowed?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: So what are the total dimensions of the shed with the pergola? Do we know that?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's what he just gave us; 13 by 14 and 10 by 10.

MEMBER FERRELL: Well, was it?

MR. LANDRY: What are the dimensions of the

23 shed?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Page 23 1 MEMBER FERRELL: Yeah. 2 MR. VIRGA: 8 by 12. The shed is 8 by 12. 3 It's a 100 square feet. MR. LANDRY: And then the roof extends 13 4 5 feet towards the water, 14 feet wide. So the whole 6 length of the shed would be -- what did you say eight 7 by --8 MR. VIRGA: If you go by the ground footing of everything, it's 200 square feet. 9 10 MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. I don't -- I'm sorry. I'm not understanding. 11 MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's what I was 12 wondering; if we need a variance. 13 MS. SAARELA: I guess the one concern I have 14 about that is whether that dimension made it into the 15 notice for this variance. Because we don't necessarily 16 have notice of the size of the variance at this point. 17 So if we never had these dimensions before 18 this moment, that may need to be renoticed. Because we 19 20 didn't post the size of the variance in the notice, 21 then. MEMBER FERRELL: Well, not only that --22

MEMBER KRIEGER: I don't understand how the

Page 24 1 shed and the pergola -- I'm sorry. 2 MEMBER FERRELL: Hold on a second. 3 So in addition to that, because they're 4 asking to add a stone cap another inch taller on the 5 wall? 6 MR. LANDRY: Yeah. We would ask to be able 7 to finish the project. 8 MEMBER FERRELL: That's not part of this? MS. SAARELA: I think that's part of the 9 obscuring question, am I correct? 10 MEMBER FERRELL: That is not an additional 11 thing that needed to be posted? 12 MS. SAARELA: No. That would just be whether 13 or not that adds to the issue of whether it's obscuring 14 the view. 15 MEMBER FERRELL: Solar panels, how about 16 17 that? 18 MS. SAARELA: Whether that's obscuring the view. And I think we discussed those being flat. 19 20 MR. LANDRY: Correct. Correct. 21 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. So it's not something that is --22 23 MS. SAARELA: Well, those are all issues of

Page 25 whether what they are constructing obscures the view or 1 2 not. MEMBER FERRELL: But without having them on 3 there and seeing them on there, how do you know? 4 5 MS. SAARELA I guess if they're flush to the 6 roof, you'd have to just sort of look at the roof. 7 MEMBER FERRELL: So that's not something you would approve tonight because it's not on the roof, am 8 I right? 9 10 MS. SAARELA: I mean, I don't think that's a 11 separate question necessarily. MR. LANDRY: If I could step in. 12 I think there are two issues. One is the obscuring issue. And 13 that, you could grant a variance tonight; that is, the 14 15 wall and that's the cap on the wall, that is the solar 16 panels on the top of the roof. That's one. 17 you think that obscures or not. 18 MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. MR. LANDRY: Two, the size of the shed, the 19 20 ordinance says 10 by 10. And the city administration is of the opinion that putting a pergola on it 21 increases the size of the shed. Okay. 22

Right.

MEMBER FERRELL:

Page 26

MR. LANDRY: So we are asking for a variance from that. So those are the two variances we are asking for. What I'm hearing tonight is, with respect to the fact that that wall sits on the right-of-way, we have to go to the county for that. And we'll be happy to do that, but we are simply asking for variances from the size of the shed and the obscurity.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Considering what our homes were like in Walled Lake in the '40s when they first built them and all the people that have been moving in now, it's beautifying and enhancing that whole roadway.

And about right-of-way, that will go to the county as we discussed. I just -- because he's, unfortunately, paid his fines and was doing as he could to beautify what he's had, what he went from the pictures to what he has got now, he put the pergola and the shed together. So, apparently, that makes an increase in size of the one particular area. The three feet is under five feet. The other area, the other homes along it are similar, although it may be a brick

wall or shrubs like thujas, I would be in support of the shed and the pergola together and the wall because it's not obscuring views. It's under the five feet. He's going by three feet and then a cap and the -- it's beautifying and enhanced by everything that he has put there. So I find this acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Yes, Ms. Saarela?

MS. SAARELA: So, before we move on, let me just clarify. It sounds like you're going to start out by making a finding regarding whether or not you believe that the proposal obscures the view as it's defined under the zoning ordinance.

The second thing I do want to point out is on the second variance I do think we need to table it to renotice it with the actual dimensions of the shed, including the pergola.

So do you want to table the whole thing? I don't know if you want to grant one now and table that one or just table the whole thing and renotice it?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Let's just table it.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Mr. Landry, would you be okay with tabling it?

1 MR. LANDRY: We would agree to whatever the 2 city administration feels is necessary, but I thought there was a schematic that was attached with the 3 4 package that Mr. Virga first submitted on his own. 5 MS. SAARELA: There might have been a 6 schematic. But from what I'm understanding, what went 7 into the notice that was posted --8 MEMBER GRONACHAN: It wasn't clear. MS. SAARELA: -- and published is just what 9 10 it says under request here on the first page of the 11 packet. MR. LANDRY: Okay. Whatever the city 12 administration -- if you believe it would be better 13 to renotice it and come back --14 15 MS. SAARELA: I just don't want it to be an invalid variance and have to --16 17 MR. LANDRY: Not a problem. We'd be happy to accommodate and come back. 18 MS. SAARELA: But feel free to talk through 19 20 it. It's up to you. 21 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I agree with that. I 22 think it would be better and cleaner if we spelled out 23 the size of the shed and the pergola. Because, you

Page 29

know, this is a case that people are going to use this for future reference and it would just be neater and cleaner if we did the right thing.

I mean, like I said, I don't have anything against the obscuring anything. I think that the petitioner showed with the bushes, you know, this is a controlled view -- I don't want to say a controlled block, but it is more effective control than some of those bushes on East Lake Street. So ...

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: This seems final. It's not going to go any further.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Exactly. And given the rest of the case, I think that it would be best if we postpone it or table it until next month.

If that's in agreement with the petitioner, then they can readvertise it.

