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CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can somebody close the door, please. I really appreciate it. Thank you so much. And good evening. This is the regular monthly meeting, Zoning Board of Appeals in Novi. Please call to order, and please stand up for the Pledge of Allegiance. Michael Thompson.
(Pledge of Allegiance)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you
so much. Please be seated, turn your cell
phones in silent mode. Excuse me? Can you
maintain the silence and put your cell phones on mute mode? Roll-call.

MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson
Peddiboyina.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes,
please.

## MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: (No verbal
response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Member
Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: (Nodding head).
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Mongo.
MEMBER MONGO: Here.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Krieger.
Absent, excused. And Member McLeod.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Here.
MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Sarah. Appreciated. Public hearing format and rules of conduct. When we call the case, please come to the podium. And you can spell your first and last name clearly for the court reporter and for the secretary. You will take the oath if you're not an attorney. Please maintain -- if anybody wants to present a case, the public, they can have three minutes
of time; not more than that. Please respect the time. Approval of the agenda. Somebody --

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we approve the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: August 2022 (sic., 2023). Somebody make a second, please.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I'll second it.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any objections?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Say all in favor aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Approval of agenda is done. Minutes of August 2023 is done. And public remarks. Anybody wants to change or add on this -- to this what we have agenda, please use the time where you can public -- you can present. If you want to
add anything, you can speak up.
AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody in
the public want to add anything in the agenda?
AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Looks like none.

MEMBER LONGO: I move that we approve the agenda as is.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody can make a second, please.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Say all in -- aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you
so much. Okay. Today's first case, PZ
23-0027, Jonathan Jacob. 1619 West Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive, south of Pontiac Drive. Parcel 50-22-03-131-052. The applicant is requesting a variance from the

City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.1.2, to allow storage of one recreational equipment or trailer under six feet tall in the front yard of a residentially zoned property between June 1st and September 30th of each year.

This property is zoned one family Residential, R-4. Please spell your first and last name clearly for the secretary and the court reporter, please.

MR. JACOB: Jonathan Jacob, $\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N} . \quad$ Jacob, $\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{B}$.

MEMBER LONGO: Are you an attorney? MR. JACOB: No, sir.

MEMBER LONGO: Do you promise to tell the truth in this case?

MR. JACOB: I do, sir.
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Jonathan. Please, proceed where we can help you tonight on this case.

MR. JACOB: Yes, sir. Thank you. I
just wanted to leave this up here again. I
know that you guys have already reviewed the
application; $I$ appreciate your time doing that. A short just presentation. I know I submitted a lot of documents, so I thank you for reviewing those photographs. No need to go through all of those today.

I do want to take the time to thank you for the hearing in this matter. I acknowledge this has been lengthy. I request this variance as stated, storage of my boat trailer at that location presented on the screen there. I understand and respect your time and acknowledge that you already read my application and request.

My property presents hardships, specifically exceptional narrowness and enclosed fencing. Due to these hardships, I can't get to the rear of the side yards. This specific area requested would not be used to store anything over six feet; and as stated in the ordinance, and will be solely for the boat trailer between those dated times. This area is not unsafe and consistently maintained. My trailer is in good working order.

My trailer is also parked next to, as if you see, an approved out building that's been there; and it's extremely hard to see when driving by, as depicted in the other photographs. This is the location of that trailer right there. And from the street side -- and again, this is ultimately looking at the front of my house; it's very hard to see the boat trailer.

If you're not familiar, my family has owned this residence since 1977 and this home has been my primary residence since 2019, when my wife and I purchased this house after my grandmother passed away.

I received this notice from Code Enforcement on July 1st from Ordinance Officer Underhill. And I want it noted that this is the first violation, any reported enforcement action since the home was actually purchased back in the 1970s. I grew up in this home, and for as long as $I$ can remember, there's been and trailer parked in this area without any problem of some sort. So to say that I
was extremely surprised about this ordinance violation notice would be to say the least.

I was able to speak with Ordinance Officer Underhill after receiving the notice; I was informed there was no complaints from any of the neighbors about it. And when I asked about the clarification which prompted this, Ms. Underhill stated -- began to explain to me something from the National Institute of Justice about the broken windows theory. If you're not familiar with the broken windows theory, this theory was developed in the early 1980s as a criminal enforcement model, where law enforcement is encouraged to address disorder and incivilities in a community to prevent crime.

The actual broken windows model
ultimately failed greatly. Though the idea of one broken window will lead to many others may sound plausible, any research on this topic failed to find a connection to crime and did not find any theory -- did not find the theory actually oversimplifies the cause of this
crime, and neglects other factors such as poverty, unemployment, lack of education, which are all contributing factors.

Ms. Underhill also went on to say that if she would allow me to put the trailer where it was and didn't cite me, what would stop someone from putting a motor home there if I moved. This area is, one, not big enough for a motor home, and her statement doesn't have any validity. But what was interesting is Ms. Underhill stated it would be okay if the boat was in the exact same spot -- if the boat was on the trailer in the exact same spot, because she would not be able to know if the boat was moved or not. And she also admitted there would be no violation or nothing she could enforce if I parked my 2001 F350 diesel pick-up truck that's four different colors and leaks oil in the exact same location.

Ms. Underhill also confirmed the trailer would not be in violation at all if it were in the exact same location if it was not

[^0]in between the time periods specified in the ordinance; and ultimately agreed with me that she feels that I specifically do have hardships at my residence, after looking at my property, that would prevent me from being in compliance with the zoning ordinance without a variance; one in which she told me she actually would help me obtain. This goes specifically against Ms. Underhill's proposed broken window theory from our first conversation.

I have had no -- I've had multiple other additional conversations with Ms. Underhill on this matter. I know that I've submitted many additional documents, and I just wanted to highlight a few of the photographs about these other areas. Stand by real quick.

This is standing in my driveway.
This is depicting two different houses right down the street from me. This is from my driveway that $I$ took this photograph. The first house is 121 Faywood. There's multiple
boat utility trailers parked in the yard behind a fence, which is exactly just like my house is. You can stand on Labata (phonetic) or on Faywood and clearly see the trailers from looking over the fence. I can see them from my driveway as you can see in this photograph.

Ms. Underhill informed me that there is nothing she can do about this because they were actually behind the residence and within the zoning ordinance. There has been no other reported violations at this home regarding those trailers; but, again, it's right behind the fence, standing on the street, looking at the same picture, and I'm in violation. She informed me that $I$ was in violation and this person is not just because of where it was located.

124 Faywood is where that other trailer on the top left -- I'm sorry. This is the second picture of 121 Faywood, as you can see directly over the fence. And that's not in violation because it's behind the house.

[^1]But I can stand on the street and look right over the fence line, as depicted in this photograph. Not in violation, again, according to Ms. Underhill. Those are where the locations of all those trailers are.

This is 124 Faywood, which is the other photograph that was presented -- the other trailer in the first photograph that I showed you still sitting right off the street. But again, Ms. Underhill stated that it was right next to the house and nothing she could do about that. That, according to Ms. Underhill, was not in violation.

Lastly, 115 North Haven, which this is a photograph standing on West Lake Drive. Right? Down the street from my house. This is on the corner of North Haven and West Lake Drive. There's a utility trailer and a boat trailer still sitting there today that, again, was told to me by Ordinance Officer Underhill was not in violation -- though I'm standing on West Lake Drive -- just because it's positioned behind the house.

I ask you to consider this. How many of these homes, trailers, and situation -- and situations are different from the request I'm asking you today; because they're not, they're exactly the same.

Lastly -- and I'm almost finished. I'm hurrying, guys. I appreciate you listening to me. This is 1641 West Lake Drive; this is five houses down from where I live. This house is inhabited and it's a horror house. This house -- Ms. Underhill is very familiar with this home, though she has failed to cite them since 2019; there has been no other violations. This is what my wife and I and my neighbors have to live next to.

