REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CITY OF NOVI

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2019 7:00 P.M.

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

BOARD MEMBERS:

Linda Krieger, Chairperson

Brent Ferrell, Vice Chairperson

Cynthia Gronachan, Acting Secretary

David M. Byrwa

Joe Peddiboyina

Kevin Sanker

ALSO PRESENT:

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

Lawrence Butler, Comm. Development, Dep. Director

Katherine Opperman, Recording Secretary

Reported by:

Darlene K. May, Certified Shorthand Reporter

| | 5 0 |
|----|---|
| 1 | Page 2 |
| 1 | Novi, Michigan |
| 2 | Tuesday, January 8, 2019 |
| 3 | 7:00 p.m. |
| 4 | |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Good evening. And |
| 6 | welcome to the Novi Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for |
| 7 | January the 8th, 2019. Happy New Year. |
| 8 | And if Member Gronachan would lead us with |
| 9 | the Pledge. |
| 10 | All rise. |
| 11 | (Pledge of Allegiance.) |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If Katherine could call |
| 13 | the role. |
| 14 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa? |
| 15 | MEMBER BYRWA: Here. |
| 16 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 17 | MEMBER FERRELL: Here. |
| 18 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 19 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Here. |
| 20 | MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Here. |
| 22 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 23 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| | |
| | |

| | Page 3 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? |
| 2 | MEMBER SANKER: Here. |
| 3 | MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Sanghvi is absent, |
| 4 | excused. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. This is a public |
| 6 | hearing format and rules of conduct are in the back. |
| 7 | And we'd appreciate if your phones are turned to |
| 8 | vibrate or just for texting. |
| 9 | And approval of the agenda. Do we have any |
| 10 | changes in the agenda, Katherine? |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. Case number PZ18-0057 |
| 12 | for Somnio Global regarding Nitrogen Storage tank has |
| 13 | been postponed at the request of the applicant until |
| 14 | February. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Do we have a |
| 16 | motion to approve the agenda? |
| 17 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So moved. |
| 18 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say, |
| 20 | "Aye." |
| 21 | Aye. |
| 22 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye. |
| 23 | MEMBER BYRWA: Aye. |
| | |

| | Page 4 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MEMBER FERRELL: Aye. |
| 2 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye. |
| 3 | MEMBER SANKER: Aye. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any opposed? None? |
| 5 | Seeing none. We have an agenda tonight. |
| 6 | Minutes for November 2018, any changes? |
| 7 | Seeing none. Do we have a motion to approve? |
| 8 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So moved. |
| 9 | MEMBER FERRELL: Second. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say, |
| 11 | "Aye." |
| 12 | Aye. |
| 13 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Aye. |
| 14 | MEMBER BYRWA: Aye. |
| 15 | MEMBER FERRELL: Aye. |
| 16 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Aye. |
| 17 | MEMBER SANKER: Aye. |
| 18 | None opposed. Okay. Very good. We have our |
| 19 | minutes approved for November 2018. |
| 20 | Public remarks. Open it up to the public. |
| 21 | If there are any comments you have regarding anything |
| 22 | besides the cases we have in front of us, you can come |
| 23 | forward. |
| | |

And seeing none, okay. Very good. Then I'll close the public remarks for this time.

It's a public hearing. It's on cable television and open. People can come as they like. We have six cases tonight and we'll call the first one.

We have a secretary. So when you come up to the podium, state your name, spell it for our court recorder and proceed with your case.

So our first case is PZ18-0047, Coy

Construction for 44682 Dunbarton, east of the Taft and
north of Nine Mile, parcel 50-22-27-376-013. The
applicant is requesting a variance from the Zoning

Ordinance 3.1.5 to allow a 10 foot rear yard variance
for a proposed 25 foot setback for a proposed
screened-in porch, 35 feet minimum required by
ordinance. The property is zoned single family
residential, R-3.

Please come forward.

MR McCOY: My name is Mike McCoy. I'm the owner of Coy Construction. And I'm here to represent Gere and Tisa Sherry, customers of ours.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Are you an attorney?
MR McCOY: No.

| | Page 6 |
|----|--|
| 1 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. |
| 2 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right |
| 3 | hand to be sworn in. |
| 4 | MR. McCOY: Oh, I'm sorry. |
| 5 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: That's fine. |
| 6 | Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in |
| 7 | this matter before you? |
| 8 | MR. McCOY: Absolutely, yes. |
| 9 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: You may proceed. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And if you have an |
| 11 | overhead, you can put it on for the people to see at |
| 12 | home. |
| 13 | Just right there. |
| 14 | MR McCOY: Yes. I don't know if all of you |
| 15 | had been to the site to look at it or not. |
| 16 | MS. OPPERMAN: Other way around. |
| 17 | It's upside down. |
| 18 | MR McCOY: Oh. Wow. |
| 19 | I guess than doesn't show too well. |
| 20 | I had it upside down. I'm kind of technology |
| 21 | challenged. I apologize for that. |
| 22 | This is the plot plan. And they this is |
| 23 | an overview of the satellite picture of that lot |
| | |

showing the house. And as you can see in the rear yard, there's a large -- just, I don't know whether you'd call that a park, but there are not any homes directly behind it. It's a lot of nice rooms there.

Here's a picture of the back were, from the back of their house.

So it's like a big park area and on the side lot to the neighbor's sides, there's like 40, 42 feet on both sides. We've constructed a wood, a small modest-sized wood deck that you can see over on the left here. And here's a picture of the back of the house.

(Displayed.)

MR. McCOY: It's a small, like 14, comes out like 12 feet from the doorwall, modest-sized deck. We want to build a screened-in porch on top of it that would look, basically, like that. It would be he shingled to match, painted to match with an octagonal shape.

The homeowner, she has issues -- if she gets bit by a mosquito or bee bite or something she's right to the hospital. So this would enable them to be able to use their backyard without the fear of getting bit

and having issues.

That porch -- it's roughed in and built, stick built, shingled to match. So it would look architecturally beautiful like this one does on the back of the house, colored to match.

And I've been in front of your board. I don't see any familiar faces so it's been a year or two. But I think I've been here for this exact same project six or seven times and I've always had good response and I'm looking forward to -- I'm hoping that you will allow us to build this porch so that my client can really use their backyard.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is that it?

MR. McCOY: I guess.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience has any comments regarding this case?

Seeing none, for the City, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. The heavy wooded area in the back, currently there is any plans for anything to be going on back there. So the bugs will be there for a while.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. And correspondence.

Page 9 1 MEMBER GRONACHAN: There were 22 letters 2 mailed, zero letters returned. One approval from a Terry Merritt at 44658 Dunbarton. Whatever they need 3 is fine with this neighbor. 4 5 And that completes the correspondence. 6 MEMBER GRONACHAN: You're welcome. 7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you. 8 We'll open it up to the board. Ouestions? Yes, Member Gronachan? 9 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good evening. So the fact 11 that you don't recognize any of us, that means that 12 Linda and I have not aged a day. Because we've been 13 here the longest. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. 14 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So that's a good thing. 16 MR. McCOY: It's nice seeing you again, 17 Cindy. 18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I was out to the property 19 and it was in mid-afternoon and the sun was hitting 20 that backyard pretty good. So even if there were -and if the trees were in bloom, there still would not 21 22 have been any shade back there. 23 MR. McCOY: Yeah. The sun beats down pretty

hard.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And they have a side deck on the side of the house which is rather small, but in terms of being out and enjoying it 24 hours a day, so to speak, I'm a big fan of these kinds of rooms in Michigan. I think they're necessary with the kind of weather, as well as the bugs, and I think that this is a minimal request that you have and I'll be in full support.

