

REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY OF NOVI

November 15, 2016

Proceedings taken in the matter of the ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Tuesday, November 15, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS

Cindy Gronachan, Chairperson

Jonathan Montville, Secretary

Linda Krieger

Mav Sanghvi

Joe Peddiboyina

ALSO PRESENT:

Beth Saarela, City Attorney

Lawrence Butler

Coordinator: Monica Dreslinski, Recording Secretary

Carol Chaput, Recording Secretary

REPORTED BY: Jennifer L. Wall, Certified Shorthand Reporter

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

INDEX

Case No.	Page
PZ16-0048	6
PZ16-0049	18
PZ16-0050	28
PZ16-0051	39
PZ16-0052	50
PZ16-0053	79
PZ16-0054	90
PZ16-0056	103

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Novi, Michigan.

Tuesday, November 15, 2016

7:00 p.m.

\*\* \*\* \*

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I would like for everybody to have a seat. I would like to call order the November 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

Would you please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Monica, would you please call the roll.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Byrwa, absent, excused. Member Ferrell, absent, excused.

Member Krieger?

MS. KRIEGER: Present.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Peddiboyina?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Here.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Present.

Thank you.

This evening we have a very long agenda. It looks like we have a lot of participants, so I'm going to ask that everybody at this time please turn off your cellphones.

I don't know that anybody has any pagers anymore, but if you do. I am also going to bring to everyone's attention, if you're coming to speak and you're not an applicant, you're coming to stand in front of the board to make your comments, you have three minutes to do so. Because of the length that we have, and the number of cases before us tonight, I will be monitoring that time.

If you see that there is a

1 resident that has shared your comments, you  
2 can come up and just tell us that you  
3 respectfully share the same comments that are  
4 previously spoken, to save us time this  
5 evening.

6 Also, at this point, I would  
7 like to ask if there is any changes in the  
8 agenda?

9 MS. DRESLINSKI: The first case  
10 PZ-0034, has been tabled to December 13,  
11 2016.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Case No.  
13 1 has been tabled. Any other changes?

14 MS. DRESLINSKI: No, ma'am.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Seeing  
16 none, all those in favor of the agenda as it  
17 stands, say aye.

18 THE BOARD: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: None  
20 opposed.

21 We have our minutes from the  
22 September 13th meeting. Are there any  
23 changes or additions or deletions on the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

minutes?

Seeing none, all those in favor of the minutes as they stand for September 13th say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: None opposed. At this point, we ask if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to make remarks to the board in reference to anything other than what's on the agenda this evening, can do so now.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to make comment?

Seeing none, we will move right along to our first case, PZ16-0048, 1217 East Lake Drive, Alan DeZell.

Is the petitioner here?  
Please come down to the podium.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for a five-foot side yard setback, 10-foot minimum allowed. The property is zoned R4.

Would you please state your

1 name, spell it and be sworn in by our  
2 secretary.

3 MR. DEZELL: I am Alan DeZell,  
4 it's spelled A-l-a-n, last name is DeZell, D,  
5 as in David, e, capital Z-e-l-l.

6 MR. MONTVILLE: Raise your right  
7 hand, please, sir. Do you swear to tell the  
8 truth in the testimony you're about to  
9 provide?

10 MR. DEZELL: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may  
12 proceed.

13 MR. DEZELL: Thank you for  
14 hearing my case today.

15 Essentially what I am looking  
16 for, my family and I, is just to have a side  
17 yard variance of five feet. It's kind of  
18 like a re-variance of what we did back in  
19 2000 when we built our house. We have a  
20 50-foot wide lot, 18-foot easement. When we  
21 built the house and the existing deck, it  
22 already has the five feet variance for the  
23 house and the existing deck as is.

1                   What we are proposing to do is  
2                   remove the existing deck and in it's same  
3                   location, same size, is put a roof covered  
4                   patio. So single story roof, it went through  
5                   architectural plans, ties into the house  
6                   really nicely.

7                   The reason why we are doing is  
8                   it is the existing deck is getting a little  
9                   deteriorated and we have situations with  
10                  animals that were burrowing underneath the  
11                  deck and such, and undermining the soil,  
12                  woodchucks that I've trapped every year for  
13                  the past six years and releasing them, and  
14                  having animals die underneath the deck then  
15                  rotting.

16                  For all those reasons, and  
17                  debris on top, we said, why not put a nice  
18                  foundation in, so per the architectural  
19                  plans, it's a full trench footing, all the  
20                  way around, tying into the existing footage,  
21                  pinning to the house, and from there,  
22                  essentially a roof covered patio that will  
23                  tie into the existing garage, and the back of



1 the house, and the reason for the variance is  
2 quite simply it's the same size as what's  
3 already there, the reason going in front of  
4 the board, as Charles Boulard and the  
5 department told me, that there is little  
6 change to the structure because it has a roof  
7 on it.

8 Single story roof, ties in  
9 again nicely. The neighbors support it. I  
10 talked to my neighbor who is adjacent closest  
11 to it, he has no issues with it.

12 The neighbors on the other  
13 side, couple houses don't as well. Pine  
14 trees cover it, so the neighbors can't even  
15 see it.

16 A lot of variances in that  
17 area to begin with, even my neighbor  
18 next-door with 100-foot lot has a 5-foot  
19 variance for his garage, it's right up where  
20 their house is and such.

21 So, yes, it's a benefit to the  
22 community. It certainly improves the value  
23 of the homestead itself and surrounding area.

1           It's a natural extension of the existing  
2           house.

3                         Without it, it would be a  
4           hardship that would be very narrow. It would  
5           be unsightly. You would have a very narrow  
6           type deck area.

7                         So I did a topography of  
8           looking at our house from the top down, with  
9           an arrow pointing to the location. I  
10          believe -- I don't know if you have that in  
11          front of you.

12                        Our house is right here, then  
13          this arrow right here is pointing to where  
14          the existing deck is in the backyard, the  
15          same location as where this would be located.

16                        Quickly looking at the site  
17          plan, page five -- you have the architectural  
18          plans in front of you by any chance?

19                        CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We do.

20                        MR. DEZELL: I also have a full  
21          size drawing, if you want. We can present  
22          that if you want. The architectural or the  
23          site plan itself?

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We have  
2 everything here. If the board members need  
3 to see it, they will --

4 MR. DEZELL: I have a site plan  
5 essentially showing the existing house here,  
6 the garage, back here is where deck already  
7 is. This back area. Again, it's going up to  
8 the same location, the roof tying in will  
9 have a similar pitch and the hip (ph) roof  
10 and such. It looks like the existing  
11 homestead.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything  
13 else?

14 MR. DEZELL: If you have any  
15 questions, be happy to answer them.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
17 you. Is there anyone in the audience that  
18 wishes to make comment on this case this  
19 evening?

20 Seeing none, building  
21 department?

22 MR. BUTLER: No comments.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were 30 letters mailed, one letter returned, zero approvals and zero objections.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Board members? Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. Good evening. I came and saw your place on Saturday.

MR. DEZELL: You did, okay.

MR. SANGHVI: To be honest, the only question I have is all the material you are using, all approved for fire protection?

MR. DEZELL: Well, certainly it's a permit with the city, so it's an open covered patio --

MR. SANGHVI: Open covered means what?

MR. DEZELL: I'm sorry. It has seven posts, so it has a foundation around the perimeter, rather than just for the posts themselves, it's a full trench footing around, with brackets that hold six posts.

1 From there it will have a full roof like you  
2 would have on your house with the eaves  
3 troughs the same as the existing house,  
4 gutters, shingled roof, you know, standard  
5 construction material. Really at this point  
6 no insulation or anything in that fashion.

7 MR. SANGHVI: The reason why I am  
8 asking you is later on you might want to  
9 (unintelligible) enclose and then you want to  
10 make sure at the beginning that this is safe  
11 enough to do what you are doing.

12 MR. DEZELL: Yes, we are focusing  
13 on, yes, if it were to be enclosed, it will  
14 have a full structure ability as far as the  
15 load bearing. The way it is constructed with  
16 the architect, it has the load bearing with  
17 the posts, and all the construction of the --  
18 you want to say the trusses, and the ridge  
19 and all the perimeters, all has the structure  
20 near that. There would be no more additional  
21 load bearing required if you were to enclose  
22 it later. Of course, being enclosed later,  
23 it's a secondary permit, or if that meets the

1 code, whether it's electrical insulation,  
2 HVAC, it's compliant with all the city  
3 ordinances. It actually went through the  
4 permit process already.

5 So after this is approved, we  
6 are ready to go.

7 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
9 Montville.

10 MR. MONTVILLE: I am looking at  
11 the notes from the previous application, just  
12 to confirm, was this a preexisting  
13 non-conforming lot initially?

14 MR. DEZELL: When we built it you  
15 mean?

16 MR. MONTVILLE: Correct.

17 MR. DEZELL: Yes, the variance  
18 was the same variance to go from 10 feet to  
19 five feet. So the house was already five  
20 feet from the lot lines, the driveway is  
21 adjacent to the other lot line because it's  
22 an easement shared with the neighbor, the  
23 other size is all five feet, all the way

1 down, and existing deck is five feet, where  
2 this is going in the same spot.

3 MR. MONTVILLE: Based on -- it  
4 being an existing structure of the building,  
5 its improved esthetics, the wildlife is a  
6 concern with the lot, that's another factor  
7 that the applicant has to deal with, for  
8 those reasons, I would be support of the  
9 applicant as it's being requested.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
11 Thank you. Anyone else? I have no problem  
12 with this.

13 I understand that there was a  
14 previous variance granted. And the other  
15 only reason why you need another variance is  
16 because of the roof. That's the only reason.

17 So it is a non-conforming lot,  
18 and I think that your request is minimal, and  
19 I will be in full support. And I would  
20 entertain a motion if anyone is ready. If  
21 there is no more discussion. Member  
22 Montville.

23 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we

1 grant the variance requested in Case No.  
2 PZ16-0048, sought by Alan DeZell for a five  
3 foot setback variance.

4 As the petitioner has shown a  
5 practical difficulty using a lot as zoned  
6 with considering the improved esthetics as a  
7 priority from the current deterioration of  
8 the back deck. The surrounding wildlife is  
9 an aspect on the eastern side of the lot, and  
10 the lot is already a preexisting  
11 non-conforming lot.

12 The petitioner did not create  
13 these conditions. The relief will not  
14 unreasonably interfere with any adjacent or  
15 surrounding properties and will potentially  
16 add to property values, as the improved  
17 esthetics will be an improvement, positive.  
18 It is consistent with the spirit and intent of  
19 the ordinance, so for those reasons, I move  
20 that we grant the variance as it's been  
21 requested.

22 MS. KRIEGER: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been



1 moved and second. Any further discussion?

2 Monica, would you please call  
3 the roll.

4 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

5 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

6 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
7 Montville?

8 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

9 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
10 Peddiboyina?

11 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

12 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

13 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

14 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson  
15 Gronachan?