This is the front yard as depicted from the day that Ms. Underhill gave me the notice of violation and still looks the exact same today. There has been multiple requests for something to be done with this house, and the people that own it consistently just do just enough not to be in trouble. This van has not moved in almost 10 years. How do I
know this? Like I said, I've been in and out of my house prior to me buying it every single day because I was a primary caregiver for my grandmother when she was alive and primary caregiver of the yard and property at this house.

```
                                    So to say that's very frustrating --
``` the one thing Ms. Underhill said was that that's a private area. As depicted by GIS itself, it's not a private road. It's not a private road until the end of the street comes back into the condo association. She said she has a relationship with those individuals; and, like I already stated, she knows who they are, but she has failed to take any action or any violations upon request since 2019.

I do you want to say this as I
finish up. I spent my life savings in hundreds of thousands of dollars to update and upgrade my home; my wife and \(I\) have done this. The homes on my street are all homes of very high value, and we don't say that lightly. We're very proud of where we live. I don't
want to see my street going down in value as the example that Ms. Underhill originally told me, but \(I\) don't think it's the boat trailers in the summer, when we all live on a lake, that's going to depreciate the neighborhood.

I have respect for the zoning ordinances and ordinance codes, and I understand the value of both. But I don't -also I don't agree with the monetary cost that it's cost me to come up here today. I had to pay \(\$ 200\) just to be allowed to speak here today. I had to take a day off work, because I work the afternoon shift, of my own money and my own time. I had to pay \(\$ 50\) in printing fees for the proper documents just to submit them properly to your board. I also had to pay an extra \(\$ 50\) because \(I\) had a notice of violation that Ms. Underhill, herself, admittedly acknowledged that I had a unique circumstance and may not actually be in violation, in her own words; she specifically told me that on the phone.

More so enough that she told me she
was going to help me to obtain this variance.
I don't think that that's very fair.
Nonetheless, I do want to specifically thank Ms. Underhill for actually taking the time to work with me and ultimately being honest about my situation. To you members sitting here before me, thank you again for reviewing my application, for taking the time to listen to me talk for considering this variance. I respectfully request that you please grant this. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you so much, Jonathan. I really appreciate your presentation and the way you presented. From the city.

MR. HALL: We have no comments, we just stand for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. MS. SAARELA: Just a comment. In
looking at this type of situation, where there's facts pointed out about other properties. We may or may not know if those are violations or in accordance with the
ordinance, but the city does investigate each property's unique circumstances and determines whether there are other violations to be issued; and that will be the same in this case. So if there are other violations, they will also be issued a ticket.

It's also important to remember that when looking at a request, it's up to the applicant to show how their property is unique and different from any other property in the neighborhood that would entitle them to use their property differently than everybody else is required to use it. So I just want to remind you of those things before discussion. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Liz. Okay. Corresponding secretary. MEMBER LONGO: Yes. There were 26 letters mailed out for this, four were returned. There were zero objections, four approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Okay. Public hearing. Anybody would like to speak on this case? Okay. Please come to the
podium and tell your first and last name clearly for the record.

MR. TRAN: Hi. My name is Xuan Tran. I'm actually the direct neighbor of John and Gin. I wholeheartedly support what he's shared today. And I --

MS. SAARELA: Can you spell your name for the court reporter, please?

MR. TRAN: Oh. I'm sorry. X, as in x-ray, \(U-A-N\), as in Nancy. Last name, Tran. T, as in Tom, \(R-A-N\), as in Nancy.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Can you tell your address, please.

MR. TRAN: My address is 1623 West Lake. I'm the house in his photos also. And I will have the same issue. I have received a warning already. Aside from supporting him on this issue and our other neighbor over here who will speak tonight, I just feel that maybe our ordinances need an update, I mean, in the end so we don't have to waste everybody's time on this issue anymore. But thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you
so much. Okay. Please come to the podium, tell your first and last name clearly for the record.

MS. JERGENS: Hi. I'm in support of Mr. Jacob also. We are three doors down, 1635 West Lake Drive. Susan Jergens, the daughter of Henry Kozlowski.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much for coming.

MADAM SECRETARY: Can you spell it?
MS. JERGENS: Sure. J-E-R-G-E-N-S.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Anybody who would like to speak? This is the opportunity where you can talk on this case.

AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Looks like none. Okay. Jonathan, that's a good presentation you gave --

MR. JACOB: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. You gave a good presentation, and I've seen the support on behalf of you. Let's see what's
going to happen for the remaining board members, let them speak out. Anybody who would like to speak on this case, other board members. Dr. Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your site the other day, on Saturday, actually, and I realize that you need some variance to keep your equipment. What kind of equipment are we talking about?

MR. JACOB: It's just a fishing boat, sir; that's all.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Okay. Very good.
I have no problem. You need to keep something somewhere and they are all very small lots; and there is no room on the street to keep anything there anyway. So I can support your request for a variance. Thank you.

MR. JACOB: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi. Any other board member.

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Jonathan, you're looking from June 1st to September 1st; am I are right, so four months period.

MR. JACOB: Yes, sir. Sorry. The 30th, September 30th; is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: June 1st to September 30th, yeah.

MR. JACOB: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, you are correct. And I have no objections on that. Thank you. Somebody -- I mean, Member Thompson, can you make a motion, please.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Sure. I just have a question for you first. The garage that it's parked next to, is it unable to go in there?

MR. JACOB: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Too long.
MR. JACOB: Too long and the way that it's constructed on the inside, yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: And then there is also a garage on the house, right?

MR. JACOB: Yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Same situation?

MR. JACOB: Yes, it is.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. JACOB: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other.
MR. JACOB: Thank you, sir.
BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal
response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Looks like none. Member Thompson, can you make a motion, please.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I can. Make sure we've got this turned on. I move that we grant the variance, Case PZ23-0027, sought by Jonathan Jacob for seasonal outdoor storage because the petitioner has shown difficulty acquiring storage for a trailer. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of his property just because of the size of his lot. He's unable to get it into his backyard.

The property is unique because it is
narrow with a fence line. The petitioner did not create the condition, as he purchased the house that way. The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, as his neighbors have agreed on. And it fits in with the lake setting. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because of the lot size and the location.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Support. Second. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you both, Dr. Sanghvi and Member Thompson. Roll-call, please. MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson Peddiboyina. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi. MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes. MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson. MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo. MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: And Member McLeod. MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes. MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Congratulations.

MR. JACOB: Thank you very much, everybody. I appreciate your time. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Case Number PZ23-0028, Ronnie and Wafaa Jamil. 1927 West Lake Drive. East of West Park Drive, South of Pontiac Trail. Parcel

50-22-03-131-026. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a side yard setback of 2.25 feet, 10 feet required, variance of 7.75 feet; for an aggregate total of 4.5 feet. 25 feet required, variance of 20.5 feet, for an increase in lot coverage to 42.5 percent. 25 percent maximum, variance of 17.5 percent. This variance would accommodate
the building of a new home. This property is zoned one family residential, R-4. Please tell your first and last name clearly for the record. And if you are not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath. Let's proceed where we can help you tonight.

MS. JAMIL: Wafaa Jamil. W-A-F-A-A. Jamil, J-A-M-I-L.

MR. JAMIL: Ronnie Jamil.
MS. JAMIL: My husband.
MR. JAMIL: 35649 Lincolnshire

Drive, Farmington Hills, Michigan.
MEMBER LONGO: Spell your name, please.

MR. JAMIL: J-A-M-I-L. Ronnie, \(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{E}\).

MR. MAROGI: I'm an engineer. I prepared the -- (indiscernible) -- for this property. My name is Larry Marogi. I'm from Barry Construction and Consulting. And the spelling of my name is \(\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Y} . \mathrm{Marogi}\), M-A-R-O-G-I.