MS. SAARELA: So I think that what it sounds like is that what you are proposing is to make a finding that there is no obscured view. So you wouldn't be, then, going through the standard under that section under the ordinance and interpretation that, based on the facts and circumstances that you have seen, that there is no obscured view. Rather than

Page 30 granting a variance allowing an obscured view. 1 2 MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. Oh, all right. 3 got you. Yeah. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 4 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Chair, excuse me? 5 6 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Peddiboyina? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Landry, you did an excellent presentation 8 in collecting the items on what all it is and what you 9 10 are doing on the project, I really like it. I have no 11 objection on this. 12 And as for the city attorney and what they 13 are saying and we need to go clean and clear. 14 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So now you're waiting for --16 17 MS. SAARELA: To table to a specific date. So I guess it's going to have to be renoticed on this 18 19 so I guess it doesn't matter. 20 MR. LANDRY: Could I make one suggestion? 21 MS. SAARELA: Yes. MR. LANDRY: Could we have a vote on the 22 23 obscuring part and resolve that part?

Page 31 1 MS. SAARELA Sure. I said that if they want 2 to do that. 3 MR. LANDRY: If they wanted to resolve the 4 obscurity part and then we would only have to come back 5 on the size of the shed. So you wouldn't have to 6 notice it for everything else all over again. 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Could I ask you a 8 question? 9 MS. SAARELA: Have you opened up public 10 comment? 11 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No. I ... 12 MS. SAARELA: Open a public comment. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. I'll take a 13 motion. 14 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: You can open up a public 16 comment. 17 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I already did. And 18 nobody came forward at the time. 19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just have a question. On the city website, there's a 55-page 20 21 document that they prepared. Were the dimensions of 22 the pergola within the 55-page document that is on the 23 city's website?

Page 32 1 MS. SAARELA It doesn't matter. It has to be 2 in the notice that was published in the paper. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I already asked for it. 3 4 There was no response from the audience so I closed it. 5 Anyway. 6 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I would like to make a 7 motion. 8 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Make a motion pertaining to the obscurity. 9 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. I move that we 11 approve -- let me start this again. In case number PZ17-0042 for Anthony Virga, I move that the question 12 of the fence and building and ... 13 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Pergola. 14 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And pergola, if it obscures the view or causes an obscurity on the 16 17 property, I move that it is the opinion of this board 18 that it is not an obstruction given the current testimony by the petitioner and the discussion at this 19 20 table and that we table -- I'm not going to add that. 21 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: It's two separate ones. 22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yeah. So that's my 23 motion.

Page 33 1 Is there a second? 2 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second it. 3 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Second. 4 Okay. Any further discussion about 5 obscuring? 6 MEMBER FERRELL: Do we need to say anything 7 about that it's a partial motion because it's not the 8 full variance? MS. SAARELA: Well, you have two variances. 9 10 You can just say that you're considering one variance today and you're going to table one variance. 11 maybe I would suggest the way you frame it is that 12 you're making a finding that the proposal does not 13 obscure the view as defined in this ordinance, section 14 15 3.32A. And for the reasons -- you know, the pictures 16 17 that were shown on the other surrounding lots. 18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I would like to amend my motion and add the statement that the attorney just --19 the city attorney just offered. Which was "does not 20 obscure the view" -- and my pen ran out of ink. 21 22 sorry.

MS. SAARELA: We'll make a finding that the

Page 34 proposal by the petitioner does not obscure the view as 1 2 defined in section 3.32A based on the facts presented 3 by the petitioner showing the surrounding properties with additional obstructions in front of the lake. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. 6 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. I accept that 7 amendment. 8 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Do you accept that? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. I second. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Any further discussion about this part of the motion? 11 None. 12 Madame secretary, please call the roll. 13 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? 14 15 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? 16 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. 17 18 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? 19 MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? 20 21 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. 22 MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? 23 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes.

Page 35 1 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. 2 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Now you can 3 table the rest. 4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And then I move that we 5 table the second part of this case and request for the 6 variance so we can have proper notification to the 7 residents in the area for the size and dimensions of 8 the pergola and the building, to be tabled for the month of December, if that's okay with the petitioner 9 10 and his attorney? MR. LANDRY: Yes. That's fine. 11 MEMBER GRONACHAN: 12 Okay. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Anybody second? 13 MEMBER FERRELL: Second. 14 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made 15 and seconded. Any further discussion? 16 17 Seeing none. Madame secretary, call the 18 roll, please. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? 19 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. 20 21 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. 22 23 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?

Page 36 1 MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. 2 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? 3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. 4 MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? 5 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. Thank you. 6 All right. We'll see you next month. 7 MEMBER FERRILL: Partial congratulations. 8 MR. LANDRY: Thank you for your consideration. 9 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: We'll see you next month. Don't forget the Christmas cookies. 11 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Moving on to the second 12 case, PZ17-0047, Compo Builders Inc., 47750 Casa Loma 13 Court, west of Beck Road and south of Nine Mile Road. 14 Parcel number 50-22-32-201-007. 15 The applicant is requesting a variance from 16 17 the City of Novi zoning ordinance section 3.1.1.E for a proposed reduced backyard setback of seven feet three 18 inches to allow 42 feet and nine inches and 50 feet 19 minimum required by code for the installation of a new 20 21 roof to cover the hot tub. This property is zoned 22 Residential Acreage.

And is the applicant here?

MR. COMPO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please come forward.

Identify yourself with your name and address, and if
you're not an attorney, be sworn in by the secretary.

MR. COMPO: David Compo. I live at 901

McDonald in Northville and I'm a builder and developer of Casa Loma.

MEMBER FERRELL: Are you an attorney?

MR. COMPO: No, I'm not.

MEMBER FERRELL: Please raise your right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. COMPO: I do.

MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please, go ahead.

MR. COMPO: This is a home that was under construction and we built it -- or we are building it, I should say, for a gentleman and his wife who are moving back from the auto companies from Shanghai. And through the process, his wife has come into some substantial injuries. So we have made modifications to our existing plan and submitted it with an elevator and barrier free showers and so on.

Page 38

As part of her therapy, the therapist recommended that she get continuous hydrotherapy. So he wanted to add a spa. However, I didn't notice until I had submitted the plan that once we put a roof on it, even though it was on a foundation attached to the covered patio area, that roof then submitted -- or went into the setback.

This would be approved if it were a stand alone. It could be set back in the backyard, just like the pool itself that they're doing is going to be into the backyard. But once it's attached to the house, then it becomes a setback issue. If it's a stand alone like a pergola out in the back yard, it would not. So I would call it kind of a glitch in the ordinance the way it's written, which probably goes also to our next one that we're going to be coming up on.

So I just ask that our client be allowed to do this, if we could do it, with a covered, extended roof area. It's still open air, but I think the looks from Bellagio and from around the area wouldn't be very good.