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

17 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
18 five to zero.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your  
20 variance has been granted. Good luck. I'm  
21 sure you will be back in contact with the  
22 building department.

23 MR. DEZELL: Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Moving along, our next case Phillips Sign and Lighting. The petitioner is here? Case PZ16-0049, 42235 Grand River.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for the installation of an additional 5.7 square foot non-illumination sign. This is at the KIA dealership.

And you are?

MR. BRETZ: My name is Steven Bretz. I am with Phillips Sign and Lighting.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you please spell your name for the recording secretary, and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.

First name is Steven, S-t-e-v-e-n, last name Bretz, B, as in boy, r-e-t-z.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to tell the truth in the testimony you are about to provide?

MR. BRETZ: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may

1 proceed.

2 MR. BRETZ: Good evening. I am  
3 here representing Phillips Sign and Lighting.  
4 Unfortunately, the representative from  
5 Feldman Auto Group could not be with me, so I  
6 will do this on my own.

7 Our hardship is two-fold.  
8 Number one, KIA national branding, they are  
9 intending to offer a new level of service,  
10 and in our ever busier world for all of us,  
11 they are going to be offering faster, more  
12 efficient service, truly revolutionizing the  
13 service world. The word express will be the  
14 nucleus of their new rebranding and identity  
15 with KIA.

16 Number two, good safe  
17 directional signage for all the visitors to  
18 the site. Our variance is not for more  
19 square footage, but for an additional sign.  
20 Please consider that the sign measures 5.7  
21 square feet. It's only 12 inches high,  
22 70 inches wide and non-illuminated.

23 Hopefully our request seems

1 modest and in good taste, and on behalf of  
2 the Feldman Auto Group and Phillips Sign, I  
3 thank you for your consideration.

4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there  
5 anyone in the audience that wishes to make  
6 comment on this case?

7 Seeing none, building  
8 department?

9 MR. BUTLER: Only comment, it is  
10 a reasonable request. We have reviewed it  
11 and it takes in pretty much what he has out  
12 there. No additional comments.

13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
14 you. Is this sign -- do you have a diagram  
15 by chance to show us where the sign exactly  
16 is going?

17 MR. BRETZ: I do. You didn't  
18 receive any of that?

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: There is  
20 a few people at home watching, so I would  
21 like to put it up there just to clarify. And  
22 I have some questions.

23 So is this sign replacing any

1 of the signs currently on the property?

2 MR. BRETZ: It is not.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And  
4 according to our pictures, what is the  
5 purpose of the express sign, to direct them  
6 into where they can get the express service,  
7 is that what the idea is?

8 MR. BRETZ: Into that express  
9 area. The way I understand it, there is  
10 already a service sign up there, but again,  
11 they're moving in the direction of rebranding  
12 their image a little bit, and to do that,  
13 they're adding the word express to that lane  
14 or to that area under the service sign. They  
15 plan on doing this at all their dealerships.  
16 They're starting -- I believe this is the  
17 first one actually.

18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
19 Thank you. Board members? Correspondence.  
20 Sorry.

21 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were  
22 14 letters mailed, two letters returned, zero  
23 approvals and zero objections.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

Board members? Member Krieger.

MS. KRIEGER: I drove all over the site, and I'm sorry, but I couldn't find the express sign, which is embarrassing.

But then my question out of that is why not if it's going to be more services, replace service with express?

MR. BRETZ: The service sign is a lit sign, number one, it's an illuminated sign. This is a non-illuminated sign, just an additional sign to go with the service message.

They really don't want to replace the word service obviously. Because that I believe that's the the first word -- somebody is coming in to bring their car in, that's the first word they're going to be looking for is that word service. That needs to remain obviously.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Question for the

1 city attorney, if they were going to take  
2 that service sign, turn it into one new sign,  
3 combining express service, would they need a  
4 variance request for that?

5 MS. SAARELA: I would have to  
6 know the size and how that sign was proposed.  
7 We have to look into that.

8 MR. MONTVILLE: For the  
9 applicant, when community customers and  
10 potential clientele, from a safety  
11 standpoint, of flow through the dealership  
12 lot, is it going to be communicated as  
13 safety -- excuse me, express service, like  
14 essentially people looking for the express  
15 sign, potential confusion and confusion on  
16 the dealership lot, would that be fair?

17 MR. BRETZ: I don't believe it's  
18 going to be a confusing -- I mean, service  
19 and express basically go together. There are  
20 two lanes there. I believe correctly going  
21 through there. I didn't see it as being a  
22 confusing issue for the customer driving  
23 through there at this point.

1 MR. MONTVILLE: Okay. The reason  
2 I ask is -- the task we are assigned with is  
3 hardship or, I guess, a reason, for the sign.  
4 I understand branding. And I think it's --  
5 just thinking of reasons why this could  
6 potentially be a hardship. I don't know if  
7 branding is one of them, if that makes sense.

8 MR. BRETZ: That's the direction  
9 that they gave us, that the reason to add a  
10 sign, they're changing up -- they're trying  
11 to revolutionize their service business.  
12 It's a very small change, obviously it's  
13 nothing major. But it is something that  
14 they're looking to include in all their  
15 dealerships, KIA.

16 MR. MONTVILLE: Again, for  
17 customers looking for the service area,  
18 potentially the express service area, I could  
19 see as a potential reason.

20 I will open it up to  
21 conversation to my fellow board members, hear  
22 your thoughts.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member



1 Sanghvi.

2 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. It  
3 started as only a General Motors dealership  
4 Chevrolet brand, when they extended the  
5 business, becoming like a motor mall, that  
6 brand name coming in. I understand that they  
7 want their brand to be visible, and we both  
8 found out it's not easy to drive around there  
9 and find this in the first place. So I  
10 believe if there is a new sign there, it  
11 won't hurt anybody. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
13 you. Do you know if there was a mock-up put  
14 up?

15 MR. BRETZ: No.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Nobody  
17 found it.

18 MR. BRETZ: There hasn't been  
19 one, to my knowledge.

20 MR. SANGHVI: That is why we  
21 couldn't find it.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
23 Peddiboyina.

1 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: As long as  
2 there are safety concerns, if everything is  
3 good, I have no issue. You need to be  
4 careful in the safety of the parking lot.

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay,  
6 thank you. I'm torn. And the reason why I  
7 am torn, I don't know if I have enough  
8 information to make a decision this evening  
9 based on the fact that I am not quite sure  
10 what the hardship is. I understand branding,  
11 but I am not convinced exactly what the need  
12 is and what the hardship is.

13 The fact there was no -- I  
14 mean, I drove around the parking lot as well.  
15 I understand what you say the goal is, but I  
16 think that -- if there had been a mock-up  
17 there of some sort to guide us, to give us an  
18 idea of just exactly, then it would have  
19 given us some information to make a decision.

20 I don't feel that we have  
21 enough -- looking at the shaking heads and  
22 the pause at the table tonight, I think that  
23 there is not enough information before this

1 board to make a decision.

2 Am I seeing shaking heads?

3 MR. SANGHVI: I agree with you.

4 I think it would be good idea if they put a  
5 mock-up up and come back next month.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: My  
7 suggestion, and you can -- it's your  
8 decision.

9 My suggestion would be to tell  
10 your client that a mock-up should be put up  
11 so we can get a feel of just exactly what  
12 this sign is going to do for the business.  
13 You know, driving around and not having a  
14 feel for it, we have to come back and make a  
15 decision, give a statement as to why there is  
16 a hardship.

17 At this point, there is five  
18 people sitting here without coming up with a  
19 reason. I don't want to just say, no, we are  
20 going to deny it. We would like to work with  
21 the business. They're in Novi. They're a  
22 fairly large business. I think that there  
23 needs to be more homework done in this

1 instance.

2 So would you be open to  
3 accepting my suggestion of postponing it  
4 until -- can we do it next month,  
5 December 13th?

6 MR. BRETZ: Yes. The proposed  
7 paperwork that we sent you, the mock-up up  
8 here, that's not --

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: With  
10 that, I propose -- the petitioner has  
11 accepted that we postpone this case -- I am  
12 looking for the number.

13 MS. DRESLINSKI: 49.

14 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: 49 to  
15 December 13th. All those in favor?

16 THE BOARD: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will  
18 see you on December 13th.

19 Our next case is PZ16-0050,  
20 this is the Road Commission for Oakland  
21 County. The commission is seeking a variance  
22 from the City of Novi for a dimensional  
23 variance for a site less than three acres,

1 minimize size, three acres allowed.

2 I know there are several  
3 people here this evening to speak in regards  
4 to this.

5 And you are?

6 MR. SMITH: I am Mike Smith from  
7 the Road Commission for Oakland County and  
8 this application was made on behalf of the  
9 First Free Baptist Church.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Who else  
11 is giving testimony in regards to this case?  
12 Just -- are you the only one?

13 MR. SMITH: Just myself. I  
14 brought the design engineer in case you had  
15 questions about design.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you  
17 like to come down so we can swear you both in  
18 at this time.

19 Neither one of you are  
20 attorneys, correct?

21 MR. SMITH: No.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We can  
23 get your names on the record and get you both

1 sworn in.

2 MR. RUCINSKI: My name is  
3 Alexander Rucinski. I am a project engineer  
4 at the Road Commission for Oakland County.

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you  
6 please spell your last name for our recording  
7 secretary.

8 MR. RUCINSKI: R-u-c-i-n-s-k-i.

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And your  
10 name again, if you could spell it for the  
11 recording secretary.

12 MR. SMITH: Michael, last name,  
13 Smith, S-m-i-t-h.

14 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
15 you. Would you both raise your right hands  
16 to be sworn in.

17 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to  
18 tell the truth in the testimony you're about  
19 to provide?

20 MR. SMITH: Yes.

21 MR. RUCINSKI: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Please  
23 proceed.

1 MR. SMITH: The reason that we  
2 applied for the application for a dimensional  
3 variance is due to the construction that's  
4 taking place on Napier and Ten Mile Road.  
5 Their property, the church is on the  
6 southeast quadrant of that intersection, and  
7 the roundabout that will be constructed there  
8 requires for the church, the highway easement  
9 to be purchased from the church that goes  
10 through their well and the septic system and  
11 also through two buildings that's located on  
12 the property.

13 The request is to allow them  
14 to redevelop the remaining property which is  
15 less than 3 acres, and that's what we are  
16 seeking for them today.

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
18 you. Is there anyone in the audience that  
19 wishes to make comment on this case?

20 Seeing none, building  
21 department?

22 MR. BUTLER: No comment at this  
23 time.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

Correspondence?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were 18 letters mailed, two letters returned, one approval from Frances Ferguson, 24040 Napier, and she notes -- Frances notes his or her approval.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank you. Board members. Member Sanghvi.

MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came and saw this property on Saturday, and my question is, what is going to happen to the building which is already existing there?

MR. SMITH: It will be -- demolition.

MR. SANGHVI: Going to get rid of the whole thing?

MR. SMITH: The Road Commission -- I'm sorry?

