



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ACTION SUMMARY
CITY OF NOVI
Tuesday, October 14, 2025 7:00 PM
Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 Ten Mile Rd
(248) 347-0415

Call to Order: 7:00 PM

Roll call: Chairperson Montague, Member Sanghvi, Member Thompson, Member Peddiboyina, Member Longo, Member Krieger, Member Samona

Present: Chairperson Montague, Member Sanghvi, Member Thompson, Member Peddiboyina, Member Longo, Member Krieger, Member Samona

Absent:

Also Present: Alan Hall (Community Development Deputy Director), Beth Saarela (City Attorney), Megan Nardone (Recording Secretary)

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes:

Approved

Approval of Agenda:

Approved

Public Remarks:

None

Public Hearings:

PZ25-0048 (Brian Frank) 721 South Lake Drive, east of Owenton Street, Parcel 50-22-03-404-010. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.32.10.A.ii.a to allow a 456 sq. ft. deck (100 sq. ft. allowed, variance of 356 sq. ft.); 3.32.10.A.ii.b for 29% lot coverage(5% allowed, variance of 24%); 3.32.10.Aii.C to allow the fence on the property line and 5 ft from the road (1 ft from property line, and 10 ft from the road required). This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-4) District.

Motion to grant the variance in case number PZ25-0048 sought by Brian Frank for 721 South Lake Drive because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the variance for a 356 square foot deck, 29% variance for lot coverage, and to allow the fence on the property line and 5 feet from the road 10 feet from the road required. Without the variance Petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property because they are replacing the previous deck with new material according to city requirements, and it's the same size as their previous deck with little improvement, the property is unique because it's lakefront. The petitioner did not create the condition because the reconstruction will be very similar because the seawall that failed, wasn't their fault. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, because it is similar to current neighbors that were taken down from the repair of the seawall, and as they explained, it'll be very similar in height with the fence.

Motion Maker: Krieger

Seconded: Sanghvi

Motion Carried: 7:0

PZ25-0049 (John and Callie Moylan) 24730 Sarah Flynn, north of Ten Mile Road, east of Beck Road, Parcel 50-22-21-328-012 The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for an aggregate side yard setback of 21 ft (25 ft required, variance of 4 ft). This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-4) District.

Motion to grant the variance in case PZ25-0049, sought by John and Callie Moylan for the 4-foot variance. Because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty, getting permission to expand, going up with their current home. Without the variance, the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property. This does not expand the current footprint. The property is unique because the garage is already built. The expansion is going to go on top of that. The petitioner did not create the condition, because of some old zoning. They said, "We're just trying to clean it up." The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. Because the garage footprint was already made, going up again. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. This will not interfere with the neighbors and is seen by the neighbors approved, and none object.

Motion Maker: Thompson
Seconded: Longo
Motion Carried: 7:0

PZ25-0050 (Raising Cane's) 26245 Novi Road, on Novi Road, south of Crescent Boulevard, Parcel 50-22-15-476-049. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Ordinance Section 5.4.2 to omit the requirement for the loading zone to be located within the rear yard setback. This property is zoned Town Center (TC).

Motion to grant the variance in case number PZ25-0050, sought by Raising Cane's, for option two. This is for the unloading zone in the rear yard setback because petitioners have shown particular difficulty in requiring them to receive the necessary goods. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property, because receiving goods would be very difficult. The property is unique because it had originally a similar activity. Petitioners did not create the condition because they purchased a property that was already doing a similar business. The relief granted will not reasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, because it presents no additional obstruction, and it will be utilized primarily in non-business hours. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it presents no obstruction to the nearby properties.

Motion Maker: Longo
Seconded: Krieger
Motion Carried: 7:0

Other Matters:

Meeting Adjournment: 7:59 pm

Zoning Ordinance, Section 7.10.8 - Miscellaneous.

No order of the Board permitting the erection of a building shall be valid for a period longer than one (1) year unless a building permit for such erection or alteration is obtained within such period and such erection or alteration is started and proceeds to completion in accordance with the terms of such permit.

No order of the Board permitting a use of a building or premises shall be valid for a period longer than one-hundred and eighty (180) days unless such use is established within such a period; provided, however, where such use permitted is dependent upon the erection or alteration of a building such order shall continue in force and effect if a building permit for such erection or alteration is obtained within one (1) year and such erection or alteration is started and proceeds to completion in accordance with the terms of such permit.

Such time limits shall be extended for those applicants requiring site plan review to a period of thirty (30) days after the date of final site plan approval has been given by the City. (Ord. No. 18.226, 5-12-08; Ord. No. 10-18.244, Pt. VII, 11-8-10).