Obviously, it has my full support as the developer of the community, and I'm building the homes

Page 39

on either side. I just finished Mr. Hoffmann's house to the south on lot eight. This is lot seven we're talking about. And on that one I have full support of Mr. Hoffmann as the owner of Wimsatt Building Materials. And on the other side a surgeon who I met with today. Again, I don't believe we've had any people that are denying this that I'm aware of.

So I want to thank the board and, of course, staff here. And I talked to Larry and Chris about this, you know, when I came into the building department.

If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board regarding this case?

KELLY HALL: Yeah, I would.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please come forward here to the podium here and mic. And identify yourself with your name and address and be sworn in by our secretary.

MS. HALL: My name is Kelly Hall. I live at 47525 Capri Court. I have been out of town for the

Page 40

last 10 days and just opened my mail to read this, that there was a meeting today. So my question is: Where is this property? Where is lot seven? Because I know there's, like, 10 lots and I haven't been back there. So my question is -- I don't know, I haven't driven back there. So I would like to know where is this lot? Is it going to be where my property is that they're talking about this? So if I can have that question: where this lot is.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Do you have a diagram of your subdivision there somewhere to show them on the screen?

MR. COMPO: I do not have the diagram of the subdivision with me. There's 10 lots all together. If you were to go from Beck Road to the west, lot seven is the last lot on the -- towards Bellagio on that lot.

MS. HALL: Is that when you drive straight down?

MR. COMPO: Straight down. All the way to the end.

MS. HALL: All the way to the end. So it's all the way on the end and to the right?

MR. COMPO: Correct. Right now it's opposite

Page 41 1 of a vacant lot. 2 MS. HALL: Okay. I know right where that is. 3 That's right down the street. That's the reason why I 4 wanted to know. I didn't want it to be back of my lot. 5 Because my home used to be woods for the last 10 years. 6 So that was my only question. My husband couldn't be 7 here so I had to show up and come here. So that was my 8 question. 9 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you. 10 MS. HALL: Okay. Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? 12 Seeing none, we will close the public remark 13 section. 14 15 For the City, Mr. Butler? 16 MR. BUTLER: No comment. 17 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comments. Very 18 good. 19 Mr. Secretary, any correspondence? MEMBER FERRELL: Mr. Chair, 26 letters were 20 21 Zero letters returned, zero approvals and zero 22 objections. 23 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. I'll open up to

the board.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Can you put the drawing up? Did you bring that with you, on what we have in our packet?

MR. COMPO: I did not. I can certainly answer any questions. It's in my head.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I guess where I'm confused is why it has to be attached to the house. And I couldn't really --

MR. COMPO: It's access for Mrs. Houlihan

(ph) to be able to get into the hot tub. So originally
it was going to be a hot tub in the yard.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Oh, okay.

MR. COMPO: Pool, hot tub, out in the yard probably 20 feet from the lot line. And with these injuries, as I discussed earlier, with her necessity of barrier free, he says the only way for her to get into this thing -- because, you know, usually they sit up about four feet -- is to be able to go to, basically, a chair height where you put the hot tub down on to a platform off the covered patio. She can set her fanny on it and swing down into it adjacent to this area, which allows her to be able to get in and out without

having to do steps and rails and this raised up monstrosity that wouldn't look very good.

So that was the entire reason for the owner requesting it. Again, I'm here upon his request because he said, "This is really what I need to have happen."

Of course, he's in Shanghai so he couldn't be here. So as his builder and as the developer and as the person who sold him the lot, he said, "Please get this. I really need this for my wife." So that's why we're doing it.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I needed that clarification. Thank you.

MR. COMPO: No problem.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I don't have any further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Anybody else? Seeing none.

I went and looked at the place. I had a hard time finding the building, but I know the area you're talking about there because there is no labeling for the place where this is located. But anyway, I have a very good idea of where this place is and I don't

personally have any problem with that.

Having said that, I will entertain a motion by somebody.

Anybody? Whoever wants to.

Okay, go ahead, Ms. Gronachan.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: In case number PZ17-0047 for 47750 Casa Loma Court, west of Beck Road and south of Nine Mile, I move that we grant the variance in this case for a proposed reduced backyard setback of seven feet three inches to allow 42 feet, nine inches for the installation of a roof to cover a hot tub. Based on the petitioner's testimony, without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or at least limited with respect to the use of the back of this yard due to a recent illness and medical handicap.

The property is unique because of its size and shape and location. The petitioner did not create the condition due to medical reasons. The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties due to the fact that this is a fairly new development. There are no other objections. And this is somewhat of a secluded, wooded area that abuts to the property in question.

Page 45 1 Therefore, I move that this variance be granted. 2 MEMBER FERRELL: Second. 3 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been 4 made and seconded. Is there any further discussion? 5 Seeing none. Madame Secretary, please call 6 roll. 7 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? 8 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? 9 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. 11 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. 12 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? 13 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. 14 15 MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? 16 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 19 MR. COMPO: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. We'll move 20 21 on to the next one, and I think that one also is yours. PZ17-0048 for 20940 Dunhill Drive. 22 West 23 of Beck Road and Eight Mile Road. Parcel number

Page 46

50-22-32-402-013. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance section 3.1.1 for the proposed increased lot coverage by one percent to 26 percent for the building of a lanai for 25 percent lot coverage allowed by the code. This property is zoned residential acreage.

And I see the petitioner is already at the podium. Please go ahead and make your presentation.

MR. COMPO: Again, thank you board and staff.

This is another one of those unique items that I wasn't aware of that we were even in percentage when I came in and talked to Chris, who was doing the plan review. He says, "I think you're right there on the edge of the lot coverage."

Just give you a quick back history on this
Archdiocese property. You know, we were considering
developing this back and one of my friends, the Hunter
Pasteur Developers, decided to do it. And then,
knowing our community down the street and our proximity
and the fact that our offices are in Novi, he had
offered that if I am interested for Compo Builders to
build him this community, that he would like us to do
so. Under one condition that we build a model home.

Page 47

We haven't built a model home in 15 years due to the down turn in economy. Unfortunately, we haven't had to. But for us, the ranch homes, the single level home, has been absolutely, incredibly popular.

When Hunter Pasteur submitted this, they did not have a minimum square footage requirement, and I believe it was 3400 for, you know, your typical colonials and up.

So I said, "Listen, if we're going to build a model, I want it to be a ranch." I want to make sure.