MR. SANGHVI: Who is going to take care of putting the church back together again?

MR. SMITH: The process -- the



1 property is being acquired under eminent  
2 domain, and the process requires that the  
3 Road Commission make them an offer to  
4 purchase either the total property or a  
5 partial acquisition, which is the highway  
6 easement.

7 The desire of the church is to  
8 have a partial acquisition because they want  
9 to remain at the current location, that's why  
10 the option to buy the total parcel is not  
11 being pursued at this time.

12 The lot is contingent upon if  
13 they will be allowed to develop on the  
14 remaining site.

15 MR. SANGHVI: I am quite  
16 sensitive to anyplace of worship being  
17 touched for -- especially public domain.  
18 That's why I am a little concerned about  
19 what's going to happen to the church. Thank  
20 you.

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board  
22 members? Member Krieger.

23 MS. KRIEGER: What is the

1 historical value of the church? When was it  
2 built?

3 MR. SMITH: In the '20s, I  
4 believe.

5 MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

6 MR. RUCINSKI: The actual  
7 structure was built, I believe in the 1920s,  
8 the information we have, the church was put  
9 into use in the mid 1970s.

10 As part of our process, we do  
11 a check through the state historic  
12 preservation office on any structure that is  
13 greater than 50 years old, we check with the  
14 state's historic preservation office.

15 They deem that the property  
16 is -- contains no historical significance in  
17 and of itself, other than the building is  
18 greater than 50 years old.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
20 you. We have the city attorney, Beth?

21 MS. SAARELA: I just want to  
22 point out in considering the variance for  
23 this case, they are not here to decide

1           whether this roundabout is going to happen,  
2           whether or not the -- you know, the structure  
3           is going to be moved, yes or no, that's going  
4           to happen.

5                         We are here to decide whether  
6           it's appropriate to give the property a  
7           variance so that they can still use the  
8           property.

9                         So anything we decide today is  
10          not going to impact whether this project  
11          happens or not, it's going to happen. So I  
12          just wanted you to be mindful of that in your  
13          discussions.

14                        CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
15          you. When I first read this case, I was very  
16          familiar, my former backyard for many, many  
17          years. But I am glad to see that the church  
18          is working with the county and that you're  
19          working together and that you want to stay.  
20          And I am in full support of this request. I  
21          think everybody did their homework, looking  
22          at all the paperwork and the documentation, I  
23          think it has been a long time coming. I

1 think because the church is being so  
2 cooperative, it's going to improve the  
3 community, and hopefully the church will grow  
4 with its members because it's keeping it's  
5 location and I understand why it wants to  
6 stay in there.

7 So I have no problem with  
8 supporting your request.

9 Is there anyone else?

10 Member Montville, would you  
11 like to do a motion?

12 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, Madam Chair.  
13 I move that we grant the variance in Case No.  
14 PZ16-0050, sought by the Road Commission for  
15 Oakland County, for a dimensional variance,  
16 as the petitioner has shown a practical  
17 difficulty regarding the variance that's  
18 being requested for the use of the property  
19 as a place of worship, due to the size of the  
20 lot being reduced to less than 3 miles.

21 Without the variance, the  
22 petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or  
23 limited with regard to the property, as the

1 current church involved will not meet the 3  
2 acre minimum for zoning as a place of  
3 worship.

4 The petitioner did not create  
5 the condition, as reduction of the lot size  
6 was the result of the required highway  
7 easement for a nearby road project.

8 The relief granted will not  
9 unreasonably interfere with adjacent  
10 properties, as the lot is already used as a  
11 place of worship. Relief is consistent with  
12 the spirit and intent of the ordinance, as it  
13 allows the lot to remain in use as it is  
14 currently, improves the surrounding traffic  
15 conditions.

16 For those reasons, I move that  
17 we grant the variance as it's been requested.

18 MS. KRIEGER: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I would  
20 like to offer a friendly amendment. I think  
21 in your first sentence you put 3 miles and it  
22 should be 3 acres, correct?

23 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. Excuse me,

1 yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

3 It's been moved and second. Monica, would  
4 you please call the roll.

5 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

6 MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

7 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
8 Montville?

9 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

10 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
11 Peddiboyina?

12 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

13 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

14 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

15 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson  
16 Gronachan?

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

18 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
19 five to zero.

20 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your  
21 variance has been granted. Congratulations  
22 and good luck.

23 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our next case is No. PZ16-0051. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi for placement of a tenant's name on a business. And this is the Novi Development and Associates. Is the petitioner here?

Would you please state your name and spell it for the recording secretary, and then raise your right hand to be sworn in.

MR. AGRAWAL: My name is Sunil Agrawal, and let me spell it, S, as in Sam, u-n-i-l, and last name is Agrawal, A, as in apple, g-r-a-w-a-l.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you're about to provide?

MR. AGRAWAL: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may proceed.

MR. AGRAWAL: We are here for a very specific reason. I have been in Novi for about 30 years now. We built this office

1 complex in 1999.

2 At that time our office  
3 complex, which is 150 feet wide, 850 feet  
4 long to our east, it's a very narrow lot.

5 When we built the building,  
6 most of our tenants at that time were high  
7 tech companies, builders, so they did not  
8 have any -- too many people visiting the  
9 facility.

10 But as of now, it has become  
11 kind of a medical service type park. And the  
12 number of visitors have increased  
13 significantly, and because of that reason, we  
14 need visibility. The patients come, they  
15 cannot see the sign. We have the monument,  
16 which is old style, doesn't give much  
17 visibility. When the visitors come, they  
18 miss the sign, they can't get in there and  
19 they end up going to Novi Automotive. They  
20 get upset, they have to turn around, come in  
21 here. And that's causing a real hardship.

22 And I want to bring one thing  
23 to the board's attention. We are not asking



1 the size. It's the same foundation same --  
2 we will use the 8-foot long right now, we  
3 will keep it 8-foot long. Instead of 4 feet,  
4 it would become four and a half feet. That's  
5 all we are asking, 48-inch high.

6 I brought two of the tenants,  
7 who are getting effected the most, they  
8 wanted to come here, so I brought them here,  
9 and they would like to say a few words to the  
10 board.

11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you  
12 please come up and state your name.

13 MR. BURNS: Robert Burns.

14 MS. NEWLEY: Victoria Newley. I  
15 am a primary care physician, and I have been  
16 at the current building for about five years,  
17 and I have recently partnered with the local  
18 hospital, St. John Providence. So I started  
19 to take on a lot of -- more insurance, so I  
20 am getting new patients, where they are  
21 having difficulty finding the location.

22 So it's not getting any better  
23 since I have been there. The problem is only

1 getting worse. I am getting more seniors,  
2 and it's very confusing to them, because the  
3 way the driveway is set up, it's not like we  
4 have our own driveway for our building, it's  
5 kind of like connected to the tire and  
6 service place, like he was saying. They will  
7 pass it, they will go to Nine Mile, they will  
8 call, so my staff is spending a lot of time  
9 on the phone trying to explain where we are.  
10 Because it's not a traditional -- it wasn't  
11 made -- established as a traditional medical  
12 complex. So now that there is a lot of  
13 medical business in there, because there is  
14 no sign on the street, it's difficult for  
15 patients to find it, especially the seniors.  
16 And it's becoming a problem whereas I don't  
17 want to leave the City of Novi, however,  
18 since I partnered with the hospital, if we  
19 can't, you know, make it easier for my  
20 patients to find out where we are, we are  
21 going to have to consider moving to an  
22 adjacent area.

23 I am getting patients as far

1 as Southfield, South Lyon, it's not patients  
2 who are only in Novi, and are used to the  
3 area. I accept a lot of insurances that a  
4 lot of doctors don't, Medicaid, so people are  
5 traveling to find me. It's very difficult  
6 for them to find.

7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
8 you.

9 MR. BURNS: I would say a lot of  
10 the same things. I own a physical therapy  
11 practice and we are a private practice, so  
12 our business is dependent completely on  
13 people being able to find us and being able  
14 to locate our practice. And the way that --  
15 the way that things are now in terms of how  
16 the sign is, we spent a lot time as well on  
17 the phone with people trying to give them  
18 direction and help them figure out which way  
19 is north, south, east and west to find the  
20 office.

21 And I know that signage is  
22 some of a sensitive area in a lot of cases,  
23 but the sign that we're asking for is not --

1 I don't believe, you know, big, dramatic, you  
2 know, Vegas type sign or something like that.  
3 We just want to be able -- we want to have  
4 people be able to find us so we can continue  
5 to thrive our business -- our business to  
6 thrive in Novi.

7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
8 you.

9 MR. AGRAWAL: One last comment  
10 that I would like to make, our largest tenant  
11 there is an (unintelligible) center and they  
12 are also having a lot of problems. They are  
13 not able to present themselves either. But  
14 they are also having -- because when the  
15 (unintelligible) easy to deal with, and when  
16 the mother is driving with the car, they are  
17 trying to find the place and they can't find  
18 the place, and the way traffic is on Novi  
19 Road now, you miss the entry to the complex,  
20 you end up going all the way to Eight Mile or  
21 someplace else and then turn around. So it's  
22 kind of causing a real hardship on us as well  
23 as other tenants there.

1                   We just want to increase the  
2                   value of our property, so that is also -- I  
3                   think should be considered, if the place is  
4                   full, people are liking it, that will help  
5                   everyone.

6                   CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
7                   you.

8                   MR. AGRAWAL: Other thing, many  
9                   surrounding businesses, in the vicinity, they  
10                  have the same kind of sign that we are  
11                  asking. So we are not asking which is  
12                  different.

13                  CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. Is  
14                  there anything else?

15                  MR. AGRAWAL: That's it, ma'am.  
16                  Thank you very much.

17                  CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there  
18                  anyone in the audience that wishes to make  
19                  comment on this case?

20                  Seeing none, building  
21                  department?

22                  MR. BUTLER: No comment at this  
23                  time.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
2 you. Correspondence?

3 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, Madam Chair.  
4 Fifty letters mailed, one letter returned,  
5 zero approvals, zero objections.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
7 you. Board members? Member Sanghvi.

8 MR. SANGHVI: I came and drove  
9 around your property a couple of days ago.  
10 And I never realized that it is as deep as it  
11 is, from the outside you can't realize how  
12 far it goes, all the way down to the railroad  
13 track out there, in the back. I can  
14 understand why visibility is necessary for the  
15 businesses that are within your complex.

16 MR. AGRAWAL: We have two  
17 buildings there, second building is not even  
18 visible.

19 MR. SANGHVI: I know, that's what  
20 I found out when I looked around there. I  
21 have no problem in supporting your  
22 application. Thank you.

23 MR. AGRAWAL: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
2 Member Krieger?

3 MS. KRIEGER: I agree. Thank  
4 you.

5 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Same thing. I  
6 came to your site. One side, I came back,  
7 the same thing, dimension, the hardship, I  
8 have no issue. I can vote for that.

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
10 Montville?