MR. McCOY: Thank you very much.

You know, they do have -- as you indicated,
Cindy, they have another deck -- the house wasn't laid
out very well on that lot. And the only door coming
into that rear yard is in the right in the corner
between the garage. It's a three foot entry door and
you couldn't -- if there was a way to build this
screened-in porch in that area and architecturally make
it look good, that's what I would have proposed to do.
But it just was not a good -- a viable option for them.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Peddiboyina.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah, I visited your property and there's a reason there's a lot of space on the back end. I observed that. And also, as my

colleague said that the sun like that, they can't enjoy. And I have no issue, too.

MR. McCOY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I agree that in Michigan you can't have a backyard without a screened-in porch. So I would be in favor as well.

MR. McCOY: Would you like me to give you a bid, I'll give you a free design.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I'm tempted.

Anybody else? Or a motion?

Yes?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ18-0047 sought by Coy Construction, Inc. of Michael McCoy. Because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty to allow a 10 foot rear yard variance for a proposed 25 feet setback for a screened in porch.

Without the variance the petitioner will unnecessarily be prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because the homeowner is allergic to mosquito bites. In addition, the screen porch will enhance the architectural appeals of the property and increase the value of the home. The

Page 12 1 petitioner did not create the condition because it's an 2 existing condition. 3 The relief, if granted, will not unnecessarily interfere with the additional surrounding 4 5 properties because of the condition for an existing structure. The relief is consistent with the spirit 6 7 and intent of the ordinance because of the -- the ordinance is for an existing structure and the addition 8 9 will not impede public safety. 10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion? And a second? 11 12 MEMBER GRONCHAN: Move -- second. 13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a Any other discussion? 14 second. 15 Seeing none, if Katherine would call the 16 role. 17 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: 18 19 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? 20 MEMBER SANKER: Yes. 21 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? 22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. 23 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan?

Page 13 1 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. 2 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? 3 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Byrwa? 4 5 MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations. 8 MR. McCOY: Thank you very much. 9 Go State. Nine o'clock. So you want to get 10 this moving here. 11 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. We'll call for our second case. It is PZ18-0055, Chris 12 13 Ketzler/Toll Brothers for 20857 Dunhill Drive, west of Beck and north of Eight Mile, parcel number 14 15 50-22-32-402-004. The applicant is requesting a two 16 percent variance from the City of Novi Ordinance from 17 Section 3.1.2 to allow the 27 percent proposed lot 18 coverage for a new home, 25 percent allowed. 19 property is zoned single family residential, R-1. 20 MR. KETZLER: Yes. Chris Ketzler, 21 K-e-t-z-l-e-r, representing Toll Brothers. 22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right 23 hand, please?

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MR. KETZLER: Yes, I do.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. KETZLER: Okay. To get started, this is a community plan of Dunhill Park. There are multiple builders within the community. It was a Hunter Pasteur community developed and we purchased 19 lots. We grand opened in July of this past year and our sales have been strong. The community has taken off. And as a result, I see activity from other builders in the community.

In the first couple of weeks we had a flurry. We had people that had been waiting and looking towards this piece of property to build a home. And one of those customers was on our Lot Four. On Lot Four, I have the plot plan, we designed and they chose a home. The home that they had been looking to build for quite some time. It's our Fenway product on Lot Four here.

And this was drawn up for their home. As you can see, it does fit in the setback lines. And I am compliant -- we are compliant in that respect. We had an oversight of a lot coverage of no greater than 25

Page 15

percent, which equals about 300 square feet that we're over.

I have met with the customers. We have discussed different areas in the home that we could potentially make smaller, but for them and the number the people that are moving in, it would have been quite a compromise and not to mention when -- this is the front elevation of the proposed home.

As you can see, the front elevation and the look of the home is very, very similar to all of the other homes existing in the community and currently being built. So it does blend with the community and the adjacent communities up and down Eight Mile.

When initially looking at downsizing the blueprint, you can see the roof plan is quite involved. To take a slice out of any portion of the roof or any portion of the home would be quite -- it would alter the plans so significantly and structurally that we'd have to start over. We looked at different plans on that particular home site. They had their heart set on this plan. They've actually started scheduling people to come in from across the world. Some of our customers have people all over the world that come and

see them for religious ceremonies and things like that when they break ground and move in, et cetera.

And I brought the customers in and looked at different areas. After fighting through the tears they couldn't figure anything on the interior of the home.

so what I'm asking is for that two percent variance. It's a very small amount on the lot coverage. What we have done as a company to safeguard going forward -- and we have sold four more homes out at the community and are actively picking up permits, I believe tomorrow. And we've got the process in place to where this will never happen again as long as we go through and build the community. We have eight sold and we've got four on the ground right now. And, like I said, we're picking up two more tomorrow, I believe tomorrow. So that safeguard is there and we thought we were covered and we just weren't.

The hardship, I guess, would be my customer is completely heartbroken about the news. And they fell in love with the community and the location.

CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Is that it?

MR. KETZLER: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Anybody in the audience

Page 17 1 have a comment regarding this case? 2 Seeing none, I'll open it up to the City. Mr. Butler? 3 MR. BUTLER: Just looking at what the 4 5 coverage was, being the 25 percent, we did review it 6 and saw that the two percent increase is a minimum 7 impact but it still requires a variance for that. 8 CHAIRPERSON SANGHVI: Okay. Thank you. 9 And correspondence? 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. Madame Chair, there's 22 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero 11 12 approvals, one objection from a Tom Loncor (ph) at 13 20940 Dunhill. "The proposed lot coverage increase will 14 15 result in one or more reduced setbacks, easement 16 distances from neighboring structures, street and 17 property lines. It also sets a precedent for other 18 future similar variance requests." 19 And that is it for correspondence. 20 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. Thank you. 21 And open up to the Board. 22 Yes, Member Peddiboyina? 23 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: For the City, the

Page 18 1 property that they proposed, is there a homeowners 2 association? MR. BUTLER: Is there an association? 3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. A homeowners 4 5 association. 6 MS. SAARELA: Probably not yet. 7 probably controlled by the developer. 8 MR. KETZLER: It's controlled by the developer. The homeowners association, I inquired with 9 10 the association and I do have a letter of their approval as well in moving forward with it. 11 12 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. Thank you. 13 MR. KETZLER: And I believe I do have a copy 14 of that. But I can certainly provide it, if I need 15 it. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes, Member Gronachan? 17 MEMBER GRONACHAN: This is never the easy 18 19 part of this job. 20 So I went back out there and drove the entire lot, if you will, or the entire section of all the 21 22 houses that are out there, Dunhill and the other 23 streets, Dunhill Court.

This used to be an old trucking company, along with an old horse barn that I spent a great many years on as a matter of fact.

MR. KETZLER: Yes, it did.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Because we had a carriage business on that very site, oddly enough. There's a little bit of history.

When I went down Dunhill, I saw that there was some houses already built with three car garages and thought what was it that this lot offered. I mean, there's some beautiful homes out there. I could not figure out -- first of all, we did not get the lot number in our packet. We got an address. So I was confused with that. And then later on they gave me the lot number so I went back out there to make sure I had it right.

And I'm just going to say it for brevity. I cannot support this. There is not enough grounds to establish a variance based on the testimony given that a client is emotionally tied to this piece of property. I get it. I get emotional. I understand that part. But, unfortunately, I can't rule my -- or make my decision based on an emotion. I have to rule my

decision -- or make my decision based on the rules and regulations of the ordinances in the city of Novi.