Because that is -- one, that is popular. And the empty nesters all want these ranches. In hitting your minimums here, I would want to get to the minimum square footage, but I'm not going to build a 3400 foot ranch, that would be gigantic.

So he amended his square footage requirements to 2850. And, plus, he's required to have a three car garage. So 2850 and a three car garage, I'm basically right there at the 25 percent lot coverage. In this, between a master suite and a dining area behind the great room, we have a patio, which is designed as a covered patio. Again, similar to the previous case, if this covered patio were to be a stand alone cupola,

Page 48

stand alone gazebo in the backyard, it wouldn't be included as lot coverage, but because it's attached, it now becomes the included.

Again, I could put a retractable awning on this, which again, I don't think it would look very good. And I think probably the most popular thing that clients are looking for is this covered lanai. It's just incredibly popular versus just an open patio.

So I sat with Chris and Larry with the plan.
I said, "Okay. Where would I have to cut?"

Because it includes, obviously, front porch, garage, house, you know, all that stuff.

I said, "Well, if I took the service door out and it didn't have a service door and I took four feet by 25 feet, that would cut out a hundred. I was getting within probably a quarter percent of being able to make the lot coverage work by kind of squishing these other areas. Not reducing the house but I had to reduce the garage and take the roof off the front porch. And I thought, "God, this is kind of making the elevation look silly."

So Chris had suggested, as well as Larry, that I come here and request this variance. But now

I'm going to be right there on the line. If I build anymore of these ranches on that specific lot -- which I think it's 150 by 105 foot lot. So this is going to be a little quandary I'm going to have to deal with if I continue to build there or come back here in front of you if it comes to one percent again.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address the board regarding this case?

Seeing none. We'll close the public remarks.

Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: We did look at it and looked at it at one percent reduction and the lot coverage was very minuscule and it was pretty much within reason for what he needs to build for his lanai.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair. There was 21 letters mailed, zero letters returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I have only one question. This variance request is for only this particular lot only; is that right?

MR. COMPO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Open it up to the board.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You're a mind reader, you know that. I've been working with you way too long.

I have a concern. I'm well familiar with that area. And 150 feet by 105 is a lot of area. And I can see your problem and I understand that one percent is minimal, but by granting this one percent, I don't want to open up Pandora's Box in letting the development think that every house can get a one percent variance.

I'm just saying that.

MR. COMPO: Understood.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I think that I would be in support of this if it was for this house only and we weren't going to set a pattern for all of the ranch houses in that area. As a ZBA member, we need to come up with criteria to meet the reason why we're granting the variance. Lot size can't necessarily be it. But I would say topography. It would be my reason for out there on why I would be in agreement to the one percent. Ranch houses are a little different in that

area. There's very few ranch houses of that magnitude -- or that quality, I should say. Not magnitude because it's not that large.

But for the dollar amount that's being spent on this house and for the lot and where it's at, I would be in support of this, if it's for this house only and it would be because of the topography of the lot. And I'll wait to hear from the rest of my board members.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Anybody else?

No comments.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: They're all looking at me.

MR. COMPO: I do have one suggestion, if I

may.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.

MR. COMPO: My suggestion would be future, if I continue to build ranches -- which I certainly hope to be able to do so. The grand opening for the real estate and all that was actually today. We have only have a foundation in the ground including the foundation of the lanai. It's our next home to frame so I was glad to be able to get this granted -- or get

into this meeting before I started framing it so I don't bring the roof if I can't have one.

But I would probably want to go back to
Randy Rutheimer (ph), the developer, and possibly ask,
"Hey, can we get this square footage to 2800? Take it,
like, 50 feet down and I can make it work on --" again,
I think these are pretty much the smallest lots. This
is lot 13, lucky 13 on Dunhill Drive as you come in.
So I think doing that and just trimming the garage a
little bit I'll make the 2800 work. But it's going to
mean he's going he has to amend this from 2850 to 28.
So 50 square feet, which you won't notice really in the
house, but ...

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So you want to table it at this time; is that what you're saying?

MR. COMPO: No.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Or you want to go with this one and the other ones you can adjust?

MR. COMPO: Go with this one. The foundation is in and I can't change it now.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. I understand.

MR. COMPO: But going in the future, to really go to your future point, we don't want to start

granting one percent variances, all of us.

And, again, it would definitely work on other lots. I just wasn't aware of it because I didn't do the math. I thought, "This is no problem."

It was the smallest ranch I could possibly do with the square footage of the garage that I need to have. I didn't know until Chris and Larry were, like, "I just did the math and it's right there."

I thought, "Oh, shoot."

So that's why I'm here.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead.

MEMBER KRIEGER: I can also agree if it's just this one lot. Because of topography, as previously mentioned, that -- and then you can work it out with the other homes. Then that would be fine, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Secretary?

MEMBER FERRELL: But we can't have them agree to that today for this?

MS. SAARELA: Well, no. That's not really something that would be part of this variance. But I think it's -- you know, it was mentioned that this

| | Page 54 |
|----|--|
| 1 | could be a problem. You're responding that the |
| 2 | intention is not to start, you know, setting a |
| 3 | precedent for others. |
| 4 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'm certainly allowed to |
| 5 | bring that up in the discussion. |
| 6 | MS. SAARELA: But I don't think that would |
| 7 | necessarily be part of the motion. |
| 8 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: No. |
| 9 | MEMBER FERRELL: So hold on a second. My |
| LO | question wasn't if she was allowed to bring it up in |
| 11 | the motion. My question was is that if we make a |
| L2 | motion |
| L3 | MS. SAARELA: It wouldn't be part of the |
| L4 | motion, no. |
| L5 | MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. I just wanted to |
| L6 | clarify that. |
| L7 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. All right. |
| L8 | Anybody making a motion? |
| L9 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I've got my quota for the |
| 20 | night. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You've got your quota |
| 22 | for the night. Okay. |
| 23 | MEMBER FERRELL: I'll take it since she has |
| | |

her quota.

I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ17-0048 sought by the petitioner for an increase of lot coverage by one percent to 26 percent -- and 25 percent is allowed -- because the petitioner has shown practical and difficulties requiring the increase to 26 percent.

Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property. The property is unique because the lot has a smaller shape on one end than the other. The petitioner did not create the condition due to the lot sizes and shapes. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties as there were no objections. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?