11 MR. MONTVILLE: Nothing.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I can  
13 appreciate the frustration of trying to look  
14 for something and I think that the most  
15 important point is that everybody that's  
16 coming to your business is not in Novi.  
17 That's very important to remember.

18 So as the city grows and as  
19 the businesses grow, we do want people to  
20 come not just from Novi. And so that was a  
21 very good point by your tenants that they  
22 brought.

23 My question is, how many

1 tenants do you have in your building?

2 MR. AGRAWAL: We have six  
3 tenants.

4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All  
5 right. And so I have no problem with this.  
6 I think that the testimony that was given  
7 this evening was done wholeheartedly and I  
8 think that you have done your homework, and  
9 so I have no problem supporting your request.

10 Member Sanghvi?

11 MR. SANGHVI: Just one question.  
12 Is this sign going to be lit up?

13 MR. AGRAWAL: Yes, a lighted  
14 sign, sir.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay. I  
16 would entertain a motion.

17 MS. KRIEGER: In Case No.  
18 16-0051, sought by petitioner, I move to  
19 approve or grant the request. The property  
20 is unique, in its narrow topography, narrow  
21 and deep and the confusion with the driveway  
22 that unreasonably prevents and limits the  
23 property use, because it confuses between the



1 two businesses. And the condition is not  
2 self-created.

3 The relief will not  
4 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or  
5 surrounding properties, will help with  
6 directions and relief is consistent with the  
7 spirit and intent of the ordinance.

8 MR. SANGHVI: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
10 moved and seconded. Any further discussion?

11 Seeing none, Monica, will you  
12 please call the roll.

13 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

14 MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

15 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

16 Montville?

17 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

18 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

19 Peddiboyina?

20 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

21 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

22 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

23 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

1 Gronachan?

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

3 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
4 five to zero.

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:

6 Congratulations. Your  
7 variance has been granted. Please see the  
8 building department. Good luck.

9 Our next Case PZ16-0052, 27212  
10 Beck Road. The applicant is requesting a  
11 variance to allow three additional wall  
12 signs. I believe this is the Starbucks. Is  
13 the petitioner here this evening?

14 Good evening. Could you state  
15 and spell your name it for the recording  
16 secretary, and then raise your right hand to  
17 be sworn in.

18 MR. STIEBER: Patrick Stieber,  
19 S-t-i-e-b-e-r.

20 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you  
21 raise your right hand.

22 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to  
23 tell the truth in the testimony you're about

1 to give?

2 MR. STIEBER: I do.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may  
4 proceed.

5 MR. STIEBER: So there is a new  
6 Starbucks going in here at the corner of Beck  
7 Road and City Gate Drive. Hopefully you all  
8 had an opportunity to go by and look at the  
9 mock-up signs that are there.

10 We currently, just so you guys  
11 are fully aware of what's going on with this  
12 sign, it's not in the variance, because we  
13 already permitted it, but this is the front  
14 elevation, and we have currently already  
15 permitted the Starbucks letters that are on  
16 the front there.

17 We tried to -- in Starbuck's  
18 eyes, this is one sign. It's a branding  
19 thing. We are putting the drive-thru on the  
20 elevation, their main elevation, with their  
21 sign to direct people to the drive-thru.  
22 It's kind of a directory type sign. It's not  
23 a branded sign, just a directional type sign.

1                   But you know how they have to  
2                   box out the sign, if we put a box around the  
3                   whole thing, you know, we would be over the  
4                   square footage. So as you can see, the  
5                   Starbucks letter is at 17.16 square feet and  
6                   the drive-thru actual square foot is at 6.96.

7                   But basically that sign is an  
8                   important sign for them due to the ingress  
9                   and egress and the traffic flow of the lot.  
10                  Having these signs on the building like this,  
11                  it's really helped them flow the traffic to  
12                  the drive-thru so we really feel like there  
13                  is a hardship or lack of identification for  
14                  these traffic flows without this sign. They  
15                  have ingress off of both Beck Road and two  
16                  ingress and egress off City Gate Drive.

17                  And if you kind of look at the  
18                  site plan there, you can kind of see, you  
19                  know, where the traffic needs to get to the  
20                  drive-thru. And this sign will alleviate  
21                  that from the main entrance, which they feel  
22                  is going to get a lot of the traffic there at  
23                  City Gate Drive.

1                   So that's the gist of what we  
2                   are asking for on the front elevation.

3                   The side elevation and rear  
4                   elevation again, they feel that there is lack  
5                   of identification due to the ingresses and  
6                   egresses, and the fact that the main parking  
7                   for this development is in the rear of the  
8                   property. So having branding on the rear of  
9                   the property they feel is definitely needed  
10                  and there is a hardship of lack of  
11                  identification, due to the fact that there is  
12                  the ingress and egress at the rear and the  
13                  parking in the rear.

14                  Same thing on the side, you  
15                  know, trying to get that branding there, you  
16                  know, the size of these signs are not  
17                  excessive.

18                  So we just are here to get  
19                  your feedback on, you know, what we are  
20                  seeing, the size of things, kind of get your  
21                  feedback on what you're thinking.

22                  Like I said, that front  
23                  elevation is a very important thing. It's a

1 directory type thing to get the cars through  
2 the property to the drive-thru.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anything  
4 else?

5 MR. STIEBER: No.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there  
7 anyone in the audience that wishes to make  
8 testimony on this case?

9 Seeing none, building  
10 department?

11 MR. BUTLER: The only comment I  
12 would say, that is a very busy intersection,  
13 especially certain times of day, so any  
14 way-finding signs to help traffic move along,  
15 to stop a backup, probably be a good idea.  
16 That is a reasonable request.

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:  
18 Correspondence?

19 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, 20 letters  
20 mailed, six letters returned, zero approvals  
21 and zero objections.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
23 you. Board members. Member Sanghvi.

1 MR. SANGHVI: I came there and  
2 drove around there. I have been there on  
3 that site before, other signs as well. If  
4 you don't know, it's a very tough lot to get  
5 around. And I understand the need for a  
6 directional sign.

7 And I guess you want your logo  
8 around, so I don't know. I'm not so sure  
9 whether you need your logo everywhere, but on  
10 the directional sign you need it definitely.  
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
13 Krieger?

14 MS. KRIEGER: I have a question  
15 about the east sign, how necessary that is.  
16 Because once they're into -- they see the  
17 Starbucks and they're headed in the  
18 drive-thru, they already know that they're on  
19 the road and going around.

20 MR. STIEBER: Side elevation?

21 MS. KRIEGER: The east side.

22 MR. STIEBER: On the rear you  
23 mean?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MR. STIEBER: Well, again, their thought process is there is the parking, you know, you can get into that parking lot, both from the Beck Road egress and you're getting in there and parking. The way that building is angled, having that additional branding there would help them.

If you look at the way the building is angled, versus Beck Road, and if you're coming in off the ingress and egress from Beck, you're not even going to really see the front of that building, until you're actually in the drive, then get back to the parking area, which is located in the rear.

MS. KRIEGER: So the front is on the west side or the north side?

MR. STIEBER: Front would be west. That's the elevation right here.

MS. KRIEGER: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Board members? Anybody else? Member Montville.

MR. MONTVILLE: Just so I am



1 organized. This is for a bigger sign on the  
2 west?

3 MR. STIEBER: It's for an  
4 additional sign on the west, which is the  
5 directional sign on the west, the front.

6 MR. MONTVILLE: Right now the  
7 only approval is on the south?

8 MR. STIEBER: No. The only one  
9 that's approved is this one right here, the  
10 Starbucks sign right there. That's the main  
11 entrance, front elevation of the building  
12 that faces Beck Road kind of on an diagonal.

13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: The north  
14 side would be the drive-thru?

15 MR. STIEBER: Correct. Which  
16 they're calling the side.

17 MR. MONTVILLE: Can I make a  
18 comment or two just on as far as the minimum  
19 necessary for those signs going on, as far as  
20 design and the size of the building?

21 MR. STIEBER: Yes. I mean,  
22 looking at the size of the building, the size  
23 of the walls and size of the signs

1 themselves, you know, they're not excessive  
2 in size. You know, they're standard circle,  
3 you know, Starbucks logo. They felt that  
4 doing this type of sign rather than a longer,  
5 bigger channel letter set sign, the board  
6 might feel that that sign is less excessive.

7 MR. MONTVILLE: Based on the  
8 traffic flow at that intersection, it is a  
9 safety concern for the visibility and  
10 potential exits. You want to avoid -- people  
11 see it at the last minute and make aggressive  
12 turns. I think it is a minimum necessary  
13 that's being requested. I would open it up  
14 to the board. But at this point I would be  
15 in a position to approve personally.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Save the  
17 best for last, right?

18 I am not in support. Such a  
19 party killer, you know.

20 Let me just say this. I spent  
21 a lot of time at that intersection. I will  
22 be honest with you, I knew it was a Starbucks  
23 building before it was done. So I knew that

1 this was coming before us. I have been  
2 driving out there.

3 Yes, I agree about the  
4 directional sign. I am in full support of  
5 that. As long as there is no additional  
6 ground signs to add up to telling everybody  
7 where to go.

8 The problem that I have is  
9 with the north sign. I think -- I agree with  
10 the rear of the building, because I don't  
11 know what future construction and future  
12 changes are going to be, in that, or if there  
13 is going to be traffic coming from that  
14 direction, so I am in favor of the back of  
15 the building.

16 I have a problem with the  
17 north sign. I don't feel -- you have got the  
18 logo in the front. You have got Starbucks.  
19 You have got the drive-thru. I mean, once  
20 you're in -- and to be honest with you, I  
21 didn't see that anybody had any problem  
22 identifying that it was a Starbucks building  
23 when they were going down the road. I really

1 didn't.

2 I will be honest with you, I  
3 kind of asked a couple of people because I am  
4 not -- I am sorry, I am not a Starbucks fan,  
5 so I don't go looking for Starbucks stores.  
6 But I am being honest. So I asked other  
7 people that are Starbucks users, and what  
8 they do to identify your store, and nobody  
9 had a problem finding this building. It's  
10 not even done yet.

11 So I can appreciate the  
12 branding. I can appreciate the request for  
13 branding, but I think it's overuse. I think  
14 that the -- I am not in favor of, like I  
15 said, the north, but I am in favor of the  
16 drive-thru. I think your testimony proved  
17 that there is a need for it. I think that  
18 your testimony proved that for the east that  
19 there is a need for that. That I can't  
20 support the north.

21 And my suggestion -- that's  
22 my -- those are my comments.

23 I have spent a lot of time out

1           there. I am surprised I'm still living for  
2           all the traffic out there. I'm just kidding.

3                       There is a lot of traffic and  
4           there is a lot of confusion. But I think  
5           once you get into that complex, especially,  
6           let's face it, when you're coming off that  
7           freeway, you can see it. That's where most  
8           of the people are coming from, to be honest  
9           with you.