So I've spent a great deal of time out on those lots driving around trying to figure something out. I thought maybe the lot was smaller than most of them and I thought that, perhaps, the petitioner was going to come back and give us some more insight, which is what we asked for the last time he was here, and he has not changed anything.

So given the past testimony, this evening's testimony, my drive out there and my time spent on the site, I am not going to be able to support this tonight as well.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes, Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. I was wondering if there was something else other than -- you mentioned a potential homeowner was heartbroken. If there's anything else that would be a practical difficulty on why you couldn't comply with the ordinance?

MR. KETZLER: As far as the practical difficulty, I wouldn't say so. Other than, like I said, it was an oversight. It's something that we've

corrected and it's 300 square feet. We looked at the garage and we started pulling small amounts of square footage in different areas out of the home. The garage we were able to pull, I think, 40 square feet out of. So limiting the side from the opening to the usable side on the other side of the opening, for lack of a better way to put it.

But to come up with the 300, it would have been shrinking down the house in its entirety.

MEMBER BYRWA: Because, see, this falls into the category of self-created. The house wasn't built yet so you can build it to really any size that you want.

MR. KETZLER: Right.

MEMBER BYRWA: And when it's a self-created situation, it's very difficult to grant the variance in a self-created situation.

MR. KETZLER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I agree. I don't understand why there's no there different testimony that could have been offered from last time than this time.

MR. KETZLER: I didn't realize I was bringing

Page 22

more testimony. I took it that you were needing more time to look at it because of the fact it was new construction.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: I also drove the site and I was looking for an address and just saw lot numbers and saw the other homes that are being built there. And I don't know how it can't be done to create a proportional that would fit -- house to fit the size of the lot according to what the ordinance recommends. So it's -- I also -- it's self-created and I can't support this. Because there's nothing unique about this site. There's no woodland or protected waterway.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Madame Chair, if there is no further discussion, I would like to make a motion to see how the board would follow.

I move that we deny the variance in case number PZ18-0055 sought by Toll Brothers for 20857

Dunhill because the petitioner has not established a practical difficulty. The petitioner has not established a compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the use of the property or be unnecessarily burdensome because the petitioner can comply with the

2.2

Page 23

ordinance by decreasing the size of the proposed variance and still have a large residence consistent with the surrounding properties.

The petitioner has not established unique circumstances regarding the area of the subject property because the petitioner is able to build residents on the adjacent lots which lots are substantially similar in size. The proposed user is merely seeking residence that is oversized for the proposed lot and can reduce the size for consistency with surrounding residents.

The petitioner has not established that the proposed use improvement will not unreasonably impact the surrounding property because the proposed residents will be bigger than the surrounding residences. The petitioner has not established, even with a grant of the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, public safety secured and substantial justice done because there is nothing about the size or area of the parcel and all surrounding lots are the same or substantially similar in size. All other neighbors will be required to limit the size of their residence to fit the lot.

Page 24

A lesser variance consisting of a smaller residence would do substantial justice to the petitioner and surrounding property owners because it will fit the lot and be consistent with surrounding residences.

The petitioner has not established that the need for the variance is not self-created because petitioner is seeking a residence that is not consistent with surrounding residences and can be reduced to fit the lot size and still be used for residential purposes consistent with surrounding residential structures.

The lot is no different than the surrounding lots. And therefore, those are my reasons that we deny this motion -- this request.

MEMBER BYRWA: I second it.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a second.

No other discussion, if Katherine could call the role.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker?

Page 25 1 MEMBER SANKER: Yes. 2 MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? 3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? 4 5 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? 6 7 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. 8 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa? MEMBER BYRWA: 9 Yes. 10 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. You can see the 11 Building Department and see what's next. 12 13 Moving to our next case for PZ18-0059, Brian Luke, for 41032 South McMahon Circle, east of 14 15 Meadowbrook and south of Ten Mile, parcel 16 50-22-25-104-016. The applicant is requesting a variance from the Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 3.1.5 17 18 for a 21 foot variance for a proposed front yard 19 variance of nine feet to allow for a new carport 20 addition, 30 feet minimum required. The property is 21 zoned single family residential, R-4. 22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Madame Chair, excuse me. 23 Before I proceed, I need to disclose something to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 26

board. I am the president of this homeowners association, which is Willowbrook. These are my neighbors and I would like to state that there is no conflict here. We did review the plans, the board reviewed the plans. I had no conversation with these residents in regards to this case and feels that there is no conflict at this time and if it's okay with the city attorney I will be sitting in on the case.

MS. SAARELA: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: And if you would, raise your right hand and be sworn in.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MR. LUKE: Yes.

MS. LUKE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You may proceed.

MS. LUKE: We didn't bring papers.

MR. LUKE: This is new to us.

MS. LUKE: Yeah. We thought that you would have already reviewed everything.

This is a photo of our home in Willowbrook Estates. We purchased the home about four years ago

Page 27

with the plans of hoping to add a garage. We did not realize the limits of our unique property shape at the time. Have since had the property stake surveyed, which we turned in a survey to the City to look at.

We had a survey done on the property to show us exactly how many feet we need to build this garage because the City did not have accurate measurements for us to use.

As you can see, that's our Expedition and our car parked along the front of our home. We would like to enclose the carport to add some additional square footage to our home and then add a garage on the end of that property.

The reason: These homes were built in the '50s. They're very small. We do not have a basement or a garage and we have two kids. So you can imagine the limitations that that brings to us. But we love the school and we love our neighbors. We have had our tires slashed since we've lived in this home. So, obviously, securing our vehicles in the garage would be beneficial for that reason.

Here's a copy of the survey just to show that we had it done by a professional. The City has

reviewed it for accuracy purposes. It kind of shows how many feet we're asking for.

MR. LUKE: It's nine feet. And, again, the uniqueness of our property is we have two side yards and a very long front yard. So most houses you're going to build a garage on, you're going to build toward your side yard and because we're on the curve there, we're building towards our front yard.

We talked to all of our neighbors, plus the articles that were sent out and no one is against it. The variance for our side yard, I guess it would be on the northeast corner, is still in compliance. It's building toward the City's right of way that is not in compliance.

MS. LUKE: And we think it's important to add we're really not encroaching on a neighbor. We're mostly encroaching on the right of way of the road there. It's very wide. But as you can see here, it's not real uncommon. Those are two houses side by side and you could probably touch or at least draw a laundry line between the two houses. So we won't be doing that to add our garage. We'll just be using a little bit of that easement there.

Page 29 1 MR. LUKE: And if you go and drive through 2 our neighborhood, the other thing that is unique is pretty much a lot of those houses were carports and 3 everyone has moved into the garage addition or enclosed 4 5 the carport. So this is a picture. You can see it. MS. LUKE: Kind of what we would like to do. 6 7 MR. LUKE: Our goal is enclosing the carport 8 and scroll over and see the garage. We wanted a two 9 car garage with a little extra storage because, again, 10 we don't have a basement. So we're very limited. I think that's it. 11 12 MS. LUKE: That's it. Yeah. 13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. That's it. 14 Thank you. 15 Anybody in the audience have any comments 16 regarding this case? 17 Seeing none, I'll open it up to the City. Mr. Butler? 18 19 MR. BUTLER: No comments at this time. Stand 20 by for questions. 21 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. 22 And from correspondence? 23 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes, Madame Chair. There

Page 30

were 35 letters mailed. Zero letters returned, three approvals. The first approval from Michael Flaherty, that's F-l-a-h-e-r-t-y, at 41011 South McMahon Circle.