Yes, Ms. Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: A friendly amendment to add the -- did you say the topography in this particular

| | Page 56 |
|----|---|
| 1 | case, that we can approve it? |
| 2 | MEMBER FERRELL: Well, wouldn't that be what |
| 3 | I was just talking about? |
| 4 | MS. SAARELA: That would be the practical |
| 5 | difficulty. |
| 6 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 7 | MEMBER FERRELL: Is that the topography, the |
| 8 | shape? |
| 9 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. That's it. |
| 10 | MEMBER FERRELL: All right. Can you second |
| 11 | that? |
| 12 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Oh, second the friendly |
| 13 | amendment. Sorry. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Now you may call the |
| 15 | roll. Thank you. |
| 16 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 17 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 18 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 19 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? |
| 21 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 23 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| | |

Page 57 1 MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? 2 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. 3 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. Thank you. 4 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: 5 MR. COMPO: Thank you so much for supporting 6 this. I appreciate it. 7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck out there. 8 MR. COMPO: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. Moving on 9 10 to the next case PZ17-0052. Armenian Community Center and Mr. C.G. Pappas. 41090 Twelve Mile Road, east of 11 Meadowbrook Road and north of Twelve Mile Road, parcel 12 number 50-22-12-351-028 slash 30 slash 34 slash 36. 13 The applicant is requesting a variance from 14 15 the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance section 4.19.2.F for the proposed location of the dumpster in the side yard. 16 17 The property is zoned residential acreage. 18 All right, sir. Please identify yourself with your name and address and if you are not an 19 20 attorney, please be sworn in by our secretary. 21 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 name is Constantine Pappas, architect for the Armenian

Community Center. The address is 1025 South Washington

23

in Royal Oak, Michigan.

MEMBER FERRELL: Are you an attorney?

MR. PAPPAS: No.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Do you swear to tell

the truth in this case?

MR. PAPPAS: Yes.

MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Please go ahead.

MEMBER FERRELL: With me today is Mr. Rafi
Orleane (ph). He is the chairman of the Armenian
Community Center. Back in October we received the
preliminary site plan approval from the Planning
Commission to build a new Armenian Community Center and
future church, which you see the plan up in front of
you. Right now the owner is located in Dearborn and
there's a lot of changing situations in Dearborn, which
kind of forced the community to come up into Novi.

They own the parcel. They've owned the parcel for a number of years. This variance is brought before you to try to make it a little bit easier for the people who are in the center, as well as some extreme topographical situations on the site. From the back of the site, it actually slopes itself all the way

Page 59

down into this potential retention area. We are planning -- we would like, if you would consider, to relocate the dumpster, which would be in the very back. It would be located approximately in this general area. That is the requirement of having it, I believe, in the rear of the yard. And we would like to move it from back here to this location right into this area.

This is our temporary church and fellowship hall. And, basically, this is where the majority of all the trash will be generated. What we would like to do is be able to locate it here, so it is very close proximity. If it were located back in this spot, we're approximately 17 feet higher from where this building is at all the way to the very back.

Also, at the same time, it would be from this location all the way to the back, over 300 feet away.

Longer than a football field.

By bringing it in this general location, everything along that whole side yard -- by the way, all that stuff along the east, the setback along the east, which is 35 feet, is just massed with existing trees. And the ordinance requires us to plant additional landscaping all along that whole area.

Page 60

We're taking it one step further, by the way, and we actually have come to an agreement of planting even more landscaping on the residents' property, which is in this area.

There's a screen wall all along this side.

The entire dumpster, which is in this area, is

completely screened with brick. There's a tremendous

amount of landscaping in the very front, which is in

this area. So, basically, anybody who drives in along

Twelve Mile cannot really see this at all because it's

completely screened. By placing it into this area,

anybody who would drive through, would be able to see

the dumpster instantly.

Our feeling is that the closer it is, the more that we're going to pay attention to its cleanliness, make sure trash is not thrown all over the place. And one of the other reasons is that we have a parking lot here. This parking lot is used to allow us to come into the building, which we would categorize as our east entry. So the closer it is, the better we think it's going to be maintained. The better functionally we think it is.

And we've talked to all the residents. We've

had three meetings with the residents for this entire project. None of them had an issue with this, from what we can see. Now, I don't know if anybody sent anything in, I have no idea. But that kind of gives you the idea of the variance that we're asking for, is to build the trash enclosure in the side yard in lieu of the rear yard.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

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

Seeing none. We'll close the public remark section.

Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: We did look at it, the side yard. They did a very well -- good design on the enclosures with the six-foot high fence with the brick and the vinyl slats and the screen gate that goes on the front. So it is pretty much not seen by the public unless you know exactly what you're looking for.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair, there were 21 letters mailed, zero returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Yes, I like your idea about moving it out near the parking lot and easy access to the street.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I'll open it up the floor.

Yes, Ms. Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: You have a very nice presentation and that, yes, as you explained that it's going to be too far and too high to go to the back, which would affect neighbors, potentially. And then the enclosure with the landscaping you said. So I can support this.

MR. PAPPAS: Yeah. One of the things that we're also talking, you know, the further away it is, you don't have a complete control over everything that's being thrown in that trash. Do you know they're going to throw it in? You don't know unless people are seeing it. You know, we don't want to be in a standpoint of having trash thrown all over the place

Page 63 1 being in the back. At least where we're proposing it, 2 we can see it and pay attention to it. I think that's the most important thing. 3 4 MEMBER KRIEGER: Thank you. 5 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 6 Anybody 7 else? 8 Yes, Mr. Peddiboyina? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I give it to you. 9 10 It's a nice presentation and I have no objections on it 11 and I approve it. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. I will 12 entertain a motion if there is no further discussion. 13 Go ahead, Ms. Krieger. 14 15 MEMBER KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ17-0052 for the Armenian 16 17 Community Center with Mr. Pappas on Twelve Mile Road, east of Meadowbrook and north of Twelve, that the 18 petitioner has shown through the presentation the 19 20 change of where the proposal for the dumpster should be in the side yard that it is more ... 21 MEMBER KRIEGER: Practical. 22 23 MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. More practical.

Thank you.

Page 64

To the side yard. That without the variance, the petitioner will unreasonably be prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because, as they stated, that the trash will be farther away and harder to maintain, whereas closer to the parking lot and with this enclosure that they can monitor it better.

It's unique because of the topography and height change as they progress to the rear of the lot. The petitioner did not create the condition because it is pre-existing. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent or surrounding properties because of the already standing landscaping plus what they are going to add to that. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance for the City.

MEMBER FERRELL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made and seconded.

Is there any further discussion?