MEMBER LONGO: Are any of you
attorneys?
MS. JAMIL: No.
MR. JAMIL: No.
MEMBER LONGO: Do you all promise to tell the truth in this case?

MS. JAMIL: Yes.
MR. JAMIL: Yes.

MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Please go ahead and proceed where you can help us tonight.

MR. JAMIL: We acquired this
property about a year ago; it's a little cottage. We tried to kind of see if we can remodel it and keep it as is and just keep it as a cottage. But it's so old and rotten, the wood, the studs, and the floors, the ceiling, everything was really not fixable unless we replaced the whole thing. So we decided to build a new home and hired the engineering firm and architect. And I think Larry already checked with the city. Larry you want to continue?

MR. MAROGI: The size of the property is 30 feet wide, and the zoning is R-4. The minimum width for \(R-4\) is 80 feet, that's why the setback is -- minimum is 25 -10 feet from one side, and total is 25 feet. So if I take from -- my property is 30 feet -actually, my client's property is 30 feet. So if I take 25 feet, I would have five feet only for building; which is not enough even for maybe two people to walk. So that's why we are requesting variance for this property, for the building. We put two and a half -- I mean 27 inches from each side, so total is four and a half feet. And we are requesting the variance for this.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you want to talk anything, ma'am?

MS. JAMIL: Yes. Same as what he's saying; we're requesting a variance to be able to build a house, you know, big enough to have a few feet on each side and, you know, build a nice home. So if you will grant us that, we'd appreciate it.

MR. JAMIL: We have a rendering of the home if you would like to look at it.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please, go ahead and present that.

MR. JAMIL: May I approach?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No.
You can put it there.
MADAM SECRETARY: There is a podium, the screen right there.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I was about to ask you that question, yes.

MR. JAMIL: This is the back of the home, facing the lake, and this is the front.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's a two-car garage?

MR. JAMIL: Pardon me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's a two-car garage?

MR. JAMIL: Yes, it is.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you. Anything you want to say?
MR. JAMIL: Nope. Thank you.
Thank you for your time.

is going to have some direction as to the openings on the side. I see a lot of windows and things there; have you discussed that with your architect?

MR. JAMIL: Yes, I just discussed it with him last week, I think. And we -- the building is going to have all fire walls. It's like the one hour fire walls on both sides of the wall. So that's to -- with respect to the opening, I'm not sure -- I didn't realize that it had to be within three feet, right?

MR. HALL: Yes.
MR. JAMIL: Less than three feet. I just saw that when \(I\) went to the city to pick up some papers, and I think I spoke with you.

MR. HALL: Actually, you probably spoke with Charles.

MR. JAMIL: Right. Right.
MR. HALL: Yeah. That's fine.
MR. JAMIL: And he mentioned it to me, which we were not aware of.

MR. HALL: So you'll be limited 25
percent of the facade for opening, so you may want to look at that; you may be very close to that, what I see right now.

The other comment I'd like to make is that you have overhangs on the house on that side. You're allowed to have a percentage of the overhang --

MR. JAMIL: I don't have any overhangs on the side -- on the left side -on the right side.

MR. HALL: Am I seeing an overhang on the roof there or not?

MR. JAMIL: The roof, yes.
MR. HALL: The roof is overhanging, yes.

MR. JAMIL: Yes.
MR. HALL: So I couldn't tell on your -- the section of the house of what the dimension of that overhang is. You're allowed --

MR. MAROGI: It's 12 inches.
MR. HALL: It's 12 inches?
MS. JAMIL: Uh-huh.

MR. HALL: Okay. So according to the ordinance -- well, the building code, actually -- because you're -- I'm sorry, the ordinance. You're allowed two inches for every foot of side yard. So you'll be only allowed to have like a little over four inches of overhang there. So \(I\) only mention that if you do proceed and you're granted the variance tonight, you may be required to have that variance also that was not advertised for that. If you're going to change your building and pull it back the additional six inches, you can have the windows, that's something you should probably discuss tonight, if that makes sense.

MR. JAMIL: Okay.
MR. HILL: Thank you. MS. JAMIL: So just for the record, we started building according to where the house sits right now, so we automatically assumed that that would be okay because that's where it sits now. We didn't do -- we didn't go any further, so it sits at two and a half
feet now.

MR. HALL: Right. Right. Yeah.
MS. JAMIL: Just -- you know.
MR. HALL: Yep. Yep.
MS. JAMIL: Yeah.
MR. HALL: Yeah, it's non-
conforming. So that is a -- you're correct. You're correct. Unfortunately, building a new house, you would be under the new code and they're going to hold you to those regulations. So that's just something to consider. If you're going to pull it back, we can discuss it tonight. If you do get approved by the variance, there may be -- the overhang may have to be reduced. And you can do that architecturally; you don't have to ask for a variance; but that wasn't advertised. Do you understand what I'm saying there?

MS. JAMIL: Yeah.
MR. JAMIL: Yes.

MR. HILL: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you.

MS. JAMIL: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:
Correspondence secretary.
MEMBER LONGO: Twenty-five letters were mailed out, eight were returned. Five were objections, and one was approved. One of the objections was from Sarah Fletcher; she's 1929 West Lake Drive. "Our neighbors have done some excellent --"

MS. SAARELA: Are you sure about the names on there?

MADAM SECRETARY: That is a printed email; so it's just showing that email was sent to me.

MEMBER LONGO: I beg your pardon. It's not from Sarah, it's from Topp, T-O-P-P, Brenda, Brenda Topp. Thank you. "Our neighbors have done some excellent research on the variance. We would like to --" they sent a letter in, but now they'd like to say that "approving a side setback have been no less than four feet on each side of the rest of the community. We think this is a reasonable
restriction that has not prevented any of these families from building their home. Therefore, we don't support this."

This is from 1921 West Lake Drive. The people that live there -- it doesn't have a name, but they're opposed because many of the homes have -- many of the homes have required a setback variance. But it usually --" and then they list one, two, three, four, five, six, seven homes, all of which have four feet setbacks on the side yards or more.

This one is from 1915 West Lake. Again, I don't have the name. "We do not support the 27 inch side setback. The owners of the lot -- of Lot 25 is asking the Zoning Board to approve a setback that necessitates a trespass on the adjoining neighbor's property for both construction of a new home and day-to-day use after the new house is built." This is -- "We welcome the future new neighbors as well as improvement to the existing property. In review of the site plan
submitted, a variance for a side yard setback should be considered at a minimum of four feet, due to the fire and emergency access of the lake in regard to existing adjacent structures." Did I say who that was? I don't think I did. It's 19 -- no. I'm sorry. It's -- it doesn't say where it's from. Oh, yes, it does. 1905 -- thank you -- West Lake Drive. That was Sandra Phillips. Gary Phillips echoed that same thing. This is from Jerry Ross, 1911 West Lake Drive. I've always felt the immediate neighbor or others build's (sic) affect should decide. The building has no effect on me." That was not an objection. That's it. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. It's now time to speak the public hearing. Anybody would like to speak on this case, this is the time. You can come to the podium. You have three minutes time lapse. Each person can speak. Also, please state your first and last name clearly, as I mentioned earlier. Thank you.

MR. MARTELLA: (Indiscernible).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You can
leave it, it comes automatically. Yep. Your time starts now at 7:34.

MR. MARTELLA: Christopher Martella. I'm an attorney with Dawda, Mann. I'm here on behalf of 1921 West Lake Drive, the Houghtons. And I am augmenting a letter that was read earlier.
(Pause)
MR. MARTELLA: Christopher Martella, an attorney with Dawda, Mann, Mulcahy \& Sadler. M-A-R-T-E-L-L-A. I'm here on behalf of 1921 West Lake; that is the Houghtons. You were read a letter by them; it was the one that had the nice little box on it, and talked about the six homes in the adjacent area and the setbacks.