"I live across the street from Brian and Debbie Luke and it is okay with me if they wish to build another garage or expand their dwelling."

The next letter is from Janet Johnson. She lives at 41025, across the street. And they're -- she's totally in favor of their plan.

"This couple is constantly working to make additions to their home that are important for their comfort and attractive to our neighborhood. I've lived here for 40 years and have watched many changes to homes. The neighborhood is about 63 years old. Often it is difficult to remain in compliance with Novi's newer homes or current city rules. I do hope that the City and Zoning Board help this young couple."

And then our final letter is from Joyce and Matthew Tunnard. It's T-u-n-n-a-r-d. At 41087 North McMahon Circle.

"Brian and Debbie Luke have been great neighbors and we are in complete support of this variance. They have worked to improve their home and

have helped to increase the value of the neighborhood. They have been supportive of others in the area and both great members of the city community."

And that's it for correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. I'll open it up to the board.

Yes, Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Nice presentation. I toured your property two days back. In this Michigan weather, we need a car garage. It's useful and also as you mentioned you have two kids and there's a lot of stuff. I have no issue in this case.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

Member Byrwa?

MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I did have the opportunity this weekend to drive by and I noticed you had it staked off and the street is kind of an unusual shaped lot where the street does a 90 degree turn, a circle turn, right in front of your house and I think it was helpful having the stake there.

But I'm looking at the site plan here and you mentioned that part of it was going to be a carport and part was going to be a garage?

MS. LUKE: Our carport is going to become additional square footage.

MEMBER BYRWA: Of the garage?

MR. LUKE: We're going to enclose it.

MS. LUKE: We're going to enclose it and add

it to our home. A lot of our neighbors have done that.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay.

MS. LUKE: Use it as like an additional living room or play area for the kids.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: I think that this neighborhood is unique. It is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Novi and I would like to point out that they're all ranch homes without basements because of the water issues that we have going on in that section of town. Plus the uniqueness of the lots that are out there, the angles. There's a lot of pie shape.

We've had other cases in terms of the shape come before us and that's the real big uniqueness in this particular subdivision. So I commend that these residents are wanting to improve their home and I'll be in full support.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

I also drove around to your north -- to your east. There's plenty of room. It looks like you can add and with the topography of it going around the corner, that gives your uniqueness.

So I would be able to support you, too.

You have a motion.

Very good.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ18-0059 sought by Brian Luke, because the petitioner has shown a practical difficulty requiring to allow a 21 foot variance for a proposed front yard variance of nine feet to allow for a new carport addition.

Without the variance, the petitioners will be prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because the current there do not have the garage.

The property is unique because this lot is in a corner and it has a unique shape. The petitioner did not create the condition because it has an established subdivision.

The relief, if granted, will not unreasonably

| | Page 34 |
|----|--|
| 1 | interfere with adjacent property. Because on the side |
| 2 | of the proposed garage addition there is a road. The |
| 3 | relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the |
| 4 | ordinance because the house do not have a garage which |
| 5 | has caused many hardship. |
| 6 | MEMBER FERRELL: Second. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We have a motion and a |
| 8 | second. Any other discussion? |
| 9 | Seeing none, if Katherine could call the |
| 10 | role? |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa? |
| 12 | MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 14 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 15 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 16 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 19 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? |
| 20 | MEMBER SANKER: Yes. |
| 21 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 22 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. |
| 23 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| | |

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: We'll see you at the February meeting.

MS. LUKE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings us to our next case, PZ18-0061, Jenny Griffith for east of Old Novi Road and south of East Lake for parcel 50-22-02-357-010. The applicant is requesting variances from the Novi Code of Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a 16 feet front yard variance for a proposed 14 feet setback, 30 feet required.

A 25 foot variance for a proposed 10 foot rear yard setback, 35 feet required. A six and 11 foot variance for a proposed four feet by four feet side yard setback, 25 feet allowed total.

A 26 percent variance for a proposed 51 percent max lot coverage, 25 percent required. And a 19 foot front deck variance for a proposed six foot deck, 25 feet required. The property is zoned single family, residential R-4.

MS. GRIFFITH: Hi, I'm Jenny Griffith and I have a signed purchase agreement and have made a deposit on the two parcels that are mentioned here.

Page 36 1 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Would you raise --2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, yeah. Wait a 3 second. 4 MS. GRIFFITH: Oh, I'm sorry. 5 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Would you raise your right 6 hand to be sworn in. 7 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in 8 the matter before you? 9 MS. GRIFFITH: I'm do. 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you. MS. GRIFFITH: So I have a signed purchase 11 12 agreement for this particular lot and this is zoned 13 R-4. And if I followed the zoning, R-4, my house would only be five feet wide so I'm putting in for a variance 14 15 really on all parts of the lot. I measured the neighbors yards for the front setback and I made mine 16 equal to theirs, 14 feet. And then the houses on these 17 18 lake lots, they're all different, I think, in depth. 19 The house directly beside mine, which would be in this 20 scenario, 65 ... 21 I want to make sure of that. 22 Lot 65. I mean, you see a lot of different 23 houses, but this particular house covers the entire --

Page 37 1 I mean, it goes all the way back to the street. Where 2 I just want a 10 foot setback and I'm going to have a 3 The coverage of the area is 51 percent. house would be 56 feet deep, 22 feet across. And, as I 4 5 said, I've looked at all neighboring houses and made sure that it fits in and a new house would add to the 6 7 value of the other houses as well. So I'm requesting a variance, quite a few of 8 them, so that I can build on this lot. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Is that it? 11 MS. GRIFFITH: I've got more pictures if you 12 want to see them. 13 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Sure. Go ahead. Put 14 them up. 15 MS. GRIFFITH: Okay. There's a second lot 16 that is also for sale. The lot I'm purchasing --- I 17 would like to purchase is lot one. The second lot is 18 identical to the lot I would like to purchase and it's 19 the same owner as well. I don't know if you want to know the owner's 20 21 name of this property. 22 So there are two lots for sale and I'm

interested in buying the lot on the right, if you're

facing the house.

I just need to put a simple house on this lot. It's going to be a rectangle, but an open space rectangle. And I have two top choices to put on the lot. I actually photoshopped my two top choices right on the lot beside the neighbor's house so you can get a better idea.

So this would be one of my top two choices.

It's a photoshop, so it's not going to look perfect.

But it's 22 feet wide. And as I said, it doesn't go as far back as some of the other houses, a lot of the other houses. It's just a lot of different -- I think they are older homes so you see a lot of different coverage of the lots.

And then my second choice where I photoshopped it in would look like this. And I think it adds to the beauty of the neighborhood and the beauty of the lake. And, of course, the glass is beautiful to see the beautiful Walled Lake. And this is where I want to retire. So I'm hoping that this would be possible.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would

Page 39 1 like to make a comment regarding it? 2 Yes. Come on up. 3 MR. EHLERS: I'm --CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh, you have to come to 4 5 the podium. 6 MR. EHLERS: T do? 7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Just state your name. 8 That way everybody can hear. MR. EHLERS: I'm a neighbor, Gary Ehlers and 9 10 I've been here probably four years in a row asking for 11 a variance on my cottage, which is about three away 12 from her. 13 MS. GRIFFITH: Nice to meet you. MR. EHLERS: And I appreciate the Zoning 14 15 Board of Appeals and what they do going forward, but I 16 would love to see this happen. The lots, as they are 17 right now, don't get taken care of as well as if someone built a house on. And I think she's measured 18 19 just about everything you can possibly measure around here that would qualify. And I'm just a neighbor who 20 21 would like to see the home values go up and keep it 22 going. So that's my comment. 23 MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

MS. GRIFFITH: And I've already spoken to the direct neighbor and we talked about things that, you know, the building site and everything. He seems pretty positive about it as well, as well as an additional neighbor. I have never met this gentleman, but another one I think of your neighbors I talked with and they all seem very positive.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you. From the City, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Just want to indicate that there's no driveway indicated in that area. There is no parking in that street so I was just kind of wondering how that is going to impact.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Very good.