10                      The people that are going to  
11           be coming from Beck, they can see you. I  
12           mean, they have got the front of the building  
13           and the Starbucks. I mean, I did every angle  
14           possible to --

15                      MR. STIEBER: I hear you. Again,  
16           that's why we are here to get feedback for  
17           sure.

18                      CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You know,  
19           we joke about the amount of driving around.  
20           I am surprised I didn't run into these two.  
21           I usually do.

22                      But that's my take on it, and  
23           I feel that I would hold back on the third

1 because that corner is changing and you don't  
2 know what you are going to need down the  
3 road. That would be my -- that's my  
4 perception of it.

5 So having said that, if  
6 anybody would like to -- I would entertain  
7 motions separate -- I'm sorry -- Member  
8 Peddiboyina.

9 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I agree with  
10 you, Madam Chairperson, what you are saying.  
11 Starbucks is a known brand name. They have a  
12 main entrance. I'll go with my chairperson.

13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All  
14 right. Thank you. Why don't we start with  
15 the motion, then we can --

16 MS. KRIEGER: I am looking  
17 forward to the other entrance being opened  
18 there.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Let's not  
20 go down the road too fast. Stick with what's  
21 in front of us.

22 Who is going to do the  
23 motions. Member Montville, did I see your

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

hand up?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will do one at a time.

MR. MONTVILLE: For the first motion, we will focus on the northern sign.

Specific to the northern sign, in Case No. PZ16-0052, sought by Allied Signs, Inc. I move that we deny the variance as requested, as the petitioner has not shown practical difficulty requiring the additional sign to properly use the lot as is currently zoned.

The circumstances and features of the property are not unique to warrant the additional sign on the northern exposure of the building. The condition is not -- is self-created, as applied for currently by the application.

The failure to grant relief will result in a little inconvenience and little ability to continue to properly use the lot as currently zoned. From an esthetic

1           standpoint, it would be an additional  
2           unnecessary sign.

3                         Granting the variance would be  
4           consistent with spirit and intent of the  
5           ordinance, as it would allot for additional  
6           signage not currently written within the  
7           ordinance.

8                         Those reasons, I move that we  
9           deny that sign on the northern exposure of  
10          the building.

11                        MR. SANGHVI:    Second.

12                        CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN:  It's been  
13          moved and second.  Any other further  
14          discussion?

15                        Seeing none, Monica, would you  
16          please call the roll.

17                        MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member Krieger?

18                        MS. KRIEGER:  Yes.

19                        MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member  
20          Montville?

21                        MR. MONTVILLE:  Yes.

22                        MS. DRESLINSKI:  Member  
23          Peddiboyina?



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion to deny  
is approved five to zero.

MS. SAARELA: I just wanted to  
point out, I don't necessarily know that it's  
really impacting your motion, but on the  
application, it looks like the wrong  
application was used for the variance. It's  
got the standards for the use variance  
instead of the sign variance standards.

I just wanted you to be  
mindful that the standards from the sign  
ordinance for the variance would apply and  
not what is stated here as far as a non-use  
variance.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I don't  
think we were using that one.

MS. SAARELA: At some point the

1 word zoning was mentioned in the motion and a  
2 sign ordinance is not in the zoning  
3 ordinance.

4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can you  
5 read back that motion? Is that possible?

6 THE REPORTER: It was hard to  
7 hear. Not at this point, I couldn't.

8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Shall we  
9 amend it?

10 MS. SAARELA: I mean, I can tell  
11 you what the standard should be. I didn't  
12 hear all what he was saying because I was  
13 looking to compare at the two standards were  
14 in the ordinance versus on the application.

15 Do you have the standards for  
16 the sign variance?

17 MR. MONTVILLE: If you could read  
18 them allowed.

19 MS. SAARELA: So to grant relief  
20 from the provision of the sign ordinance, it  
21 may be granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals  
22 upon the following affirmative findings of  
23 practical difficulty. The request is based

1           upon circumstances or features that are  
2           exceptional and unique to the property, and  
3           do not result from conditions that exist  
4           generally in the city or that are  
5           self-created. B, that the failure to grant  
6           relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the  
7           use of the property, will result in  
8           substantially more than mere inconvenience or  
9           inability to attain a higher economic or  
10          financial return. And C, that the grant of  
11          relief will not result in a use of structure  
12          that is incompatible with or unreasonably  
13          interferes with adjacent or surrounding  
14          properties, will result in substantial  
15          justice being done to both the applicant in  
16          adjacent or surrounding properties, and is  
17          not inconsistent with the spirit and intent  
18          of this chapter.

19                   CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We were  
20                   close. You didn't add that last part to it.  
21                   So I think it needs to be amended.

22                   MR. MONTVILLE: I'm sorry, you  
23                   say the last part one more time.

1 MS. SAARELA: Subsection C, which  
2 is the third variance standard, that the  
3 grant of relief will not result in a use of  
4 structure that is incompatible with or  
5 unreasonably interferes with adjacent or  
6 surrounding properties, will result in  
7 substantial justice being done to both the  
8 applicant and adjacent or surrounding  
9 original properties, and is not inconsistent  
10 with the spirit and intent of this chapter.

11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Can we --  
12 this is a question for the city attorney.  
13 Can we strike the last motion and reword it?

14 MS. SAARELA: I didn't hear how  
15 far you went with it. Did you already vote  
16 on it?

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

18 MS. SAARELA: Someone would have  
19 to move to reconsider. At this point, I  
20 think you would have move to reconsider the  
21 motion and start it over.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You got  
23 to say that on record. I can't. You have to

1 do a move to reconsider.

2 MS. SAARELA: It might be  
3 difficult because if it passed five to zero,  
4 there was no one opposing it in order to  
5 reconsider. I think you're going to have to  
6 rely on what was stated at this point.

7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We will  
8 use this one for the next two.

9 MS. SAARELA: That's why I wanted  
10 you to be mindful that you're using the right  
11 standard for the next two.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All  
13 right. Next one. You are going to do the  
14 front, front elevation.

15 MR. MONTVILLE: The drive-thru  
16 next. I move that we grant the variance in  
17 Case No. PZ16-0052, sought by Allied Signs,  
18 Inc., for the inclusion of a drive-thru  
19 addition on the east side frontage of the  
20 business and the building.

21 Without the variance, the  
22 petitioner will be unreasonably prevented  
23 with respect to the use of the property due

1 to visibilty and safety concerns. The relief  
2 granted will not unreasonably interfere with  
3 surrounding areas of properties, as it is the  
4 minimum necessary to display the drive-thru  
5 properties of the business. The relief is  
6 consistent with the spirit and intent of the  
7 ordinance, as again it allows the business to  
8 safely indicate the drive-thru and the use of  
9 the business currently.

10 So for those reasons, I move  
11 that we grant the variance as requested.

12 MR. SANGHVI: Make a friendly  
13 amendment to add words that it will allow for  
14 a safe traffic flow.

15 MR. MONTVILLE: Sure. Again, I  
16 would agree with that amendment.

17 MR. SANGHVI: I second the  
18 motion. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
20 moved and second. Any further discussion?

21 Monica, would you please call  
22 the roll.

23 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
Montville?

MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
Peddiboyina?

MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson  
Gronachan?

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
Now the third one, rear elevation of the  
building.

MR. MONTVILLE: Specific to the  
rear elevation signage being requested by the  
applicant, I move that we deny the variance  
as requested in No. PZ16-0052 -- excuse me --  
0052, sought by Allied Signs, as the  
petitioner has not shown practical difficulty

1 requiring the sign.

2 I apologize, I would defer, if  
3 anyone else is better prepared to make this  
4 motion.

5 MS. SAARELA: I just want to note  
6 that you can move to reconsider on the first  
7 one within this meeting, someone who voted in  
8 favor of the motion to pass has to make the  
9 motion to reconsider. So you could re-do  
10 that one in this meeting, or you could wait  
11 until the next meeting after you see how it  
12 was written, you move to rescind it at that  
13 point if you don't agree with it, but then  
14 you have the applicant not necessarily here,  
15 so --

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So was  
17 it -- Member Montville, was it your intent to  
18 deny the rear building? There was only one.  
19 We were going to move for two. Two, we  
20 approved, one we didn't.

21 MR. MONTVILLE: Correct. So  
22 looking at the building --

23 MS. SAARELA: Can I just make a



1 suggestion. Do we know who is in concurrence  
2 with what signage -- approving what  
3 signage -- it might be easier to just to make  
4 one motion, if everybody is in agreement with  
5 the same signage, to just say two signs are  
6 approved, one is not versus trying to make  
7 three separate motions at this point.

8 I don't know how -- if you're  
9 able to tell how everybody feels about each  
10 one based all the member's comments.

11 MS. KRIEGER: Then they would  
12 decide where they want to go.

13 MS. SAARELA: No. You would just  
14 say which ones you're -- all in the scope of  
15 the same motion.

16 So at this point you could  
17 move to reconsider that original motion and  
18 just amend it at that point, amend the motion  
19 and talk about all the signage. If you think  
20 that everybody is on board.

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I think  
22 that's a good idea.

23 MR. MONTVILLE: Based on that

1 information, I would move that we review the  
2 first motion that was presented and  
3 rephrase --

4 MS. SAARELA: You have to first  
5 move to reconsider.

6 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we  
7 reconsider the first motion that was  
8 presented.

9 MS. KRIEGER: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

11 It's been moved and second. So now we need a  
12 new motion. Are you ready? I told you guys  
13 we should have a motion making class. This  
14 is it.

15 MS. KRIEGER: In Case No.  
16 PZ16-0052, sought by Allied Signs, I move to  
17 reconsider what we were discussing  
18 previously, and for the denial to recant  
19 that.

20 MS. SAARELA: No, it's already  
21 passed a motion to reconsider. You're on a  
22 new motion.

23 MS. KRIEGER: I move for the

1 Starbucks drive-thru sign to be approved, and  
2 the east wall sign to be approved, and the  
3 north wall to be denied and the petitioner  
4 has --

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Wait.  
6 That's the wrong --

7 MS. KRIEGER: The petitioner did  
8 not create the condition because of the  
9 location, and the relief granted will not  
10 unreasonably interfere with adjacent and  
11 surrounding properties. That per discussion,  
12 that Starbucks is well-known and because for  
13 safety and drive-thru that the traffic flow  
14 that these two signs will be sufficient for  
15 traffic.

16 The relief is consistent with  
17 the spirit and intent of the ordinance,  
18 because of Novi's intent to be with the  
19 signs, but not overdone.

20 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Do we  
21 have to cover the denial, too?

22 MS. SAARELA: Yes, you have to  
23 say why you're denying.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Denying  
2 the third sign.

3 MS. KRIEGER: For the  
4 circumstances and features of the property,  
5 including the third sign on the north side  
6 are not unique. Once you see the directional  
7 Starbucks sign that it does not interfere  
8 with traffic flow, that it also -- the safety  
9 that people will get there -- to the  
10 building, through the building. The  
11 circumstances and features of the property  
12 relating to the variance request are  
13 self-created by the way the building is --

14 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: They  
15 wanted it just for branding.