Seeing none. Madame Secretary, please call roll.

| | Page 65 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 2 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 4 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? |
| 6 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 8 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| 12 | MR. PAPPAS: Thank you very much. We'd like |
| 13 | to thank everybody in the city departments throughout |
| 14 | this whole process. They've been incredible. That's |
| 15 | all. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Welcome to Novi. |
| 17 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Welcome to Novi. |
| 18 | MR. PAPPAS: Thank you. We're very excited. |
| 19 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: When will you be |
| 20 | completed? |
| 21 | MR. PAPPAS: Well, we're going to try to get |
| 22 | going on breaking ground in spring, hopefully. |
| 23 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: All right. |
| | |

Page 66 1 MR. PAPPAS: That's our idea. 2 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Okay. 3 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you so much. 4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Congratulations. You're 5 welcome. Good luck. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Moving on to the next 6 7 case, PZ17-0053, Coy Construction, Inc. 25863 Arcadia 8 Drive, west of Taft Road and south of Eleven Mile Road. Parcel number 50-22-21-202-005. The applicant is 9 10 requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning ordinance 3.1.2 for a proposed four foot reduced rear 11 yard setback to 31 feet to build a 17-foot-deep 12 screened-in porch and 35 feet minimum required by code. 13 This property is zoned Single Family Residential. 14 15 And please identify yourself, your name and And if you are not an attorney, be sworn in 16 17 by our secretary and then make your presentation. 18 MR. SAFERIAN: Yes, sir. My name is Richard Saferian. It's S-a-f-e-r-i-a-n. I'm here 19 20 representing Coy Construction and Mr. --MEMBER FERRELL: Hold on a second. 21 You need to be sworn in first. 22 23 MR. SAFERIAN: Sorry about that.

MEMBER FERRELL: Raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth in this case?

MR. SAFERIAN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay, go ahead.

MR. SAFERIAN: I'm here representing Coy
Construction and Mr. and Mrs. Orbain at 25863 Arcadia
Drive. As the chairman said, we are looking for a
four-foot variance on the rear setback.

Mr. and Mrs. Orbain came to us, recently acquired this home. Mrs. Orbain actually has severe allergy to beets (ph). As you see from the pictures we provided, there's no really rear backyard living space. There's the patio, but as you can see in kind of this picture here that we provided as well, just some severe kind of overgrowth from before. You got the trees, plants.

So what we're looking to do is kind of tear out this fence here and build a screened porch in that same area, as well as a deck going on the side. Why we want the 17 feet is really -- we're just looking for a nice livable space. Somewhere that she can put a nice table and chairs, go out and enjoy her backyard without being interfered and sitting outside and worrying about

the outside elements.

Really, we feel that 17 feet allows for a nice space for, like I said, some outdoor living area where other people can kind of be with her and walk around.

And really that's our main thing that we are presenting. We know that we are encroaching on the lot line; however, we just feel she -- she expressed to us and they did when they came to us that that's what they were looking for, was a nice outdoor space for her. Somewhere that she can be comfortable and not really worry too much about being outside with her family.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you.

Is there anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment about this case?

Seeing none. I close the public remarks.

Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: No comment.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: No comment, very good.

Mr. Secretary?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair, 16 letters mailed, zero letters returned, two approvals, zero objections.

Page 69 1 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Very good. Thank you. 2 MEMBER FERRELL: Hold on. The first approval 3 is by Tim and Jenny Bell, 25882 Venetian Court, 4 V-e-n-e-t-i-a-n, Court. Just an approval. 5 And the other one is from Dave and Cindy Webster, W-e-b-s-t-e-r, at 25841 Arcadia Drive. 6 7 "This email is in regards to the variance requested by Lisa and Rich Orbain." 8 9 MR. SAFERIAN: Orbain. 10 MEMBER FERRELL: Sorry. "We are the immediate neighbors and their 11 foremost affected by request. We support the request 12 for the variance." 13 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 14 15 The only question I have: Do they have a homeowner's association? 16 MR. SAFERIAN: I believe -- to be honest with 17 18 you, sir, I'm not positive. But if there is, we always go through and get their approval before we do 19 20 anything. 21 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you. 22 I'll open it up to the board. 23 Yes, Ms. Krieger?

Page 70 1 MEMBER KRIEGER: Question: Are there 2 easements like small drainage or electrical? 3 MR. SAFERIAN: No. Just the rear setback. MEMBER KRIEGER: Then I can understand the 4 5 need for an enclosed area in the summer with the pollens. So having a medical condition, I can 6 7 understand this variance. 8 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Gronachan, any motions? 9 MEMBER GRONACHAN: You mispronounced my last 10 11 name. It's Gronachan. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: I'm sorry. 12 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I know I'm the newest 13 member. 14 15 So this is a pie-shaped lot, correct? MR. SAFERIAN: Yeah. 16 17 MEMBER KRIEGER: It's not a square. 18 that's where you're running into your problem? MR. SAFERIAN: Correct. 19 20 MEMBER KRIEGER: So it's really the unique 21 size of the lot. It's not that big of a room that 22 you're building, correct? 23 MR. SAFERIAN: Yeah.

Page 71 1 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I think that given the 2 size of the lot and the shape and given the allergies, and it's Michigan and weather, and the growth that you 3 4 have there, I'm in full support and have no problem 5 with it. 6 MR. SAFERIAN: Thank you. 7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And I'll be supporting 8 your request. 9 Thank you very much. MR. SAFERIAN: 10 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. And the ordinance in the back. 11 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, I said the 12 overgrowth. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Very good. 15 Thank you. 16 Anybody else? 17 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I have a question, 18 Chairperson Sanghvi. Without the homeowner's association approval, can we do this one? 19 MS. SAARELA: I don't know if there is a 20 homeowner's association. 21 22 Do we know if there is one? 23 MR. BUTLER: No.

Page 72 1 MS. SAARELA: There may not be one. 2 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I have no objection 3 then. Thank you. 4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Is that a motion? 5 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: It can be. 6 MEMBER KRIEGER: Well, I thought you were 7 motioning. 8 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Again? I'm out of retirement already. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Go ahead. 11 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I changed my last name and 12 now I came back as a new person. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Gronachan. 13 14 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So my quota has been 15 excelled. 16 In case number -- wait. Let me go back and redo that. 17 18 I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ17-0053 at 25863 Arcadia Drive, west of Taft 19 and south of Eleven Mile sought by the petitioner for a 20 request of a four-foot variance for a 17-foot deep 21 22 screened-in porch with 35 feet minimum required by 23 code.