Correspondence?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes, Madame Chair. There was 56 letters mailed. Four letters returned, one approval and one objection.

The approval is from Gary Ehlers. He just spoke. His address is 1705 East Lake Drive and he has just given his testimony. The letter echoes those sentiments.

And then the objection is from an Amy J.
Westin at 1715 Paramount.

"The nature of the East Lake Drive nearest
Pavilion Park will change if this proposal is approved.
While an added six foot to the docket and two foot
variance on the front simply enhances the nature of the
lakeside living that is so apparent to all walking,
biking and driving along East Lake Drive from Herman
Street to the park, the whole structure enlargement
encompassing all but four feet on each side and 10 feet
along. Chatman will be shoehorned in a bulging house
among present --"

I apologize.

"Individual homes that meet guidelines.

"The size dwelling will set a precedent for future remodels of the affordable housing along East Lake Drive nearest the park. Please decline the side and rear proposals to maintain current ordinances."

And that concludes the correspondence in this matter.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. I'll open it up to the board.

Yes, Member Byrwa?

Page 42 1 MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I did have the 2 opportunity to visit, you know, that East Lake Drive. 3 And, you know, I noticed seemed like almost every house on that side of the street was existing, nonconforming. 4 5 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 6 MEMBER BYRWA: Where you're not building 7 really any closer than the neighboring houses down the 8 street each way. 9 MS. GRIFFITH: Exactly. 10 MEMBER BYRWA: That's a very narrow lot. 11 know, I missed part of the conversation with the 12 building official about the offstreet parking. You're 13 going to be able to get at least one offstreet parking spot there? 14 15 MS. GRIFFITH: Well, I'm going to have a 16 garage in the back of the house and 10 feet will be a 17 driveway behind the garage. 18

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay.

19

20

21

22

23

MS. GRIFFITH: So I won't have any cars on the street.

MEMBER BYRWA: Very good. But the point I want to mentioned is it's not like it's anything out of character, the setbacks that you're proposing, because

the neighboring houses are all existing, nonconforming, you know.

MS. GRIFFITH: Right.

MEMBER BYRWA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. Member Gronachan?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Welcome to the

neighborhood. A great place to retire, right?

I do agree that these lots are a challenge up there and have been for many years. And on any lot up there on East Lake Drive or South Lake or that area, you are going to need some sort of variance. As a board member, I would have liked to have actually seen the drawings of the house on your plan. And the reason why is that I have a problem with 51 percent maximum lot coverage.

There are some houses that do exceed some of the lot coverage up there, but I think 51 percent is way over excessive. Even for that area. And my suggestion, because this board usually is pretty cooperative when it comes to up there, is that I'd like to see a little more detail. Like, I'd like to see plans of the house on the property. I realize this is a speck, but there might be something out there. I'd

like to see the driveway. I'd like to see less than 51 percent max lot coverage. I believe that there's a lot of houses out there. If you talk to some of them, there are a lot less than 51 percent lot coverage out there. And then I can get a better handle on what it is that I'm voting on. And so I can't propose -- I can't support this request tonight, but I would recommend that we postpone it so we could get more detail. And that's my opinion for this evening to the board and I will wait until I hear from the rest of the board members. But that's where I stand at this point.

MS. GRIFFITH: Could I make a comment to that comment?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: At this point you got to wait until the board finishes the discussion.

MS. GRIFFITH: Okay.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I agree with my colleague and what she says. And we need the proper, full layout and what it is exactly so we can move and that's my opinion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That would be a good

Page 45

prospect. If you had two choices, if you can go back and then we'll postpone and come back with your idea where your driveway is supposed to be and then we can make a better decision for you.

MS. GRIFFITH: May I ask how detailed?

Because in order to -- the point is that I have a contingency on this purchase agreement, that if the variances aren't approved, then I can't -- I don't really want to hire an architect and pay an architect and surveyor because it's \$5,000 for the different surveys alone and if I'm not sure it's going to work that's \$5,000 down the drain for me.

So I'm asking how detailed do you want this drawing? I'm not going to be able to pay an architect until I know about the lot coverage. I don't want to put all that money in to those services.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Through the Chair, if I may?

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: My suggestion would be that it sounds like you have some neighbors in the neighborhood that are willing to assist you on this. You may want to talk to them. They have all been where

Page 46

you are. And I'm not asking for an architectural rendering at this point, but we need to have something laid out. Because, again, you're looking for a 51 percent maximum lot coverage. And if you could narrow that down, I think that house -- this premise that you've got going on here, I think it's a great idea, but you need to --

MS. GRIFFITH: How far do you want to narrowed down?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, I don't know. I'm not an architect. So I'm just a zoning person. So I think that if you look around the neighborhood and see the houses that are consistent, that that might help you. And you may want to talk to the neighbors and see. I know there are a great group of people out there and they're willing to help a lot of people. I mean, this gentleman came for your support and you two don't even know each other.

MS. GRIFFITH: Yeah.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So you may have a cup of coffee and he may offer you some guidance.

MS. GRIFFITH: Right. I just want to share with you the neighbor's house covers a lot more of his

lot than mine does, the direct neighbor.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, again, each case is viewed on individual basis. So I can't speak to what your neighbor did. I don't have it -- he's not before me and I don't have his specifics here.

I have your lot in front of me and I know that the way this board rules that the 51 percent lot coverage is excessive based on the years that I have at this table. So that's my recommendation. I think that there's going to be a little more homework to do before you can get this worked out.

So I think that if you go back to the seller and explain that to him and, if he's been there awhile, then he'll understand that this is what the Zoning Board usually does. And you can probably work with the Building Department and they can possibly get you back here next month. I can't speak to that for sure, but that might be a possibility.

MS. GRIFFITH: So you would like me to go back -- I didn't hear that. Who do you want me to go back to?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Go back to the building so you can get this postponed until ...

Page 48 1 Can you postpone it until next month, 2 Katherine? 3 MS. OPPERMAN: Yes. MEMBER GRONACHAN: So you can come back here 4 5 next month. 6 MS. GRIFFITH: Okay. Is that what everyone 7 agrees to, then? MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, that's what we have 8 to get you to agree to and then we'll rule on -- and 9 10 then we'll make a motion to postpone it. If you're in agreement to that, then that's what we will do. 11 12 MS. GRIFFITH: I don't think I have a choice, 13 right? 14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is that a motion? 15 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I move that in case 16 number -- as soon as I find the number. PZ18--0061 for 17 Jenny Griffith, I move that we postpone the case until March of 2019. 18 19 MS. OPPERMAN: February. 20 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Sorry. February of 2019. 21 Boy I'm all over the place tonight. 22 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is that a second? 23 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second.