16 MS. KRIEGER: Then for branding,  
17 it's just labeling the building more.

18 The failure and grant will not  
19 merely inconvenience the ability to attain a  
20 higher economic or financial return.  
21 Starbucks will do well either way.

22 They will get plenty of  
23 traffic flow and financial gain. The

1 variance would result in interference with  
2 adjacent or surrounding property. It's a  
3 distraction because of speeds in this area.  
4 Granting the variance would be not  
5 inconsistent with the spirit and intent of  
6 the ordinance. Keep Novi the way it is.

7 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

8 MS. KRIEGER: Is there an  
9 amendment?

10 MS. SAARELA: You don't have to  
11 change anything. I guess I just wanted to  
12 point out all you're really doing is granting  
13 less relief than was requested. So you  
14 didn't really need to go through every single  
15 standard again, and for the reason why you  
16 weren't granting the full request. It's  
17 fine.

18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
19 moved and is there a second?

20 MR. SANGHVI: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
22 moved and second. Any further discussion?

23 Seeing none, Monica, would you

1 please call the roll.

2 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

3 MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

4 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

5 Montville?

6 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

7 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

8 Peddiboyina?

9 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

10 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

11 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

12 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

13 Gronachan?

14 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

15 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion to

16 approve as amended passes five to zero.

17 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

18 That was a long way to get there, but we

19 appreciate your patience and congratulations

20 and welcome to Novi.

21 We look forward to --

22 MR. STIEBER: Thank you for your

23 time. Have a good evening.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: We still have a couple more cases here.

Our next case is Roger and Doreen Ong, Case No. PZ16-0053. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow 4 feet from the rear corner of a shed, six feet is allowed to the interior of rear lot. This property is zoned R4.

And you are?

MS. ONG: I am Noreen. It's mistyped. It says Doreen, but I'm Noreen with an N.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you both state your names, spell them for the recording secretary, and then raise your right hand to be sworn.

Noreen Ong, N-o-r-e-e-n,  
O-n-g.

MR. DILLON: Jim Dillon.

MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to tell the truth in the testimony you're about to provide?

MS. ONG: I do.

1 MR. DILLON: I do.

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may  
3 proceed.

4 MS. ONG: I am just requesting a  
5 4-foot variance from the rear corners -- both  
6 the rear corners of my shed that I'm building  
7 on the back of my property.

8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Is there  
9 anything else you can add to tell us why --

10 MS. ONG: Well, the property is a  
11 little small. The previous owners had put on  
12 an addition so the backyard is small. And if  
13 I moved it up, then it would kind of be in  
14 the middle of the backyard.

15 Just to have it so it's in the  
16 corner of the yard, I have two children, so I  
17 didn't want it in the middle of the backyard.

18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So  
19 basically your lot shape is what you're  
20 trying to tell us is unique.

21 MS. ONG: Yes. The previous  
22 owners put a large addition on, pretty much  
23 doubled the size of the house. It took up



1 half the backyard. So if I put the shed all  
2 the way up, with the proper variance, it  
3 would be pretty much near my patio. So I  
4 just -- to put it in the corner of the yard,  
5 it just comes close to my fence.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All  
7 right. Thank you. Is there anyone in the  
8 audience that wishes to make testimony on  
9 this case? Please come on down.

10 If you two could just step  
11 aside and we will let them --

12 MS. WHITE: Good evening. My  
13 name is Chevette White, and I am the  
14 next-door neighbor. And I basically came  
15 here to note my approval for this, if the  
16 board would accept that. I don't see any  
17 problems with their shed. It is behind their  
18 privacy fence. So it's not obstructing any  
19 view and it's obstructing any of the  
20 next-door neighbors adjacent to them.

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
22 you.

23 MR. DANIEL SMITH: I'm Daniel

1 Smith. I'm an adjacent property owner as  
2 well. And I just want to mention a few  
3 things on this.

4 I think the board is aware  
5 probably of the information here. Not that I  
6 have a big opposition, I think it's really  
7 two feet is maybe what it works out to, after  
8 the variance, or actually four. But I did  
9 speak with the gentleman that was building  
10 the shed and the structure was put up before  
11 a permit was pulled. So I just wanted to,  
12 you know, let you guys be aware of the facts  
13 of this. You know, I did have a conversation  
14 with them. They did not have a permit at the  
15 time. I guess you got advised and a couple  
16 of months later, I received this in the mail.

17 The decision is ultimately up  
18 to you guys. I just didn't want to take  
19 light, as far as you know, there is a  
20 violation here, as far as not pulling a  
21 permit. I just don't think that should be  
22 looked at too lightly. I mean, I have got a  
23 shed on my yard as well. It's got a permit,

1 it's got the proper six feet, you know, I  
2 just want you guys to be aware of that.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
4 you.

5 MR. DANIEL SMITH: Once again, it  
6 is behind a privacy fence. They put a fence  
7 up, their yard is pretty tight back there.  
8 So that -- I mean, that's the decision they  
9 made. But I don't think, once again, the  
10 2 feet or 4 feet is going to an issue it's  
11 within their boundaries.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
13 you. Is there anyone else?

14 Any correspondence?

15 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes. There were  
16 91 letters mailed, zero letters returned,  
17 zero approvals, zero objections.

18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Building  
19 department?

20 MR. BUTLER: No comments.

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: City  
22 attorney, would you like to clarify that our  
23 jurisdiction really -- we don't have anything

1 to do with the permit, is that correct? We  
2 don't have any --

3 MS. SAARELA: I mean, the fact  
4 that there may be a zoning ordinance -- a  
5 code violation isn't really part of the  
6 standards to be considered at this point.

7 It's not part of the variance  
8 standards that you're looking at. There is  
9 no, I guess, standard that's applicable to --  
10 punish type aspect.

11 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That's  
12 not within our purview?

13 MS. SAARELA: No. There can  
14 still be independent of this -- there could  
15 be have been a ticket written, but that  
16 wouldn't have been your consideration, that  
17 would have been for district court  
18 consideration.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
20 you. Board members? Member Montville.

21 MR. MONTVILLE: The use of the  
22 shed?

23 MS. ONG: The use of the shed,

1 would be, I have two small children, bikes,  
2 yard equipment. The garage is small, so with  
3 a minivan and patio furniture and just things  
4 that we accumulate in our lifestyle, the shed  
5 would be to store things, you know, seasonal  
6 things, like switch back and forth to the  
7 winter and summer.

8 MR. MONTVILLE: I'll open it up  
9 back to the board at this time.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
11 Sanghvi?

12 MR. SANGHVI: I came and saw your  
13 place. And first when I saw the University  
14 of Michigan paraphernalia out in front, I  
15 thought, wow, they are a supporter of U of M  
16 here. Because I am a supporter of U of M,  
17 too. But that is besides the point.

18 The point is, you will see the  
19 pie-shaped lot and difficult to store things.  
20 I understand your need for the shed. So I  
21 have no difficulty in supporting your shed.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone  
23 else? Member Peddiboyina.

1 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I have no  
2 issue.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All  
4 right. Thank you. Member Krieger?

5 MS. KRIEGER: How old is the  
6 fence? You have to replace the fence?

7 MS. ONG: The fence is two years  
8 old. It's a vinyl fence. We have lived  
9 there two years. It was put in actually two  
10 years ago this month.

11 MS. KRIEGER: And the shed will  
12 be four feet?

13 MS. ONG: Four foot variance from  
14 the -- from just the back two corners.

15 MS. KRIEGER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: I don't  
17 have an objection. The only thing is, the  
18 fact that the resident mentioned about  
19 building it without a permit. I don't  
20 promote that. I don't encourage that. It's  
21 out of our jurisdiction, but I would wish  
22 that residents would go to the building  
23 department, and seek information before they

1 go and build things so that we can help. The  
2 City of Novi and the building department,  
3 they're great people, they are very  
4 knowledgable, and nine times out of ten, they  
5 offer great advice.

6 MS. ONG: I apologize for that.  
7 Two years ago when I put the fence up, I  
8 contacted my subdivision like three times,  
9 and nobody responded back. So it didn't  
10 occur to me that it would be -- you know, I  
11 thought that would be a much bigger deal than  
12 a small shed because it's a large fence and  
13 nobody responded back to any emails, so I  
14 guess it didn't occur to me. I apologize for  
15 that.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So in the  
17 future, you always check the building  
18 department if you decide to build anything  
19 else. But I have no problem, given the  
20 configuration of the lot, and that it's a  
21 minimal request, that there is really no  
22 objections to the neighbors. Most of  
23 these -- your lot is pie shaped, and so I

1 have no objections to this. So I would be in  
2 support of your request.

3 If anybody would like to  
4 entertain a motion. Member Montville?

5 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we  
6 grant the variance in Case No. PZ16-0053,  
7 sought by the petitioner for a 4-foot rear  
8 corner, where six is required, as this  
9 property -- as petitioner has shown practical  
10 difficulty due to the unique layout of the  
11 property. The variance -- without the  
12 variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably  
13 prevented or limited with respect to the use  
14 of the property, due to necessary storage and  
15 with the shed being, and the lot, the  
16 previous owner add to the house and made the  
17 lot difficult to operate within. The  
18 property is unique.

19 For those reasons, including  
20 again to reiterate the shape of the lot, the  
21 petitioner did not create the shape of the  
22 lot, as it is a pre-existing condition.

23 The relief granted will not



1 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or  
2 surrounding properties, due to the privacy  
3 fence currently surrounding the lot. The  
4 relief is consistent with the spirit and  
5 intent of the ordinance. For those reasons,  
6 I move that we grant the variance that has  
7 been requested.

8 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I second.

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
10 moved and second. Any further discussion?

11 Seeing none, Monica, would you  
12 please call the roll.

13 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

14 MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

15 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

16 Montville?

17 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

18 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member

19 Peddiboyina?

20 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

21 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

22 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

23 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson

1 Gronachan?

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

3 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
4 five to zero.

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your  
6 variance has been granted and I'm sure you  
7 will be seeing the building department for  
8 some other wonderful project.

9 MS. ONG: Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our next  
11 case is David and Colleen Bouren. Are the  
12 petitioners here. 1391 East Lake Drive.

13 The applicant is requesting a  
14 variance to allow 31-foot rear yard variance,  
15 35 feet is required, a side yard variance of  
16 1.5 feet, 10 feet is required. And a total  
17 aggregate variance of 4.5 feet. And a front  
18 yard variance of 14.5 feet, 30 feet is  
19 required. This property is zoned R4.

20 Good evening. Would you  
21 please state your names, spell it for the  
22 recording secretary and then raise your right  
23 hands to be sworn.

1 MR. BOUREN: David Bouren,  
2 D-a-v-i-d, B-o-u-r-e-n.

3 MS. BOUREN: Colleen Bouren,  
4 C-o-l-l-e-e-n, B-o-u-r-e-n.

5 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you swear to  
6 tell the truth in the testimony you are about  
7 to provide?