The property in question is pictured in Exhibit 1, just so you have an idea of where it is. The plan and the Houghton home is the adjacent property to the north, Lot Number 26. The bulk of what is going on in
the discussions here have been about the side yard setback. Currently proposed in the currently non-conforming structure is at 27 inches, foot and a half -- sorry -- two and a half feet.

The Houghtons, they're adjacent neighbors. And if you turn over to the second page, all of -- focused -- okay. All of the colored homes that aren't in red, so Lots 27, 26, 18, 9, 8, and 7, all have between four and five yard -- four and five foot side yard setbacks on either side. The homes range anywhere from 2,200 to 2,500 square feet. So the -- understanding that these are narrow lots -- they are 30 feet wide. They were platted that way in the early 1900s, 1913. This does create a major issue in depth. So we understand the coverage issues, and the seeking of a variance is almost always necessary to build anything larger than a small one-story home, similar to what is there currently that is going to be torn down.

The important piece to remember here
is there are other variances that have been granted, obviously, to utilize the property because people want to build larger homes, but they understand the need to have access both for safety, fire, and simply to prevent an ongoing trespass. When you have something so narrow, the ability to get to your side yard or even wash a window or put up a ladder or even access. As was mentioned, the Fire Department has restrictions on anything less than three feet for safety reasons.

So to give you an idea, two homes that were built to the north, my client's and the adjacent home, there have a four-foot setback on either side of the property line. And if you turn to Exhibit 3, that is a four-foot either side of the property line setback; just about enough to pull a Bobcat through, barely pull a kayak. If you want to wash your windows, clean your gutters, or whatnot, you're almost assuredly going to be trespassing; and I hope you like your neighbors.

So approving a variance of anything
less than four feet, you've already made neighbors unhappy people because you've created an incident of trespass almost assuredly, unless somebody wants to walk their lawn mower through the center of their house to mow their backyard. They can always float it in; I guess that's an option, but, you know, you do have those kinds of issues.

So, you know, again, you can see also in the same exhibit, it's the rear of the house. This is the front yard versus the rear. You notice again, these are enough for ingress and egress if necessary; and, again, we don't create an issue with trespass. You still have to like your neighbor and you can somewhat mow your lawn and what not; but, again, you have issues of sideage slab non-opening windows, which was also mentioned. Again, anything less than three feet, fire code has a problem with even opening windows. You can have some windows but they can't open.

Again, as you see here, we have
setback issues already; and you have a build-out -- a pop-out on either side. Both homes have pop-outs on their respective sides of the property. And this was only allowed because of the four plus foot side yard setback; otherwise, this pop-out would be mere inches.

Currently, if -- this is Exhibit 4. If you go over to Exhibit 4, you will notice that is the existing home and lot that is requesting the variance. The air conditioning unit belongs to my clients. That is at the current width, so our four-foot setback, and them being right on the property line, the 27 inches where the current structure to be torn down exists.

As you notice, you couldn't put two units, AC units next to each other, you couldn't put a back-up generator, so you have an issue of where do you place things. And, again, once you tear the building down, its non-conforming use becomes requirement to conform; so we run into that issue as well
about once this comes down, conforming with the current code.

Last but not least, you will notice this is further forward towards the front of the house. That's my neighbor's entrance to their home. The existing poles that are right there are the fence line that was taken down. So if a fence line is put up, you can see how narrow the gap is at 27 inches. Again, we jokingly say that's from the tip of my finger to my shoulder, so we're not talking about a lot of distance. If you'd like to bring even a pool floaty from your garage or from the front to the back, you can't do it without creating a trespass.

As was astutely mentioned, you know, previously the five things that the municipality looks at when granting a variance are strict enforcement makes it impossible to use the property. Well, there are other people that have sought variances of lesser nature. And you could use this -- although not the way people want to build homes today
-- under current zoning, except for the fact that -- let's talk about a 20 -foot setback making their 10 -foot wide house wouldn't be exactly --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Excuse me.
MR. MARTELLA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:
(Indiscernible) -- the time limit.
MR. MARTELLA: I have 30 seconds, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're already past six minutes.

MR. MARTELLA: Oh. Sorry. I apoligize. Then \(I\) will end it at that. Under the analysis as stated before, the five points, this is not compliant any of them. So that's that.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Anybody would like to speak, please?
MR. JAJJOKA: Can I speak?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
Yeah. Please, go ahead.
MR. JAJJOKA: David Jajjoka.
(Indiscernible).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No.
Can you please speak clearly?
MR. JAJJOKA: David Jajjoka. David Jajjoka. J-A-J-J-O-K-A. 381 Deer Path Trail, Waterford, Michigan, 48237. Let me make sure. This is good. What we are proposing is 2.27 inchs to the property line. And there is like another four feet --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Can you speak on the mic clearly, please? Put your mic on back so that the audience can hear clearly.

MR. JAJJOKA: Yeah. The proposed house is 27 inches to the property line, not the next house. The next house is about four feet, right? Yeah. So the total is about six foot, three inches or four inches, I believe; (indiscernible) -- between two walls. I just want to mention that. Not like the one that's showing here, which is going to be more. I just want to point that --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's not
true.

MR. JAJJOKA: This is eight foot.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's eight
foot. That's four foot by four feet.
MR. JAJJOKA: That cannot be.
Cannot be eight foot, look out the window.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You
can speak on this case on behalf of -(indiscernible) -- you know. Thank you.

MR. JAJJOKA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody
else, please? Please respect the time; I
really appreciate it. One-on-one discussion is very important, rather than the group.

MR. STREET: My name is James
Street, 1915 West Lake Drive. My wife and I own the house two parcels to the north of the Jamils. We're actually very happy that the Jamils are going to build and move in. One of our concerns, though, is, you know, in terms of the neighborhood is the -- respecting each other's property and also trying your best not
to inconvenience your neighbors. It's really important, especially when you're living in a 30 foot piece of property with really tight side setbacks.

As you heard earlier, most of the new construction in the area, if not all of it, have built really nice homes on setbacks that were roughly four feet or -- side setbacks roughly four feet or larger. In our case, we work with our builder to try to fit into that four foot side back -- side -- um, side setback. And we were able to build a two-story 2,900 square foot home. So in our view, it can be done and we don't think it really creates a hardship to grant a setback of 27 inches.

And you may ask, okay, we're two properties north, why is it important. Well, it's important because a couple of things; one, you've gotta be able to get along with your neighbors. And I can tell you that 27 inches, as you just heard, you will be asking or walking on other people's property all the
time. And it's just -- it's a non tenable situation where by approving a 27 inch variance, by definition you're going to create a hardship for the neighborhood.

And quite frankly, you'll create one for the Jamils as well, because they need to be able to get their stuff to the front of the -- to the lake side; and it will be really difficult, if not impossible to do so. Unless you've lived on a lake and you've done this sort of thing, you may not appreciate what it takes to get a paddleboard, a canoe, a dock, a lift, all those kinds of things that we need to do to get to the lake side.

And so I think it would be great if they can work with their builder to work with the plans and get a reasonable side setback that will work for them and for the neighborhood. And I think that's, in my opinion, the best route to go. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. Any other audience, please? Yes, please come to the podium.

MS. ROSS: I always have to lower these. I'm Deborah Ross, 1911 West Lake Drive. I am three houses to the north. And luckily my brilliant husband bought a piece of property in 1970 something that was 60 feet wide, so we never had to deal with this. But I've seen people come in and knock down the cottages and build beautiful homes, so I know it can be done.

And one time a few years ago I watched across the lake two houses burn. One house caught on fire and then the other one did. And it was quite a hardship and quite a terrible thing to watch both of them go. So we really need to think about this in terms of safety. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, Deborah. Okay. Any other audience, please?