Page 49 1 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: If you can call the 2 role. What? 3 MEMBER FERRELL: I have a discussion. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Any further discussion? 6 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, Madame Chair. 7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Oh. Go ahead. 8 MEMBER FERRELL: Madame Chair, I just want to 9 be clear I'm not saying I would say I would or would 10 not vote if it was 51 percent or not. If there is 11 other houses that have that percentage and you can get some of the drawings and the renderings of that stuff 12 13 that shows that, that would be something that I would like to see and look at as well. 14 15 MS. GRIFFITH: If I'm hearing -- I'm sorry. I can barely hear you. 16 17 MEMBER FERRELL: I'm sorry. I'm sick. 18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So I think he's saying 19 he's not ruling out 51 percent -- I'm speaking on 20 behalf of Member Ferrell. I'm just repeating what he 21 said. 22 MEMBER FERRELL: Thank you. 23 MEMBER GRONACHAN: He said that he would not

| | Page 50 |
|----|---|
| 1 | be opposed to 51 percent if you can bring renderings of |
| 2 | other houses to show that to reflect that. |
| 3 | MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you. |
| 4 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So that's what I'm saying |
| 5 | is what you need to do a little research on it as |
| 6 | opposed to just this. |
| 7 | MS. GRIFFITH: Right. |
| 8 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: As opposed to just this. |
| 9 | And I think that if you reach out to the neighbors, you |
| 10 | will be well on your way. |
| 11 | MS. GRIFFITH: Okay. Very good. Thank you. |
| 12 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So we'll see you next |
| 13 | month. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Katherine, call the |
| 15 | role. |
| 16 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa? |
| 17 | MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. |
| 18 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 19 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 21 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. |
| | |

Page 51 1 MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? 2 MEMBER SANKER: Yes. 3 MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Peddiboyina? MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. 4 5 MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. That goes 6 7 to the next case, PZ18-0062, Nancy Simmons for 117 Maudlin Street, west of Old Novi Road and south of 8 South Lake Drive, parcel 50-22-03-453-007. Applicant 9 10 is requesting variances from the Novi Code of Ordinance, Section 2.2 to allow accessory use on parcel 11 12 50-22-03-453-016 absent a primary use, Section 4.19 13 parcel 50-22-03-453-016 absent a primary use and allow a structure in the rear setback, Section 3.32 to allow 14 15 a structure in the rear setback. The property is zoned 16 Single Family Residential, R-4. 17 MS. GRIFFITH: Hello. I'm Nancy Simmons, 18 S-i-m-m-o-n-s. 19 Would you please raise MEMBER GRONACHAN: 20 your right hand to be sworn in. 21 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in 22 the matter before you? 23 MS. GRIFFITH: Yes.

Page 52

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MS. GRIFFITH: Well, I have a complicated lot, like you said. I'm off South Lake Drive. I live off Maudlin here. My home right here is the only one that sets back from Maudlin Street. So most of my property lies in the front of my home. And behind me is an empty lot which is owned by the Fishers. And the Fishers and I have a property lease agreement. They have no issues with me building a new deck.

But the issue, I believe with the City of
Novi, is not just variances, it's -- perhaps, when I
purchased the home right here I have had the land
surveys give me a survey and it's very close to what it
is here on the land survey map.

My home encroaches on the empty lot behind me. Okay.

So I did get a lease agreement from the Fishers. They don't have an issue.

All right. The current deck that is on my home was already built on the home when I purchased it in '05. I have issues, safety issues, with it right now. It is currently 10 by 14. It is rotted and I have fallen through it personally while I was grilling.

Page 53

I want to make it safe. My mother, my
76-year-old mother lives with me. She has ailments.
She uses a crutch. I would like to be able to build a deck so she can walk out on to an even surface. I would like to be able to enjoy my lake view. I do not use it. I know there's a table on it, but I don't use it.

I have done many improvements to the front of my home right now. It's looking really nice. I will be living there for a long time.

The Fishers have insured me that they have owned the land for 40 years, they never use it. They own a kid's camp, a summer camp out in Commerce and they bring the kids there Monday through Friday during the summer and they have a lake lot as well. So they bring them boating every day.

Actually, I have been there since '05. I take care of their lot. I keep all the branches from the woods right there to the right side of my back yard, which is owned by the City. So I keep that whole lot cleaned up with branches and trash. And, you know, I would just like to improve the safety reasons and just be able to go out there and enjoy the lake view,

Page 54 1 have family members over for barbecues. So that's 2 about it. 3 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Thank 4 you. 5 Anybody in the audience wish to speak to this 6 case? 7 Seeing none. To the City, Mr. Butler? 8 MR. BUTLER: No comment at this time. 9 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All right. 10 Correspondence. MEMBER GRONACHAN: There were 52 letters 11 12 mailed, four letters returned, one approval. And that 13 is from a Terry -- I'm just going to spell the last name G-a-r-i-e-p-y, at 109 Maudlin with no comments 14 15 except approval. 16 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okie doke. Member 17 Byrwa? 18 MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I had the opportunity 19 on Sunday to visit the property and I was a bit 20 confused. Somehow there's several issues that I didn't 21 understand. You back up to a large lot that runs out to South Lake Drive? 22 23 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct.

Page 55

MEMBER BYRWA: Right. And you're asking to allow the shed to remain there?

MS. GRIFFITH: No. I'm asking to rebuild the current deck. The deck is rotted.

MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. So that is what is deemed as the accessory use or whatever.

Well, the problem I have is that what should be happening is the person who owns the property that you're building on, they should be the ones, in my opinion, that would be coming in asking for the variance.

Yeah, if the City ...

MS. SAARELA: From what I understand, she has a license agreement to build on their property.

MEMBER BYRWA: Correct.

MS. SAARELA: So as long as they're authorizing it, you can grant the variance. I would recommend that you make the variance subject to the term of the license agreement. But if she's authorized by the property owner -- we have that a lot. We have shopping centers. We have someone coming in for a variance. They're not the property owner. They just get signed off from the property owner. This would be

Page 56 1 a similar scenario where she's getting a license or an 2 easement from the property owner to get the variance. MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. What about there's a 3 shed out there that was -- it looks like it was 4 5 recently built and that looks like it encroaches on 6 that property also. 7 MS. GRIFFITH: It is actually kitty korner. 8 So that is part of my property. 9 Do you know when the fence was MEMBER BYRWA: 10 put up? Did you buy the property with the privacy fence? 11 12 I put fence in. MS. GRIFFITH: No. 13 Was there a permit on that, do MEMBER BYRWA: 14 you know, Larry? 15 MR. BUTLER: I don't know. 16 MEMBER BYRWA: Because it's like a six-foot 17 privacy fence and it runs throughout the front yard on there and I know most communities have rules about 18 19 front yard fencing shouldn't be six foot and all and 20 solid and everything. 21 But, yeah, that's just a little confusing 22 when somebody's asking for a variance to build on 23 somebody else's property.

Page 57 1 Go ahead. 2 MS. GRIFFITH: Well, as far as the privacy 3 fence, the two homes that are next to me, they've been rentals forever. 4 5 MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. 6 MS. GRIFFITH: They do not upkeep their 7 homes, their yards. 8 MEMBER BYRWA: Yeah. I had the opportunity 9 on Sunday to meet the person buying the property to the 10 south of you. 11 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. Okay. 12 MEMBER BYRWA: She --13 MS. GRIFFITH: At 119? MEMBER BYRWA: 14 It was directly to the house. 15 It's a white house. MS. GRIFFITH: 16 Yes. 17 MEMBER BYRWA: And I got the impression it 18 was going be a tear down and build something else there 19 next to you there. 20 MS. GRIFFITH: Right. Most communities don't allow 21 MEMBER BYRWA: 22 six foot fencing to go beyond the front wall of the 23 house into your front yard.