Page 73

Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring -- I'm sorry. Because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty due to the lot, size and shape. Also the wooded area surrounding the home, without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because, again, given the odd shape of the lot and the wooded area behind it and the medical condition that the homeowner is experiencing with allergies. The property is unique because of the wooded area and the petitioner did not create the condition, given the lot size.

Relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties based on the letters of approval that are on file. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a minimum request and, therefore, I move that we grant this variance.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: A motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?

Seeing none. Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

| | Page 74 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 2 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 4 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? |
| 6 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 8 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| 12 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Congratulations. |
| 13 | MR. SAFERIAN: Thank you, guys. I appreciate |
| 14 | your time and hope you guys have a great day. |
| 15 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck. I hope the |
| 16 | weather holds. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Next case. PZ17-0054, |
| 18 | Intercity Neon, Panera Bread. 25875 Novi Road, Suite |
| 19 | 100, west of Novi Road and south of Grand River Avenue. |
| 20 | Parcel number 50-22-22-227-029. The applicant is |
| 21 | requesting a variance from the City of Novi Code of |
| 22 | Ordinance section 28-5.E.1 for the proposed |
| 23 | installation of a building mounted projecting sign and |
| | |

one pedestrian projecting sign allowed by code. This property is zoned Town Center-1.

Please identify yourself with your name and address and if you're not an attorney, please be sworn in by our secretary. Thank you.

MS. HOLKE: My name is Donna Holke and I am with Intercity Neon. 23920 Amber, Warren, Michigan.

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

MS. HOLKE: I do.

MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead.

MS. HOLKE: I'm here on behalf of Panera
Bread. We're requesting -- basically, our request is
for an additional sign. They want to put up a blade
sign at their location. It was recently -- they just
remodeled it. It's got all new illuminated signs.
They recovered the awnings. And this is part of their
new design with this blade sign and it meets the
requirements of the City with the stylish bracket that
they have on it.

So the way this building goes, they're kind of tucked back in the corner and their building keeps setting back, and it's a crazy parking lot. So the

Page 76 1 more signage there, the more people can find where they're supposed to go to get inside. Our big issue is 2 just the property, the odd shape of the property and 3 the building itself, which is not anything that they 4 5 caused. 6 It wouldn't cause any problems with anybody 7 It just makes it easier for the else there. 8 pedestrians around to find their way in inside the 9 store. 10 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. Anybody in the audience who would like to make a comment? 11 Seeing none. 12 Mr. Butler, any comments? 13 MR. BUTLER: No comments. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 16 Mr. Secretary? 17 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Mr. Chair. There was 18 43 letters mailed, two letters returned, zero approvals and zero objections. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 21 I just have one question. What you have got 22 there now is it a mock-up or is it the real sign?

MS. HOLKE: Pardon me?

23

Page 77 1 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: On the wall? 2 MS. HOLKE: Oh, no. It's not the real sign. 3 The real sign will be thicker. The one we have there 4 is just Sintra plastic and it was an old rod iron. 5 Even the bracket is not the right bracket. It just is 6 to show you that it was going to be a rod iron 7 bracket. 8 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you. Open to the board. 9 10 MEMBER FERRELL: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Mr. Ferrell? 11 MEMBER FERRELL: You said you guys want the 12 sign to show the entrance to the building. Because 13 isn't the entrance underneath the Panera Bread sign, 14 15 like the big sign? From the sketch I'm looking at. 16 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: The entrance is facing 17 west. 18 MS. HOLKE: Yeah. But if you're coming from 19 the other way, you can't see that sign. 20 MEMBER FERRELL: Coming from which way? 21 MS. HOLKE: If you're coming from ... MEMBER GRONACHAN: The north. 22 23 MS. HOLKE: Well, actually, either way.

know, because you're driving parallel to the building. But if you're coming back from over by the drive-thru, then you know that -- there's a sign -- let's see. I was there today.

MEMBER FERRELL: So there's two signs?

MS. HOLKE: There's two signs there.

MEMBER FERRELL: There's going to be one on the side of the drive-thru and then there's one on the front of the building?

MS. HOLKE: Right.

MEMBER FERRELL: So you have a third sign that sticks out?

MS. HOLKE: Right.

MEMBER FERRELL: So I kind of have an issue with that. Because I feel like if you're on Novi Road, you'll still see the building. You know that Panera Bread is there because you can see the sign that is in the front, right, facing the west? And then you'll see the one that is facing the north.

So what is this third sign going to do?

There's another entrance on that side? Is that ...

MS. HOLKE: I don't think there is an entrance on that side. Because that's where the

Page 79 1 drive-thru is. MEMBER GRONACHAN: Isn't the drive-thru in 2 3 the back? 4 MS. CARR: Can I? 5 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Are you with Panera? 6 MS. CARR: Yes. I'm the general manager. 7 MS. HOLKE: She knows. She knows the 8 logistics of the store. 9 MS. CARR: Yeah. 10 MEMBER KRIEGR: Is she going to be sworn in? 11 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Excuse me, please identify yourself with your name and address and then 12 go ahead. 13 MS. CARR: Christin Carr, 417 Anaconda 14 15 Street, Commerce Township. MEMBER FERRELL: Go ahead and raise your 16 right hand. 17 Do you swear to tell the truth in this case? 18 19 MS. CARR: Yes. MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Go ahead. 20 It's a pedestrian level sign with 21 MS. CARR: our logo is what we're looking to add. So there are 22 23 the two entries and there's the two big neons that are

up really high. So this is a pedestrian-level sign with a logo.

Because of our parking, people do park way in one direction, way in another direction. And it's just that sort of --

MEMBER FERRELL: So is there still an entrance on the side where, I guess, it used to be kind of?

MS. CARR: There's still both entrances over there.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. I guess maybe I was confused with the pictures.

MS. CARR: And with the remodel, there's new patio furniture. There's a new wall. It's like the biggest remodel in the world for Panera right now. So it's a very different look from our 20-year-old. We have our 20-year anniversary this week at Panera, so it's a very different look. And the sign is just -- again, with our logo the neon is just the Panera Bread. They typed, you know, way up there neons.