AUDIENCE: (No verbal response). CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Looks like none. Mr. Ronnie, are you there?
Can you come to the podium, please? Okay. As
our city manager mentioned, we have three motions we need to make today on this case. And do you have anything to change your mind to setback variance? You want to come back? How do you want to proceed with the board, what we did tonight?

MR. JAMIL: I have discussed with my architect and he said if we can get a three-foot setback on each side, it will be sufficient enough to put the door on the side entry instead of facing north. So if we can get a variance of six feet, which is three feet on each side, that would be workable for us.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Liz, can we ask this case to --

MS. SAARELA: You can grant a lesser variance; but if they're asking to increase it has to be renoticed. But if they're asking for less than was posted, you can always grant less.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.
Okay. Let's see. It's open to the board.

Okay. Dr. Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. Good evening.

MR. JAMIL: Good evening.
MS. JAMIL: Good evening.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I came and saw your place, and I know it's a very small place. What is the total size of your lot.

MR. JAMIL: It's 30 by 150, I believe; 30 foot wide, 150 deep.

MEMBER SANGHVI: What is the square footage of the house you are trying to put on it?

MR. JAMIL: I think the first floor is 1,200 square feet, plus a garage.

MEMBER SANGHVI: And how many bedrooms?

MR. JAMIL: Three bedrooms on the second floor.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I see. Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. JAMIL: Thank you.
MS. JAMIL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you,
Dr. Sanghvi. Any other board member, please? Yeah, go ahead, Michael (sic).

MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes, I have a problem with the setback; it needs to be bigger. It's a pretty tall structure you're putting there; it's two floors and an attic --

MR. JAMIL: Uh-huh.
MR. MONTAGUE: -- which is towering over, which is pretty large. So I don't like the site coverage at 42 percent; that's another problem that we're propagating by doing this. So \(I\) won't be in support unless you go back and make some changes.

MR. JAMIL: The height of the property is within the city's --

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I wasn't saying it was not, I'm just saying it is towering, it is tall, and it being two and a half or three feet from next door, it does tower, so --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other board member, please? Go ahead.

MEMBER MCLEOD: So question. Did I
hear correctly that you do have a side entryway as well or no?

MR. JAMIL: No.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Okay. So it won't be a side door within that three-foot setback?

MR. JAMIL: No.
MEMBER MCLEOD: What about an air conditioner?

MR. JAMIL: I'm sure we'll need one.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Okay. Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Jay. Go ahead, sir.

MEMBER LONGO: You mentioned that there might be a possibility of three-foot setback; I assume that's on both sides?

MR. JAMIL: On both sides, yes.
MR. LONGO: Right now you're at four and a half, total?

MR. JAMIL: Total.
MEMBER LONGO: Which I also don't support. Have you looked at anything better, where it would be like four feet or eight feet total; have you considered anything like that?

MR. JAMIL: It just would be so
narrow. We want the door to be not going into the side of the house; we want to be able to go in straightforward. So if we reduce it to six feet -- I mean increase it to six feet, the door may be on an angle going into the property.

MS. JAMIL: Or to the side.
MEMBER LONGO: You're talking about the front door, correct?

MR. JAMIL: The front door, yes.
MEMBER LONGO: So you don't see any way to go any better?

MR. JAMIL: It would be difficult.

But --
MEMBER LONGO: That's all I have.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board member?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael?
MR. THOMPSON: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

Okay. It's time for the motion. Michael. MEMBER LONGO: I move that we deny the variance of Case Number PZ23-0025, sought by Ronnie and Wafaa for the side yard variance and the lot coverage variance, which is practical difficulty of such severe variances. The circumstances and features of the property include variances that are not unique because they are generally that throughout the city. The circumstances of features of line property -- of the property -- excuse me -relating to the various requests are selfcreated because they are asking to build a home that is, frankly, too wide for the lot. The failure to grant relief and result -- will result in mere inconvenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return, based on petitioner's statement that they want a larger home. The variance would result in interference with the adjacent and surrounding properties by creating a very narrow distance between homes. Granting the variance would be inconsistent
with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Homes have not been that close in the other recent builds.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Somebody can make --
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I would second it. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson
Peddiboyina.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: No.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. I would be
agreeing to the motion?
MADAM SECRETARY: You would be agreeing to deny their variance.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member McCloud. MEMBER MCCLOUD: No.

MADAM SECRETARY: Okay. Thank you. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
MR. JAMIL: Thank you.
MS. JAMIL: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Case

Number PZ23-0032, Nowak and Fraus
Engineers/Audi. 24295 Haggerty Road, West of Haggerty Road, North of 10 Mile, Parcel 50-22-24-476-030. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.10.3.a to allow one overhead door to face a major thoroughfare, 10 Mile Road. This property is zoned general business, B-3. Okay. Go ahead and spell your first and last name clearly for the record. And if you are not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath.

MR. COPPERSMITH: My name is Adam Coppersmith. A-D-A-M. \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{H}\). I'm with Studio Detroit; we're the
architecture firm for the development.
MEMBER LONGO: Are you an attorney?
MR. COPPERSMITH: I am not.
MEMBER LONGO: Do you promise to tell the truth in this case?

MR. COPPERSMITH: I do.
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Adam, please go ahead and proceed where we can help you tonight on this case.

MR. COPPERSMITH: So I'm in front of you to ask for a variance to replace two existing overhead doors that face 10 Mile Road in the existing building. It's currently an unoccupied space; we're looking to redevelop that into a new automotive dealership. It was previously an automotive dealership before. And at the location that faces 10 Mile, it is the service drive entrance, where the customer will come onto the site and pull in to drop off their vehicle for service.

And so currently there are two overhead doors; we're proposing to remove
those two and replace them with a single 16 foot wide overhead door. And just maintaining the requirements of the brand image, it's just to have a single door versus the two.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Do you have a picture, by chance, so that the audience can look at it?

MR. COPPERSMITH: So the existing -so in this location here is the two existing glass overhead doors, and they set (sic) back behind these existing black columns. In this location here you can see where -- this is where we're requesting a single 16 foot wide door, eliminating the two individual. This is a glass door also; it's a coiling high speed door versus a traditional glass sectional door, so that it's more energy efficient. It will open and close quicker to prevent the air -- the cold air coming in in the winter, the warm air entering in the summer.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you. Anything you would like to add?
MR. COPPERSMITH: I think that's
all.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. From the city?

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the door that you're saying is glass; it's not plastic, it's glass?

MR. COPPERSMITH: It is a glass door, correct.

MR. HALL: Okay. Thank you. And the door is screened by the building from Haggerty; you'll be able to see it from 10 Mile. We have no -- we stand for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Okay. Secretary for correspondence.

MEMBER LONGO: Eight letters were mailed out, two were returned. There were no objections and no approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Anybody would like to speak on this case in public?

AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like none. Okay. I have no objection on this
case, and it's open to the board. Yes, Dr. Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited your place a couple of days ago. I've known this place for a long time, actually. And I can understand there is no other way you can put any door anywhere there to get the service and everything functional; so I can support your requirement. Thank you.

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

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like none. It's motion time. Member Montague.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ23-0032, sought by Nowak \& Fraus Engineers, for a variance from Section 3.10.3.a to allow an overhead door facing a major thoroughfare. Without the -- sorry. Without this variance the petitioner would be prevented from use of the property because the building is existing
and the service layout exists as such so the entrance to that service area is already defined.