8 MR. BOUREN: Yes.

9 MS. BOUREN: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may  
11 proceed.

12 MR. BOUREN: First off, there was  
13 a revised update to the variance request.  
14 You did not list all the ones requested.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: They're  
16 posted, that's okay. I just read through.

17 MR. BOUREN: So we want to tear  
18 down our existing house on East Lake Drive  
19 and build a new one. Footprint is almost  
20 identical. We are going to get a little bit  
21 longer and a little bit narrower than our  
22 current house. The lot has obvious  
23 difficulties because of the size of it. The

1 house was built a long time ago. There is  
2 variances up and down the street, many other  
3 people here tonight are on the same street  
4 for variances.

5 MS. BOUREN: It's a 33-foot lot.

6 MR. BOUREN: If you follow the  
7 variances, for all the setbacks, you end up  
8 with like a 7-foot wide house or something,  
9 which isn't practical.

10 MS. BOUREN: So the house is  
11 getting five feet longer to accommodate the  
12 stairs. We are going to be two stories.  
13 Right now it's 850 square feet. It's one of  
14 the original cottages on the lake. We would  
15 like to update it, make it nicer, things like  
16 that.

17 And then the carport on the  
18 side is in the same position. We are going  
19 to make it a little bit longer, at least  
20 10 feet longer, to accommodate two full cars  
21 instead of like one and a half cars.

22 And then we were looking for  
23 an additional deck on the front. And then we

1 had a deck on the back, so it would be moving  
2 that back, farther back.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
4 Anything else? Is there anyone in the  
5 audience that wishes to make comment on this  
6 case?

7 Seeing none, correspondence?

8 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were  
9 31 letters mailed, one letter returned, one  
10 approval, six objections. The first  
11 objection is from Angela Maher at 1375 East  
12 Lake Drive. She notes a previous reply. She  
13 comments on the modular home, a setback too  
14 close to road in her opinion, and a rear  
15 setback that is too close to a telephone  
16 pole. She notes the neighbor's telephone  
17 caught on fire at one point after being  
18 struck by lightning, it took the fire  
19 department six hours to put out the fire.

20 The second objection is from  
21 Carl Ingling (ph) at 1389 East Lake Drive.  
22 He notes that he approves of the few  
23 variances requested, but asks that we note

1 his overall objection to the requested  
2 variance. He objects to the north side  
3 property line as it borders his property.  
4 Objection is to the front yard variance, as  
5 he believes it would allow the home to set  
6 too close to the road. He notes he has no  
7 objection to the lot coverage 39 percent, no  
8 objection to the south property line, no  
9 objection to the rear setback variance.

10 The third objection is from  
11 Brent Brashears (ph) at 1395 East Lake Road.  
12 He objects to the front yard setback at  
13 9.5 feet, and he believes it goes against  
14 case law for lake front homes, obstructing a  
15 neighbor's view of the water, 45-degree  
16 radius. And he notes that he doesn't believe  
17 the applicant provided an adequate site plan  
18 illustrating the house. He sent in an  
19 additional objection, noting the metal frame  
20 of the structure and notes the attempt to  
21 expand the original footprint, and he doesn't  
22 believe the hardship.

23 The last objection is from

1           Angela Maher. Reiterating some of her  
2           initial concerns and the traveling of the  
3           modular home upon installation.

4                       And then the approval is from  
5           Ed Peters at 1393 East Lake Drive. He notes  
6           that he lives next-door on the south side,  
7           has no objections to the plans they have  
8           submitted.

9                       That's the only approval.

10                      CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
11           you. Building department?

12                      MR. BUTLER: No comment.

13                      CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
14           Board members. Member Sanghvi.

15                      MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came  
16           and saw your property there and looked  
17           around, and as far as I am concerned, you're  
18           asking for a smaller house than you started  
19           with. I have no difficulty in it.

20                      MR. BOUREN: Smaller, yes.

21                      CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Member  
22           Peddiboyina?

23                      MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I have no

1 objections.

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
3 you. Member Montville?

4 MR. MONTVILLE: Can you speak to  
5 the improved esthetic value of the proposed  
6 house versus what you currently own? What  
7 kind of process you went through to improve  
8 on that?

9 MR. BOUREN: The current house is  
10 pretty old, has ceramic insulators in it.  
11 That kind of dates it. We don't use exposed  
12 wires anymore. It's old. I don't think it  
13 has a full foundation. It has cinder blocks  
14 that only go so deep. We have looked at many  
15 different options to improve the house,  
16 shoring up the foundation, lifting it,  
17 building onto our existing structure. We  
18 thought the modular house is a good build.  
19 They do them very efficiently now. And we  
20 thought that would be less hardship on the  
21 neighbors, tearing our house down and  
22 bringing in one in like that.

23 MR. MONTVILLE: I would note, the



1 information provided, it's clearly -- the  
2 focus was an improved esthetic component, and  
3 I would also be in support of the request as  
4 it's been submitted.

5 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay,  
6 thank you. Anyone else?

7 I have some questions about  
8 the deck. Since there has been issues  
9 from -- in the picture that you provided of  
10 the house, I think is going to look -- is  
11 that the blue -- blue and white house --

12 MR. BOUREN: That's similar to  
13 what we are looking for. It's a rectangle,  
14 it's kind of like that.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So the  
16 deck, if you can go back to your blueprint,  
17 the deck in the front is the 9 feet, is that  
18 to the road?

19 MR. BOUREN: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You  
21 mentioned that you have a deck now?

22 MR. BOUREN: We have a deck in  
23 the rear of the house. We don't have one on

1 the front. Our current entry on the front is  
2 on the side, in the driveway, which kind of  
3 makes it very tight driving cars through and  
4 getting through. So we wanted to move the  
5 front door to the front of the house and we  
6 wanted some type of deck to --

7 MS. BOUREN: Because it's raised  
8 up.

9 MR. BOUREN: From the front of  
10 the house. We didn't want to run across  
11 grass.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So what  
13 is the size of the front deck?

14 MR. BOUREN: That one is 6 feet.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: How wide?

16 MR. BOUREN: As wide as the  
17 house. We have it drawn there. The house is  
18 15 feet, 15 and a half feet wide.

19 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: And then  
20 the back deck that's going to be new? You  
21 were adding the back deck on for the --

22 MR. BOUREN: We have an existing  
23 back deck now. That's where our rear entry

1 is. We have steps to get up there. So the  
2 back deck is farther rearward because we are  
3 adding five feet to the length of the house.  
4 The house we have planned is getting  
5 narrower, but it's longer. When you add the  
6 stairs into the floor plan, it just crowds  
7 everything, so we added some additional  
8 length.

9 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

10 Then the carport that you mentioned, that's  
11 now going to be for two cars, correct? And  
12 then actually you don't have the storage,  
13 there is no basement, so the carport will  
14 also be, I would assume, lawnmowers and that  
15 sort of thing?

16 MS. BOUREN: No, we have a shed  
17 back there.

18 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Just one,  
19 is there just one shed?

20 MR. BOUREN: I have a portable  
21 canopy in the backyard where I store my boat  
22 and stuff.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: So those

1 are staying, the two sheds?

2 MR. BOUREN: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Question  
4 for the city. In regards to the canopy shed,  
5 I thought this was -- because there was an  
6 objection about that. Is there any  
7 regulation in regards to that, do they --

8 MR. BUTLER: Actually, in that  
9 area I have seen several of them. They don't  
10 have an HOA out there, association, so there  
11 is no association that prevents them from  
12 something like that. But there is nothing  
13 that says they cannot have that cover for  
14 their boat.

15 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Just  
16 checking. I have no objections to any of  
17 this, now that I've asked all my questions.  
18 I will be in full support of your request.

19 I think they're minimal. I  
20 think given the lot size and the improvements  
21 that you're making to your property, I think  
22 its going to be better for your neighborhood.

23 So I would entertain a motion

1 from someone. Member Montville?

2 MR. MONTVILLE: I move that we  
3 grant the variance as being requested in Case  
4 No. PZ16-0054, sought by David and Colleen  
5 Bouren, as the petitioner has shown practical  
6 difficulty requiring the variances, in order  
7 to properly use the lot as currently zoned.  
8 Without the variances, the petitioner will be  
9 unreasonably prevented or limited with  
10 respect to the use of the property, as is  
11 currently a non-conforming lot, requires the  
12 variances being requested. The property is  
13 unique, again due to it's non-conforming  
14 nature. Petitioner did not create that  
15 condition.

16 The relief granted will not  
17 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or  
18 surrounding properties as it is very near to  
19 the current foundation of the current  
20 structure and will increase in esthetic  
21 values and hopefully add to the value to the  
22 surrounding properties as well.

23 The relief is consistent with

1 the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

2 For those reasons, I move that  
3 we grant the variances as they have been  
4 requested.

5 MR. SANGHVI: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
7 moved and second. Any further discussion in  
8 regard to this?

9 Seeing none, Monica, would you  
10 please call the roll.

11 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

12 MS. KRIEGER: Yes.

13 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
14 Montville?

15 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

16 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
17 Peddiboyina?

18 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

19 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

20 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

21 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson  
22 Gronachan?

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

1 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
2 five to zero.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your  
4 variance has been granted. Good luck. I am  
5 sure you will be seeing the building  
6 department.

7 MR. BOUREN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Our last  
9 case for the evening is Future Homes and  
10 Design, PZ16-0056. The petitioner is here.

11 MR. JESHUIUN: Good evening,  
12 board members. I have some papers that I  
13 printed out for each one to explain a little  
14 better. We wanted to make sure you had hard  
15 copies.

16 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Before  
17 you get started, gentlemen, I need you to  
18 state your names and then be sworn in by our  
19 secretary, please.

20 MR. JESHUIUN: My name is Matthew  
21 Jeshuiun, J-e-s-h-i-u-n. This is my  
22 associate.

23 MR. TISHNER: My name is John

1 Tishner (ph). I am just helping him.

2 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Are you  
3 giving testimony this evening?

4 MR. TISHNER: No. I was just  
5 helping set things up.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Would you  
7 raise your right hand, sir, and be sworn in  
8 by our secretary.

9 MR. MONTVILLE: Do you promise to  
10 tell the truth in the testimony you are about  
11 to provide?

12 MR. JESHUIUN: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: You may  
14 proceed.

15 MR. JESHUIUN: I don't know if  
16 you remember, but I came before you about  
17 year and a half ago with Ms. Harris for this  
18 property. You can actually see the top  
19 blueprint copy you have, that's labeled  
20 original, is the house we became before you  
21 asking for variances in April 2015.

22 We have the same four  
23 variances that we are requesting for this



1 evening. They were all granted. It was  
2 basically a remodel. She had a current --  
3 existing home. We tore the second story  
4 down, we ended up running into a bunch of  
5 foundation issues and things that we  
6 addressed. You know, you guys granted the  
7 four variances and we built the house. It  
8 took about seven, eight months with all the  
9 issues we had, which is actually why I have  
10 the beard, because winter came and we worked  
11 all the way through winter and I kind of  
12 joked and said I wasn't going to shave the  
13 beard until the project was complete and  
14 unfortunately on April of 23rd of this year,  
15 the neighbor's house to the right caught fire  
16 and caught our house that was freshly built  
17 caught on fire also.