Page 58 1 MS. GRIFFITH: Well, that's my main property. 2 MS. SAARELA: I mean, this is something, I 3 guess, that can be asked if you have a concern about the legality of something that is there to the building 4 5 department. I don't think the question about the fence 6 is --7 MEMBER BYRWA: Right. It is off the subject 8 here. 9 MS. SAARELA: -- relevant to the variance 10 that's in front of us right now. 11 MEMBER BYRWA: Okay. That's all. Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Gronachan? 13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just want to clarify because there seems to be 14 15 confusion. So I'm going to be the clarifying moment here. So you bought this house in 2005? 16 17 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 18 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And the house had this 19 deck? 20 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. MEMBER GRONACHAN: The deck is not on the 21 22 your property, it is on someone else's -- a portion of 23 the deck is not on your property. It is on someone

Page 59 else's property? 1 2 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 3 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And you knew that when you bought the house? 4 5 MS. GRIFFITH: I really wasn't -- I didn't 6 realize that, no. 7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Well, regardless if you knew it or not, that's how it was sold. 8 9 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 10 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Then comes the repair of the deck. 11 12 MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And there's a survey done at some point which you learn that this deck is on 14 15 someone else's property? MS. GRIFFITH: Correct. 16 17 MEMBER GRONACHAN: You go to the owner and 18 you have an agreement with that owner that instead of 19 removing that deck off the back of your house and not having any deck, they're allowing you to keep the deck, 20 a portion of it on their property, and that is the 21 22 variance that you're requesting here tonight do I have 23 it clear?

Page 60 1 MS. GRIFFITH: Well, clarification, I would 2 like to tear that deck down and rebuild a new one. 3 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'm sorry, correct. I don't know what I just said, but that's 4 5 what I meant to say, at any rate. 6 So, first of all, I think we've been out to 7 that address before. It's a very nice piece of property. I know that there's been a lot of work done 8 on that house and it's quite obvious that you do keep 9 10 it up. It's a very, very nice addition to that 11 particular street. 12 MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you. 13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: There have been many 14 challenges on that street throughout the years. 15 MS. GRIFFITH: Yes. 16 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And being a long time 17 member of this board, I'm well aware of most of them, 18 and I have a long memory. 19 So getting back to your request, I don't have 20 a problem. This is a very unique request. I don't 21 think we've ever come across where somebody needed a

variance on somebody else's property. So it's a first

for me after 14 years. And given the testimony of the

22

Page 61

petitioner, given the lay of the property, the configuration of the lot, the clarification that there is a licensed agreement between the petitioner and the owner of the property where the portion of the deck is, I feel that all requirements have been met and I would be in support of this request, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

To add to that, I drove by on your street and yours is very unique because it sets so far back compared to the two side neighbors. So that automatically pushes you into the neighbor's yard. That you have the deck encroaching, but you have this lease agreement. So if you would just bring that to the City, a copy of that, then I also would be in favor.

MS. GRIFFITH: And they do have that.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. Cool.

And Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Chair.

Yeah. A nice presentation and also you mentioned that there's a deck issue. And you have a mother and it's not good to keep the old deck. If you replace and she can enjoy also. We have only a few

Page 62 1 months in the summertime and I have no issue. Thank 2 Good luck. you. 3 MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Would you like to make 4 5 a motion? MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'll do the motion. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. 8 MEMBER GRONACHAN: If I can find the sheet. 9 I have too much paper going on over here. I forget 10 what it was like to be secretary. I move that we grant the variance in case 11 number PZ18-0062 sought by Nancy Simmons of 117 Maudlin 12 13 Street for -- to allow the accessory use of a parcel absent a primary use based on Section 4.9. And to 14 15 allow a structure in the rear setback, Section 3.32, to 16 allow a structure in the rear setback. 17 Because the petitioner has shown a practical 18 difficulty, requiring the request for this variance. Without the variance, the petitioner would be 19 20 unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use 21 of the property because this is a pre-existing 22 condition that existed prior to her actually purchasing

23

the property.

The property is unique because of lot size and shape. The petitioner did not create this condition as given in her testimony based on the sale and purchase. And again, the license agreement between her and the owner of the actual property.

The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of the improvement of the deck along with increasing the safety of the deck as given -- as testimony given by the petitioner indicating that she actually fell and sustained an injury due to the condition of the deck.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a minimum request given on -- because it is a minimum request based on the location of the property, the location of the deck, the lot size and the uniqueness.

Therefore, I move that the variance be granted on this case.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second.

MS. SAARELA: I recommend that the variance be subject to the terms of the licensing agreement.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: As the attorney just

| | Page 64 |
|----|---|
| 1 | stated. |
| 2 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second it. |
| 3 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: I'll accept that friendly |
| 4 | amendment. |
| 5 | MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second it. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. So we have a |
| 7 | motion and a second with the amendment. Katherine, if |
| 8 | you could |
| 9 | Is there any other discussion? |
| 10 | Nope. All right. Call the role? |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 12 | MEMBER PEDDOBYINA: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? |
| 14 | MEMBER SANKER: Yes. |
| 15 | MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 18 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 19 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 20 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 21 | MS. OPPERMAN: And Member Byrwa? |
| 22 | MEMBER BYRWA: No. |
| 23 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| | |

Page 65 1 MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you. 2 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations. 3 MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you. 4 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good luck. CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That brings us to our 5 last case, PZ18-0063 for Chris Ketzler/Toll Brothers 6 20735 Dunhill Drive, west of Beck and north of Eight 7 8 Mile, parcel 50-22-32-400-013. The applicant is 9 requesting a variance from the City of Novi Ordinance 10 Section 28-6 for a 44 square foot variance to allow 11 installation of a 64 square foot temporary sign, 20 12 square feet allowed. 13 Section 28.6 for a three foot sign variance 14 for a proposed nine foot high sign, six feet allowed. 15 The property is zoned single family residential R-1. Welcome back. 16 17 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Good evening again. 18 MR. KETZLER: I'm back. 19 MEMBER GRONACHAN: It's been a long time. 20 MR. KETZLER: I'm still Chris. 21 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Raise your right hand. MR. KETZLER: And I'm still telling the 22 23 truth.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth in the matter before you?

MR. KETZLER: Yes, I do.

was brought to my attention.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. KETZLER: Same community, Dunhill Park.

We have two marketing signs that service the community.

One on Eight Mile and one on Beck. The signs are identical and they are already in place. They were installed by Hunter Pasteur. And recently, before the holidays, I received a phone call from Hunter Pasteur indicating that the signs were in violation. It was not my knowledge that they were in violation, but it

So my immediate reaction was to come to the city of Novi and I met with Maureen. And she encouraged me to get an extension on the variance. They are temporary signs. The signs do serve as a location mark for our community and also serve to advertise to passing traffic, as you are aware. There is plenty of traffic on Beck and Eight Mile in that area.

Like I said, the signs are existing. We're requesting that the variance be granted for another

year as we sell out the community. But as you can see they are very tasteful. They are in roughly seven to 800 lineal feet landscaped areas. And, like I said, they are there. They have been approved and we are seeking the extension as we sell out our community.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Anyone in the audience have any comment for this case?

Very good.

From the City, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: From my discussion with the ordinance officers for the signage, they concur that the sign was located in that location. Due to the fact there is not a lot of signage around and it did enhance the area a little bit.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you.