MEMBER FERRELL: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: This sign you're looking on the diagram to Novi Road, the second sign, I'm

Page 81 1 confused about that. 2 MEMBER FERRELL: Maybe I can answer your 3 question. 4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Do you have a diagram? 5 MEMBER FERRELL: Yeah. Do you have anything 6 with you that you can put up? 7 MS. HOLKE: Showing the sign? 8 MEMBER GRONACHAN: On where the sign would be. 9 10 MS. HOLKE: This is where the sign is going 11 to go. MEMBER GRONACHAN: It's different than our 12 diagram is. 13 MS. HOLKE: And here's the drive-thru. 14 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's what I was thinking. Okay. 16 17 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: And everybody knows the Panera bread in Novi. 18 19 Okay. Thank you. I have no objections. MS. CARR: I think one of your board members 20 who isn't present gets delivery five days a week. 21 22 recognized his name as soon as I saw it. 23 MEMBER KRIEGER: Oh, wow.

Page 82 1 MS. CARR: So, hello, Thomas? Where are you? You're supposed to have my back here. 2 MEMBER FERRELL: That's hilarious. 3 4 MEMBER KRIEGER: And he's not here and he 5 didn't bring anybody anything. 6 MS. CARR: Hello? 7 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Mr. Chairman, I have no 8 objections. CHAIRMAN SANGHVI: Okay. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN SANGHVI: Yes. 11 MR. BUTLER: I just wanted to make a note. 12 That sign, the reason it's called a projection 13 pedestrian sign is it's mainly for pedestrians walking 14 15 through the parking lot to see their sign. That's why it's called a pedestrian protruding sign. So it makes 16 17 it easier as they get out of that south parking lot of 18 their vehicle that's the first thing they see, that sign as they're walking towards the door there. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. 21 MR. BUTLER: You're welcome. 22 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes, Ms. Gronachan? 23 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'm in your parking lot a

lot.

MS. CARR: Oh, you feel the pain.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I understand your pain. I don't know if six signs would help you. So I'm glad that you pointed out that it's a pedestrian sign. And I want to help you out with the logistics a little bit.

You were doing well by saying that the way lot is angled -- it's on an angle, number one. And it's very stretched out. I don't even know the length of that building and the number of stores that are in it. And the way the traffic comes in, you can come in from the north off Grand River. You can come in off of Novi Road. You can come in off the side street. So there's several different entrances into this parking lot, number one.

MS. CARR: Right.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And the uniqueness and the shape of this lot is a challenge for all the business owners, not just yourselves.

MS. CARR: Oh, our neighbors love us.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yeah. I'm sure they do.

But I want to clarify for the record that this isn't just for coming in off the street. Because

you could park at one end and walk a long way to get to Panera. That's why this sign is so important. So I think that that was what -- the point you were trying to make and I'm in full agreement of that.

The other thing is that the visibility.

Because of the way the lot is, you can't see the store at the end.

MS. CARR: Right.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You know, like in some of the shopping malls when you're walking around, you know if you're at Kroger, Home Depot is at the other end.

It's not that visible in this.

MS. CARR: Right.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And again, it's because of the uniqueness of the lot and the shape and, my favorite word for the night, topography. Because there is a kind of hill there and it makes visibility very difficult. So, given all of those challenges, I would be in support, and I'm not normally. So I'm in support of this. Because you truly have a hardship.

MS. CARR: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I will be supporting

you.

Page 85 1 MS. CARR: Thank you. You've been there, I 2 see. MS. CARR: Yes, I have. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Anybody else? 5 I don't remember seeing the corporate logo 6 before, that sign you are going to add, the slanting 7 sign you're going to make. This is a new thing, having 8 the corporate logo there? MS. CARR: Our old neons didn't have them on 9 10 there and the new ones don't either. They awnings 11 don't have them. There were very outdated. MS. HOLKE: But they are used in other 12 They do have that, the mother logo. 13 cities. CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Any further discussion? 14 15 May I have a motion? Joe's turn. 16 MEMBER KRIEGER: 17 MEMBER FERRELL: Do you want to do it, Joe? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: No. 18 MEMBER FERRELL: I'll do it. 19 20 I move that we grant the variance in case 21 number PZ17-0054 sought by the petitioner for a mounted 22 projecting pedestrian sign because the petitioner has 23 shown practical difficulty due to the lot shape and

Page 86

difficulty seeing. Without the variance the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property due to the shape of the parking lot and how difficult it is to, I guess, see the entrance of the building.

The property is unique because of the shape of the lot. The petitioner did not create the condition. Again, due to the design and how the lot was designed. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, as there were no objections. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and it's a minimal request to aid in the visibility of the business for the entrance to said business.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Motion has been made and seconded.

If there is no further discussion, Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell?

MEMBER FERRELL: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes.

| | Page 87 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger? |
| 2 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 4 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. OPPERMAN: And Chairperson Sanghvi? |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Congratulations. |
| 9 | Thank you. |
| 10 | MS. CARR: Thank you. |
| 11 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: You're welcome. See you |
| 12 | in the parking lot. |
| 13 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yeah. At least now we can |
| 14 | see where we're going. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. Now that |
| 16 | there is no further thing, I would entertain a motion |
| 17 | for adjournment. |
| 18 | MEMBER FERRELL: So moved. |
| 19 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I have one thing to add. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. |
| 21 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I would just like to wish |
| 22 | everybody a happy Thanksgiving. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Thank you. We wish you |
| | |

11/14/2017

| | Page 88 |
|----|--|
| 1 | the same. |
| 2 | MEMBER FERRELL: To you as well. |
| 3 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. To you as |
| 4 | well. To everybody. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: All right. Those in |
| 6 | favor of adjournment, say, "Aye." |
| 7 | Aye. |
| 8 | MEMBER KRIEGER: Aye. |
| 9 | MEMBER FERRELL: Aye. |
| 10 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Meeting is adjourned. |
| 12 | (At 8:28 p.m., matter concluded.) |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |

| | Page 89 |
|----------|---|
| 1 | CERTIFICATE |
| 2 | |
| 3 | STATE OF MICHIGAN) |
| 4 |) ss |
| 5 | COUNTY OF OAKLAND) |
| 6 | |
| 7 | I, Darlene K. May, do hereby certify that I |
| 8 | have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and |
| 9 | testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the |
| 10 | time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further |
| 11 | certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of |
| 12 | eighty-nine (89) typewritten pages, is a true and |
| 13 | correct transcript of my said stenographic notes. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | /s/ Darlene K. May Darlene K. May, RPR/CSR-6479 |
| 16 | |
| 17 | November 28, 2017 (Date) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 22 | |
| 23 | |
| ر ک | |
| | |