18 Ms. Harris, unfortunately  
19 wasn't able to be here this evening, she is  
20 at her other home in Washington D.C.  
21 obviously being displaced from the fire and  
22 the house being burned down. So I am  
23 essentially representing her this evening.

1                   With that being said, upon the  
2                   fire of April of 2015, this year, the  
3                   insurance company said we should bring in  
4                   structural engineers to deem whether or not  
5                   the house was salvagable.

6                   Basically the roof of the new  
7                   home caught fire. We still have the first  
8                   and second floor and the basement level  
9                   somewhat intact, but the fire department put  
10                  about 200,000 gallons of water into the  
11                  house. At one point the basement was  
12                  completely filled. I was there for the  
13                  whole -- from an hour after the fire started,  
14                  I was there for the day. I witnessed and  
15                  walked through all this.

16                  Structurally, an engineer  
17                  basically said, we need to tear it down,  
18                  water damage, you know, building products  
19                  there mostly, you know, wall sheathing, the  
20                  floor sheathing, all that swells when it gets  
21                  wet. So we just determined to take the house  
22                  down.

23                                   Building department pointed

1 out that we are in somewhat of a unique  
2 situation, that due not to Ms. Harris' fault,  
3 of the situation, she would be able to  
4 possibly keep her existing footprint, if the  
5 existing foundation was suitable to rebuild  
6 on.

7 The structural engineer said,  
8 you know, let's tear down the house. At the  
9 point of getting the house tore down, I will  
10 come back out and reassess the foundation and  
11 make a determination on whether or not it's  
12 suitable to rebuild on.

13 So we got the house tore down  
14 a couple of months ago, he came back out.  
15 And, you know, he said more or less, we can  
16 rebuild on it. It's going to need a little  
17 bit of reinforcement. Basically, everyone's  
18 consensus, mine, the homeowner's, the  
19 building department, structural engineer, the  
20 architect, everybody agrees, we are building  
21 a new home, why would we build it on top of a  
22 100 year old Michigan foundation. That's  
23 been somewhat hodgepodes over the past 60

1 years. You know, it's a partial foundation  
2 basement with partial crawl, and, you know,  
3 all these things work together. It's going  
4 to be the value of the future home along with  
5 surrounding properties, why would we build on  
6 it.

7 The answer to that is, well,  
8 if we can't get the variances, we are  
9 requesting this evening, her house is going  
10 to become so small that it would be pointless  
11 to build.

12 So, essentially we still have  
13 this existing foundation sitting in the  
14 ground waiting to hear whether or not we will  
15 get the approval from you guys and whether or  
16 not we can put a new foundation in the  
17 ground. Essentially, what we are asking for  
18 is almost identical to what we have already  
19 built. That's why I gave you the original  
20 and the proposed, so you can see the house  
21 has exactly gotten narrower. Because before  
22 on the north side, she was only a foot and a  
23 half off the property line, and that was

1 grandfathered in. You can see that that  
2 shaded in area is actually where the second  
3 floor came in, we actually stepped in a foot  
4 and a half, because as I have been told all  
5 along from the building department, that  
6 anything that's closer than three feet to the  
7 property line has to have a one hour rating,  
8 therefore, you can't have windows. So we  
9 have operated from the beginning that we are  
10 going to be 3 feet off the property line.  
11 She obviously is on a lake, she wants to have  
12 views of the lake. She doesn't want her  
13 north and south side to have no windows,  
14 especially with bedrooms. You know, you have  
15 to have egress. It don't make much sense.

16 So our new proposed foundation  
17 is actually a foot and a half narrower on the  
18 north side and I think eight inches narrower  
19 on the south side, from what we already  
20 built.

21 As far as everything else,  
22 it's basically the same. You know, we have a  
23 tower on the back. We have stretched a

1 little bit further towards the root side, but  
2 she still is well within the normal setback.  
3 That wasn't even something we needed to ask  
4 for. Essentially she is just trying to get  
5 the same square footage for this new build as  
6 opposed to what we had just built. So the  
7 house getting narrower 3 feet in length we  
8 stretched a little closer to the road.

9 Also with an opportunity to do  
10 a completely new foundation, we will be able  
11 to address some things that we were somewhat  
12 handcuffed on the first time around, which  
13 was the stairway, which was in a very odd  
14 location, and the elevator, which we ended up  
15 sticking on the outside of the building.

16 With the new foundation, we  
17 will able to address that, get the elevator  
18 into the inside, put the stairway in a better  
19 location, and, you know, that's really all  
20 that we have to say about it.

21 I mean, I could obviously go  
22 through all the reasons that she requested it  
23 the first time around, you know, those same

1 hardships still apply. She is an elderly  
2 woman, she is 69. She is looking to build,  
3 you know, her final home. She wants to stay  
4 here, she loves it in Novi. She obviously  
5 has another home in Washington DC, but she  
6 only spends winters there. She spends the  
7 other eight, nine months of the year here in  
8 Novi. She wants to build the house that she  
9 can in the future, if she needs to have care,  
10 she will have the elevator. You know, all  
11 those things.

12 Also we have signatures from  
13 neighbors of everyone that was okay with the  
14 build. That's basically the last page.

15 I think that's really all I  
16 have to say. Really the hardship this time  
17 comes around to the fact that she had a fire  
18 that was no fault of her own and her house  
19 had to be torn down. We are just looking to  
20 basically rebuild the same thing that she  
21 already had.

22 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.  
23 Anything else? Is there anyone in the

1 audience that wishes to make comment on this  
2 case?

3 Seeing none, is there any  
4 correspondence?

5 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes, there were  
6 45 letters mailed, four letters returned,  
7 zero approvals, and two objections.

8 The first objection comes from  
9 Chris Branmild (ph) at 1255 East Lake Road,  
10 notes he understands lake lots, the way  
11 things used to be. He says, that he believes  
12 when there is an opportunity to create more  
13 space between houses, that's what should be  
14 done. He notes the previous fire and he  
15 notes he has photos from the fire.

16 Second objection is from  
17 Robert Andrews at 1262 East Lake Drive. He  
18 objects to the setback on the north and  
19 south. He notes a 40 foot wide lot, which  
20 should be at least five feet on each side and  
21 the house on the lake side should be no  
22 closer to the lake than 25 feet.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.



1 Building department?

2 MR. BUTLER: No comment.

3 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
4 you. Board members. Member Sanghvi?

5 MR. SANGHVI: Thank you. I came  
6 and saw your property. It's a very small  
7 lot. What you are asking to do is basically  
8 reconstruct the house that used to be there.  
9 Footprint being the same in every other  
10 respect. I have no difficulty supporting  
11 your application. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Anyone  
13 else? I have no objection to this. I think  
14 it was very tragic and I am grateful no one  
15 was hurt.

16 And under the circumstances,  
17 being that these variances were previously  
18 granted, and as you gave testimony to through  
19 no fault of the petitioner's, the house needs  
20 to be rebuilt.

21 So I think that these  
22 variances are within the spirit of the  
23 ordinance, given the lot size, given the

1 conditions and that they were granted before,  
2 I think that because you addressed the --  
3 brought it in a little bit off the lot line,  
4 was a good thing.

5 Therefore, I will be in full  
6 support of your request.

7 Member Krieger?

8 MR. SANGHVI: Did you want to  
9 address the objections?

10 MR. JESHUIUN: I forgot to say in  
11 my statement that basically what we are  
12 asking for has been, you know, pretty much  
13 applied up and down the street and granted.  
14 There is three new houses that have been  
15 built in the past year. One is less than  
16 25 feet off the water, they're all like three  
17 foot off the property line. You know, the  
18 first time around I took pictures of all the  
19 houses up and down. I didn't feel that I  
20 needed to do it a second time being that  
21 we're essentially asking for what we had  
22 already been granted the first time.

23 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Okay.

1 Member Peddiboyina?

2 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: I have no  
3 objections. You being a good homeowner in  
4 getting the signature of the neighbors. Good  
5 luck.

6 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Thank  
7 you. I would like to entertain a motion.  
8 Anyone ready? Member Krieger.

9 MS. KRIEGER: In Case No.  
10 PZY16-0056, for Future Homes and Design, I  
11 move to approve the request for the  
12 variance -- for variances requested, that the  
13 petitioner has shown practical difficulty and  
14 due to the topography and limited use of  
15 space on each house on East Lake Drive,  
16 around the whole Walled Lake, have shown  
17 evidence of doing their homework for what is  
18 best that would fit in with the site, that  
19 the property is unique and they did not  
20 create this condition. The relief will not  
21 unreasonably interfere with adjacent or  
22 surrounding properties, or will actually  
23 increase potential sale values in the

1 neighborhood, and it is in the spirit and  
2 intent of the ordinance.

3 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: It's been  
5 moved and second. Is there any further  
6 discussion?

7 Monica, would you please call  
8 the roll.

9 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Krieger?

10 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

11 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
12 Montville?

13 MR. MONTVILLE: Yes.

14 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member  
15 Peddiboyina?

16 MR. PEDDIBOYINA: Yes.

17 MS. DRESLINSKI: Member Sanghvi?

18 MR. SANGHVI: Yes.

19 MS. DRESLINSKI: Chairperson  
20 Gronachan?

21 CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Yes.

22 MS. DRESLINSKI: Motion passes  
23 five to zero.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Your variances have been granted. I'm sure you will be working with the building department and good luck this time.

MR. JESHUIUN: Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: That concludes this evening. Does anyone have anything else to add to the board, or bring in front of the board?

I would like to remind everybody of the Christmas party on December 9. Please check your email for your invitation and respond to Cheryl Walsh. So I would like to see all the board members there. Some of you didn't make it last year, you were missed. We all talked about because you weren't there. This year I don't want that to happen again, Member Montville. Just kidding.

Is there anything else?

MR. SANGHVI: Wish you a very Happy Thanksgiving.

CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: Happy

1           Holidays. For this year, now that Member  
2           Sanghvi brought this up, I'd like to say a  
3           special thanks to the building department.  
4           They do a great job. Monica is going to be  
5           moving into something else. We have Carol  
6           our new girl, and we have a city attorney  
7           that works very hard. We have Larry our new  
8           member. We are very lucky to have such a  
9           wonderful group in the City of Novi. And  
10          that's what we have -- one more thing to be  
11          thankful for this year. I want to thank you  
12          all of you on behalf of this board. You took  
13          calls, you take emails, you follow-up. It's  
14          not easy working with a group of volunteers,  
15          but you manage to get it done. It's always  
16          on a professional level. And so I take this  
17          motion to thank you all now.

18                                With that, I would like --

19                                MR. SANGHVI: Amen to whatever  
20          you said. We should adjourn.

21                                CHAIRPERSON GRONACHAN: All those  
22          in favor.

23                                THE BOARD: Aye.