From correspondence?

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes, Madame Chair. There were 13 letters mailed, nine letters returned, no approvals, no objections.

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Very good. Open it up to the Board.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: Since I gave the bad news on the last one, I would like to give some positive.

Finish the evening on a lighter note.

MR. KETZLER: Thank you.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: So this area that I talked about, I spent a great deal, like 30 years living out in that neighborhood and Eight Mile is a challenge.

When I was first coming back out there on Sunday when I was driving out to look at the other location, I noticed this sign. This sign oddly enough did not jump out at me. And the reason is because the lay of the land, so to speak, is so wide and open out there that you barely have visible -- you barely see that sign until you're on top of it.

So it's just so cleared out. I don't know what other words to use except that the width of Eight Mile and the speed that you're going and the lighting and those trees, there is not anything to really, you know, hold that sign or draw your attention to that sign. So I think that it does need to be that big for where it's located.

The one on Beck, I don't think it had to be that big. But the one on Eight Mile, this one on Eight Mile -- this is the Eight Mile sign; is that correct?

MR. KETZLER: This is the Eight Mile sign,

Page 69 1 correct. 2 MEMBER GRONACHAN: This is the Eight Mile 3 I'm in full support of that. sign. My only question is if we can amend that 4 5 either one year or sellout would be my recommendation for these signs because they are so large. And for the 6 7 quality of what those houses are, they don't need that 8 kind of sign for that long. Once they sell out, it should be taken down as soon as that division is sold 9 10 out. And the way -- when I was out there on Sunday, it 11 looked like it was going to be sell out pretty soon. 12 So I wouldn't like to see the signs linger. 13 And that's my two cents for what it's worth. 14 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Thank you. 15 Anyone else? 16 Yes. Member Peddiboyina? 17 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, thank you. Yes.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Oh, thank you. Yes. I saw this. The Toll Brothers are very famous and very expensive properties. And I have no objection. And you guys can see what you can sell in one year. I wish you good luck.

MR. KETZLER: Thank you.

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Member Ferrell?

Page 70 1 MEMBER FERRELL: Yes, thanks, Madame Chair. 2 I agree with Member Gronachan about that. 3 But I think I wouldn't extend it over a year, if it took over a year to sell out. I'm sure it's probably 4 5 not going to, but whoever makes a motion, I would want to have that added to it. 6 7 MEMBER GRONACHAN: To come back in a year, 8 Member Ferrell? 9 MEMBER FERRELL: If it sold out in a year, 10 they'd have it removed. If it's not, it stays a year 11 then they come back in a year. It doesn't continue 12 past a year. 13 Is that a motion? MEMBER GRONACHAN: MEMBER FERRELL: I can try. I don't know if 14 15 you'll be able to hear me. MEMBER GRONACHAN: You sound a little better. 16 I think it was all that medical advice that Member 17 18 Krieger and I gave you earlier. 19 MR. KETZLER: I'm going on day number 10 of 20 that cold. It's a fun one. 21 MEMBER FERRELL: It's been a over a week. 22 MR. KETZLER: Yes. A great New Year's for 23 the family and I.

Page 71 1 MEMBER FERRELL: Unless Member Byrwa would 2 like to do it. 3 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Do you want me to? CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: 4 Okay. 5 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Go ahead. 6 CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: You can do it. 7 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I move that we grant the 8 variance in case number PZ18-0063 sought by Chris K-e-t-z-l-e-r because the petitioner has shown the 9 10 practical difficulty for a 44 square feet variance to allow the installation of 64 square foot of temporary 11 sign and a three foot sign variance for the proposed 12 13 nine feet high sign. Without the variance, the petitioner will be 14 15 unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use 16 the property because the sign is for a marketing 17 purpose for the building. The petitioner did not create the condition 18 19 because it is a temporary sign for marketing purpose. 20 And after that one year the petitioner should show up 21 to the Building. 22

If relief is granted it will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent and surrounding properties

Page 72 1 because the sign is located in the area that is common 2 to the community and the landscape area and it does not interfere with the adjacent property. 3 The relief is consistent with the spirit and 4 5 intent of the ordinance because a temporary sign is 6 located in the landscape area. 7 Thank you. 8 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Before I second that, 9 Member Peddiboyina, did you say one year or sell out? 10 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: One year, yeah. MEMBER GRONACHAN: Or sellout? 11 12 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: He has to come back. 13 MEMBER GRONACHAN: No. So what my 14 recommendation was that we can put the sign up, but as 15 soon as all the properties sell out the sign has to 16 come down if it's before the one year. Would you 17 accept that as a friendly amendment? 18 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes. I accept that. 19 MEMBER GRONACHAN: And if they don't sell out 20 within a year, they would have to come back. 21 MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: 22 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Then I second that and the 23 friendly amendment.

| | Page 73 |
|----|--|
| 1 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is there any |
| 2 | discussion? |
| 3 | Okay. Very good. Member Katherine, if you |
| 4 | can call the role. |
| 5 | MS. OPPERMAN: I've been promoted. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Come on, be a member. |
| 7 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Byrwa? |
| 8 | MEMBER BYRWA: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Ferrell? |
| 10 | MEMBER FERRELL: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Gronachan? |
| 12 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Krieger? |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Yes. |
| 15 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? |
| 16 | MEMBER SANKER: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Peddiboyina? |
| 18 | Yes. |
| 19 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Congratulations. I |
| 21 | hope they all sell out for you. |
| 22 | MR. KETZLER: Thank you. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: That concludes to our |

Page 74 1 other matters. So we're to adjournment. 2 MEMBER GRONACHAN: I do have a question, Member Chair? 3 In regards to the case of PZ18-0057, the 4 5 Somnio Global on West Twelve Mile, could we get 6 clarification for next month that when the gate is 7 going to be open so we can get on the property. 8 MR. BUTLER: The gates are open during the 9 week and they're closed on weekends. They're locked on 10 weekends. But you can drive right through during the 11 week. 12 MEMBER GRONACHAN: Do we know what the hours 13 are? 14 MR. BUTLER: He never said they were closed 15 after hours, I believe they're 8:00 to 5:00. 16 MEMBER GRONACHAN: So maybe we can get like 17 an extension because most of us work until 5:00 to get 18 there. 19 MR. BUTLER: I can talk to him. He's a very nice gentleman and I'll talk to him and find out. 20 21 can be open later than that because I don't know what 22 type of shifts they work over there.

MEMBER GRONACHAN: If we can have that back

| | Page 75 |
|----|---|
| 1 | in our packet next month, that would be very helpful. |
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: And is it the next |
| 3 | month we'll do the election of officers. |
| 4 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Is Mav back? |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Is Mav back next month? |
| 6 | MS. OPPERMAN: I don't believe he'll be back |
| 7 | until April. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Okay. We'll discuss it |
| 9 | then. |
| 10 | Thank you. We'll have a motion to adjourn. |
| 11 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: So moved. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: All in favor say, Aye." |
| 13 | MEMBER BYRWA: Aye. |
| 14 | MEMBER FERRELL: Aye. |
| 15 | MEMBER GRONACHAN: Here. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: Aye. |
| 17 | Member Peddiboyina Aye. |
| 18 | MEMBER SANKER: Aye. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON KRIEGER: We're adjourned. |
| 20 | (At 8:18 a.m., meeting adjourned.) |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| | |
| | |

| | Page 76 |
|----|---|
| 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 | seventy-six (76) 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 | January 31, 2018 (Date) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | - |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| | |