The property is unique because it's located on two main thoroughfares, being on Haggerty and 10 Mile. The petitioner did not create the situation because, obviously, he purchased an existing building. The relief granted doesn't necessarily interfere with the surrounding properties. All the properties around are very commercial in nature; it's a fairly nice building sitting amongst that. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it does fit in the area and it is in existing condition, which is basically replacing two doors with one door.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Support.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you.
MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson
Peddiboyina.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes,
please.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member McLeod.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:

Congratulations.
MR. COPPERSMITH: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And the case number for tonight. PZ23-0033, Henry K-O-Z-L-O-W-S-K-I, Kozlowski. 1635 West Lake Drive, east of West Park Drive, south of Pontiac Trial. Parcel 50-22-03-131-012. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 5.1.2
to allow storage of one recreational equipment or trailer under six feet tall in the front yard of a residentially zoned property between June 1st and September 30 th of each year.

This property is zoned one family residential,
R-4. Okay. Please, go ahead, spell your first and last name clearly for our record. And if you're not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath.

MS. JERGENS: Susan, \(S-U-S-A-N\), Jergens, J-E-R-G-E-N-S. And I'm not an attorney.

MEMBER LONGO: Do you promise to tell the truth in this case?

MS. JERGENS: I do.
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
MS. JERGENS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Ma'am, please go ahead and proceed where we can here you tonight.

MS. JERGENS: Sure. Sure. I'm
hoping that we will be granted the variance to allow our jet ski trailer on the property.

And I appreciate everyone's time right now. I've physically been on this property over 40 years, and have never heard of any variances or any violations with this variance. We've had many trailers, boats throughout the years. We are physically not able to put this trailer on the side lot or, staying within our property lines, go to the front of the house. We actually consider the lake side the front of the house, and this is the rear that we have this thing, but the City looks at this differently.

We do not believe this is causing any hardship or diminishing of the property -nearby properties, even; this is a lake and these are trailers and jet keys. So we would like to request a variance be granted. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. JERGENS: Any other thing you'd like to add, or anybody would like to speak on this or just you.

MS. JERGENS: I wholeheartedly
support Mr. Jacob's presentation; that was wonderful. Yes. And, again, we are neighbors, three doors down from them. Yes. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you so much, ma'am. Okay. From the city.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, no. We stand for questions.

MS. SAARELA: Just a remainder that you have to look at whether there's a unique circumstance of the property that makes it different from other properties that would make it unreasonable and prevent them from using the property the way that it's required to by ordinance.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Elizabeth. From the city. I'm sorry. There's nothing?

MR. HALL: Yep. Just for questions. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you
so much. Correspondence secretary.
MEMBER LONGO: Seventeen letters were mailed out, two were returned. There
were no objections and there were two approvals.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:
(Indiscernible).
MEMBER SANGHVI: What?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: That's
fine. Thank you. Public hearing. Anybody who would like to speak on this case, please?

MR. JACOB: Jonathan Jacob.
\(\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{J}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{B}\). Again, as previously stated in my presentation, this is an exact similar circumstance; the fact that Mr. Kozlowski cannot even get to the lake side of the home from where he is. And I echo what has already been stated. Again, being in the area a long, long time, many years -- I'm 35, so since I was a kid, there's always been some sort of trailer or something on that. This July was the first time that anybody's ever said a word about anything on West Lake Drive like this.

Coincidentally, I was actually mailed the photograph of Mr. Kozlowski's house
and my notice of violation, and there was much confusion on which one was which. So it appears the ordinance Officer Underhill may be going to a time of retirement if she can't figure out where the right place is.

So I support this and I think that this is a little bit of an overreach on her end of it. And I hope that I find the same way that you found for me. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other public.

AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Looks like none. Okay. It's time for the board; somebody can speak on this.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I have a question. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please, go ahead.

MEMBER THOMPSON: So the picture shows there's two trailers.

MS. JERGENS: Yes. Yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: You're asking for a variance for one or two?

MS. JERGENS: For two. There's not two at all times. For example, if you go there right now, there's only one. So this would be for two trailers; one is a single and one is a double.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Like a personal watercraft, is it?

MS. JERGENS: Yes. Jet skis, yes.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Little bit different situation. Jet ski trailers are shorter, yes?

MS. JERGENS: Yes. Well, that's all that's there, the jet ski trailers, yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Being shorter, is that unable to go in the garage?

MS. JERGENS: Yes. Yes. There's no room in the garage, yes.

MEMBER THOMPSON: There's no -- it's too long or there's not room, boxes and stuff? MS. JERGENS: The dimensions -- let me take a look here.
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\section*{CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Is it} going to fit in the garage or you don't have space in the garage?

MS. JERGENS: No, this would not be able to fit in the garage, correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: How often you keep both of them?

MS. JERGENS: Um, if my son -- I have two sons; if one takes and leaves it on a friend's lake. So, again, I believe we've only had this one double trailer right now for two months in our driveway, so --

MS. SAARELA: So the variance is for one trailer; you can't add an additional trailer at the point after it's been posted. They're requesting two trailers at any time, they need to redo the whole variance and come back on another day, repost for two trailers. So you cannot grant a variance for two trailers.

MS. JERGENS: But we were -- the picture shows two. And when Ms. Hill --

MS. SAARELA: It was not advertised
for two trailers; they can't grant two
trailers. If you're requesting two trailers, that's what needs to go on the application, not just in the picture. You need to specify two trailers, front yard, whatever the request is. You need to advertise it for two trailers; that was not done in this case. So if that's the request, you'll have to be renoticed and come back on another day.

MS. JERGENS: Okay. So let's just leave it for the one then at this point.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. You want to go for one trailer?

MS. JERGENS: Well, yeah. I mean that's what we have right now. And, again, Ms. Hill knows what was on our property when she took the picture showing the two. I've never had to do this again in my life. This wasn't explained to me properly.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You're okay with one trailer?

MS. JERGENS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any
other board member would like to speak on this? Dr. Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: He was before me. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Sorry.

MEMBER MCLEOD: Thank you. I just wanted to throw caution out there.

MS. JERGENS: Sure.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: When you address at the podium, please don't throw other neighbors under the bus, please don't insult city staff or -- and, again, your neighbors. That might not strongly impact your case this time around, but it may in future instances. I just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Dr. Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Before I start, I just want to clarify. We don't need to readvertise this because of the little change in the requirement?

MS. SAARELA: They have two trailers versus one, you'll need to readvertise.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Okay. Just one. Thank you.

MS. SAARELA: Yeah.
MEMBER SANGHVI: I went and saw your place the other day. I think there is no choice but to put it there somewhere during your summer, otherwise you can't use it.

MS. JERGENS: Exactly.
MEMBER SANGHVI: So I understand your need and I can support it without any problem. Thank you.

MS. JERGENS: Okay. Thank you.
Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I have no objection for the one trailer. This is motion time; if none of the board members would like to speak, Dr. Sanghvi, it's the one trailer motion.

MEMBER SANGHVI: I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ23-0033, sought by Henry Kozlowski of 1635 West Lake Drive, for the storage of recreational equipment during the summer months in the
front yard because petitioner has shown practical difficulty about putting this storage somewhere during the summer months to use the equipment. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented from enjoying the property during summer months. And the property is unique because of its narrow and unique situation along the lakeside. This is not a self-created condition. The relief granted will not unreasonably enterfer with adjacent or surrounding properties. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Thank you.

MS. JERGENS: All right.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Somebody can second, please?

MEMBER MCLEOD: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you.

MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson
Peddiboyina.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes,
please.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Mr. Montague.
MR. MONTAGUE: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member McLeod.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:

Congratulations.
MS. JERGENS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Case
Number 5 for tonight. PZ23-0034, Remodeling
Star, Inc. 1537 West Lake Drive east of West Park Drive, south of Pontiac Trail, Parcel

50-22-03-131-006. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a front yard
setback of 15 feet --
(Pause)
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Excuse me.
MR. HUARD: No problem. It's okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's okay. It's okay. Take a long time.
(Pause)
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you for
pausing, chairperson.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much, everybody. I'm sorry for that, you know.

MR. HUARD: No problem.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry. I'm repeating the case again. PZ-23-0034.

Remodeling Star, Inc. 1537 West Lake Drive, west (sic) of West Park Drive, south of Pontiac Trail. Parcel 50-22-03-131-006. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a front yard setback of 15 feet, 30 th feet required, variance of 15 feet, for a side yard setback of 1 foot, 10 feet required, variance
of nine feet, for an aggregate total of eight feet, 25 feet required, variance of 17 feet. This variance would accommodate the building of a second story addition on an existing home. This property is zoned one family residential, R-4. Please spell your first and last name clearly for the record. If you're not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath.

MR. HUARD: Sure thing. My first name is Michael, \(M-I-C-H-A-E-L\). Last name is Huard, \(H-U-A-R-D\).

MEMBER LONGO: Michael, are you an attorney?

MR. HUARD: I am not, sir.
MEMBER LONGO: Do you promise to tell the truth in this case?

MR. HUARD: Yes, sir.
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Michael, please, proceed where we can help you tonight. Are you the -- (indiscernible).

MR. HUARD: Yes, I am. I'm with

Remodeling Star, representing -- well, I'm here for the McClellan family.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Please go ahead.

MR. HUARD: Sure. What we're
looking to do is there's an existing office over the garage right now. And the homeowner would like to expand the office towards the front and to the sides, not encroaching on any of the existing roofline as far as the width of the house or anything like that. And that's really about it. We're not going to be raising the roofline, we're not going to be raising the peek of the roof; it's basically just expanding the wall out.

And when \(I\) was speaking with the gentleman from the city, he did inform us of one side needs to be without a window and without -- with a fire wall rated wall. We were aware of the fire wall rated wall but not the windows, so we made modifications internally for that change as well. So --

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Do you
have any pictures showing the audience?
MR. HUARD: Sure. So this is the structure as it exists now, where we have -this is the attached garage here.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Let him --

MR. HUARD: Pardon me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: It's not coming on the screen; I was waiting for that.

MR. HUARD: Oh. We'll wait.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yep. Go ahead.

MR. HUARD: There we go. So this is the existing attached garage and this is the existing overhang, which is an additional bedroom space or office space for the homeowner. What we're looking to do -- this should be maybe a little bit of glare. What we're looking at is this expansion of the office space from right about here, up to here. And I think there was about a foot on either side that we're going -- is going to be extended. But again, roofline-wise or peek of the roof, there is no change there. And then
the width of the overhang and everything will remain the same. You know, we are aware that it's legal non-conforming as it sits right now, so we're just looking for a variance to make the addition to this office space for the homeowner.

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

MR. HUARD: No, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. From the city.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman. Yes, he will be asking for three dimensional variances tonight if you approve the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Corresponding secretary.

MEMBER LONGO: Twenty-seven letters were mailed out, three were returned. There was one objection and two approvals. The objection was from Joann and Ned Noel, I think it is. "Since the lake front lots in our area are narrow, we usually support the side yard setback variance. But this is just too much.

Only one foot instead of 10 feet just presents a fire hazard. We feel the remodel needs to be redesigned so the setback from the side yard is seven or eight feet, definitely not one feet. So sorry to have to oppose this, but, as homeowners settle for a smaller variance and a larger side yard setback.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.
Thank you. Anybody in the public would like to speak on this case?

MR. JACOB: Jonathan Jacob, 1619
West Lake. No objection.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. Any other audience, please?

AUDIENCE: (No verbal response).
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like none. Okay. So open to the board. Dr. Sanghvi.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and visited. You already have a second story there.

MR. HUARD: Correct.
MEMBER SANGHVI: You are trying to
extend it on top of your garage?
MR. HUARD: Yes, doctor.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Your footprint is
not changing?
MR. HUARD: No, sir.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Nothing else is
changing?
MR. HUARD: No, sir. The existing
setback --
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I have no problem. Thank you.

MR. HUARD: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: And the
roof is matching the same?
MR. HUARD: Yes, the roof is
matching the same. Now, are you referencing the height of the peek of the roof?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.
MR. HUARD: Yes, the peek of the roof is matching.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Any other board member? Please, go ahead.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: I don't understand
the one foot setback. That's an existing condition. You're not getting closer to the property line with this addition?

MR. HUARD: Absolutely not.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: It looks like it's actually -- what you're doing is setback further because it's over the garage.

MR. HUARD: Correct.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: So is the variance because of an existing condition, that it has to conform now?

MR. HUARD: That's correct.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: It's the same thing with the front yard; all of these are because he's doing an addition, so he now has to try to get the existing structure to conform.

MR. HUARD: That's correct. That's correct.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: All right. Thank you.

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

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, go
ahead.
MEMBER LONGO: We typically don't read approvals, but \(I\) think it's important to know that the property right next door sent approval saying that "This is an enhancement to our community," and they have no objection.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. MR. HUARD: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Looks like
none. From my side, I have nothing. Okay. It's motion time. Jay.

MEMBER MCLEOD: Yep. I apologize, I've been scribbling here. The scope of the work had changed from what \(I\) initially considered. Knowing that the impact is only going to be what is succinctly over the garage as opposed to a brand new construction does
change the view on it. So I move that we grant the variance in Case Number PZ23-0034, sought by Remodeling Star, Inc., for -- and there is a significant number here. Front yard setback of 15 feet, where 30 feet is required, variance of 15. For a side yard setback of one foot, 10 feet required, variance of nine feet. For an added total of eight feet, 25 feet required, variance is 17 feet. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to these other property (sic) because they are looking to expand the upper story of the house within the current footprint. And being prevented from doing so would limit the activity that he can do in his own house. The property is unique because of the very thin lot shape and the fact that it currently exists within one foot of the property line; which is not impacted by the new construction. Petitioner did not create the condition due to the -- not altering the lot shape that existed previously. The relief
granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent surrounding properties. The immediate next-door neighbor did provide the approvals -- their approval of it. And it should, if anything, impact positively on the neighborhood value. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is overall of benefit to the area. The neighbors approve. And without the variance, the homeowner would be impacting on the use of their own property.

MEMBER LONGO: I second that. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you. MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson Peddiboyina. CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi. MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.
MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo.
MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague. MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Member McLeod. MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:

Congratulations.
MR. HUARD: Thank you very much.
You all have a nice evening.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: PZ23-0035,
814 Services LLC/Primrose Daycare and Swim School. 4345510 Mile Road, west of Novi Road, south of 10 Mile Road. Parcel

50-22-27-200-003. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning

Ordinance Section 4.12.2.i.a to allow reduced outdoor recreation space for a daycare to 8,495 square feet. 30,300 square feet area required, based on the estimated number of children. Variance of 21,505 square feet. The Section 4.12.2.ii.b to allow direct access to 10 Mile Road. V-E-H-I-C-U-L-A-R, vehicular
access to and from a major arterial road is not allowed. This property is zoned office service, OS-1. Okay. Please go ahead and spell your first and last name clearly for the record. If you are not an attorney, our secretary will take the oath.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Thank you. My name Mark Kellenberger -- M-A-R-K.

K-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R -- with 814 Services.
I am not an attorney.
MEMBER LONGO: Do you promise to
tell the truth in this case?
MR. KELLENBERGER: I do.
MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Thank you for
allowing us to be here. Good evening. We're proposing the redevelopment of the former retirement home at 4345510 Mile Road. We're seeking two variances this evening; the first is to allow the development -- the proposed redevelopment to utilize the two existing curb cuts and access 10 Mile Road.

The second request is to allow the
proposed play area to be just under 9,000 square feet, where just over 30,000 would be required. The state licensing requirement for Michigan for childcare would only require 1,200 square feet for an outdoor play area, so we far exceed that. The building, itself, is 13,000 square feet. So to provide almost three times that for the play area would seem excessive in our mind.

The play area is typical of what we develop across the Country for our childcare tenants, and our tenant is in agreement with the proposed layout. The classrooms are not let into the playground area all at once, so they are dismissed by classroom, by age group; so there won't be the entire population of children on the play area at one time.

There is an existing wetland on the western portion of the property, and an existing utility easement on the eastern portion of the property that prohibits, really, expanding out any further to provide any additional play area.

none. Okay. Yeah. You mentioned that based on the area, how many children are you accommodating on this?

MR. KELLENBERGER: The license requires -- the license allowable is 202; that's based on a full occupancy, which is not always the case, but that would be the license capacity.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: What age are you looking on this?

MR. KELLENBERGER: I'm sorry?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: What age are the kids?

MR. KELLENBERGER: It's pre-school to just under school age; so it's primarily child daycare.

MEMBER LONGO: Excuse me. School age means grade school age?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Well, let me step back. When I say pre-school, infant to school age. So just, typically, just prior to entering kindergarten or elementary school. Depending on enrollment and necessity or need
in the area, they sometimes do have like after-school type programs for older children; but that's just based on need or operations.

MEMBER LONGO: And again, older children are grade school?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Older children --
MEMBER LONGO: Are they high school?
What --

MR. KELLENBERGER: No, not grade school. I'm sorry. No. So it would be infant to, you know, kindergarten age.

MEMBER LONGO: Six years.
MR. KELLENBERGER: Yeah. Five, six years old.

MR. LONGO: Thank you.
MR. KELLENBERGER: Yep. I'm sorry for the confusion.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Do you own this business, Mark?

MR. KELLENBERGER: No. We own the property and are looking to develop it for our two tenants.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Let
me open it to the board. Dr. Sanghvi.
MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you. I know this property is a nursing home for many years.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Yes.
MEMBER SANGHVI: My only concern is first of all, is there going to be a swimming pool there?

MR. KELLENBERGER: So this facility here is a swim school. It's inside, indoor pools --

MEMBER SANGHVI: How deep is it going to be for the kindergarten?

MR. KELLENBERGER: They're pools are typically four feet; it's just for instruction.

MEMBER SANGHVI: And the second question I had was, on the back side where there is wetlands, are you going to have it all screened off?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Oh, yes. So the wetlands is on this property over here; it's not shown in its entirety. It's bufferred
extremely well. We went through a buffer review as part of the Planning Commission review, so it's screened from the residential area. It's considerably far from that residence, but it is screened by the existing vegetation. We've got, as you can see, pretty extensive landscaping and we are not impacting the wetlands.

MEMBER SANGHVI: My only concern is that children do very unexpected things at any time.

MR. KELLENBERGER: The child play areas are all fenced and secured.

MEMBER SANGHVI: So you're going to make sure everything is quite secure there?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Oh, 100 percent, sir.

MEMBER SANGHVI: Thank you.
MR. KELLENBERGER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Dr. Sanghvi. Safety is very important and you need to take care of the safety; it's of high priority. This property is on the cleaner's
opposite, the dry cleaning opposite of the building of this one?

MR. KELLENBERGER: The dry cleaning? CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes, it's on the other side of the street.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, and the liquor shop on the opposite.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Oh, on the opposite property, yes. This is the old retirement home property.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Are you removing the old building or just --

MR. KELLENBERGER: We are removing the old building, demolishing and removing all of that for this new development.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: You Own this property?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Yeah. I believe it's been closed on; but yeah, we are under contract, and \(I\) believe it was closed.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Any other board member, please? Okay.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: So how far from the intersection of Novi Road there is your easternmost entry? You're asking for two curb cuts, and it seems to me that one's awful close to Novi Road.

MR. KELLENBERGER: I don't have that dimension. Again, the Planning Commission and Engineering Department had reviewed this and granted the preliminary site plan. Our understanding was it was just to allow the access to there; that it wasn't concerned over the location or the number.

MEMBER MONTAGUE: But you're needing a variance -- they're needing a variance for two curb cuts, right?

MR. HALL: That's correct.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: Right. So part of this is we would have to allow that, so I am concerned. That's a busy -- I know that's a busy intersection; \(I\) go through there all the time.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Yeah.
MEMBER MONTAGUE: And that's awful
close to that intersection.

MR. KELLENBERGER: So the thought is with the two existing curb cuts, it would allow people to navigate that property, utilize one for right turn coming out. It would allow people to navigate inbound traffic as well and not stack up into the drive. So it gives alternate access for both ingress and egress for both the swim school and the child care.

MONTAGUE: Yeah. It's still concerning. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other board member?

MEMBER MCLEOD: Correct me if I'm wrong. With those two connection points is how they exist today, yes?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Correct. They exist in their current form and as proposed and reviewed by the city.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Go ahead.

MEMBER LONGO: To Clifford's point,
isn't there a gas station between you and Novi Road?

MR. KELLENBERGER: Yes.
MEMBER LONGO: Okay. So there's a gas station there?

MEMBER MONTAGUE: I go there all the time.

MR. KELLENBERGER: There is some other property there too as well. And there is a bank in there as well.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, it used to be a bank, Flagstar Bank.

MR. KELLENBERGER: Yes. So there's -- we're three properties -- the third property off the corner.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. I have no objection on this. It is motion time. Michael Thompson.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Excuse me?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Please go ahead, Michael Thompson, for the motion.

MEMBER THOMPSON: I move that we grant the variance in Case PZ23-0035, sought
by 814 Services, LLC, for the outdoor recreational space. They're asking for one variance.

MEMBER MCLEOD: Two.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Two variances.

MEMBER THOMPSON: Two variances, the outdoor recreation, and the parking, the curb -- (indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The entrance off of 10 Mile.

MR. THOMPSON: That is already there.

MR. HALL: The entrance off of 10 Mile, that's not allowed, so you have to --

MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. So the two variances with the outdoor recreation space and vehicular access to a major road. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring on an existing space. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, as the outdoor -- the parking
is already paved that way; they're not making an improvement on it. The property is unique, being off of 10 Mile Road, in an OS-1 space, which is considered to be an office space. The petitioner did not create the condition because it is currently that way now with the two driveways. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because there is other businesses there, such as the -(indiscernible) -- bank and the gas station. And the relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance; again, being in a business area.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Somebody can make a second, please.
MEMBER MCLEOD: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.
Call roll-call, please.
MADAM SECRETARY: Chairperson
Peddiboyina.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes,
please.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|r|}{Page 101} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Member Sanghvi.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Member Thompson.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Member Longo.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MEMBER LONGO: Yes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Member Montague.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Member McLeod.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MEMBER MCLEOD: Yes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you. Motion} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{passes.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Congratulations and good luck for the} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{business.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MR. KELLENBERGER: Thank you so} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{much.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Take care} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{of it.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{MR. KELLENBERGER: We appreciate it} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any other} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{matters before I adjourn?} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MR. JACOB: Can I speak real quick?
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No.
Public hearing is done.
MR. JACOB: Just to address something that was said to me.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: No. No. No. It's already done. We requested the public hearing, remarks anything you need to talk in the beginning.

MR. JACOB: I didn't understand.
MS. SAARELA: You can't talk to the -- if you have a question for administration, you always can call administration.

MR. JACOB: I'm sorry. It was in response to something that was said from your board to me, so --

MS. SAARELA: If you have a concern, you can always give --

MR. JACOB: No. No, it's not a concern, it was just for clarification, that's all.

MS. SAARELA: We're off the public record, so --

MR. JACOB: No, that's fine. I'm not looking for any trouble, ma'am. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you so much. I appreciate it. Before I adjourn, any other matters for the board or any other things?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Before I adjourn, say all in favor aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Any nays?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No verbal response).

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you. Good night.
(Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.)
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