



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ACTION SUMMARY
CITY OF NOVI
Tuesday, June 10, 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 Butler, Alternate Member Samona,

Present: Chairperson Montague, Member Thompson, Member Longo, Member Krieger, Alternate Member Samona

Absent: Member Sanghvi, Member Peddiboyina, Member Butler

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

Pledge of Allegiance
Approval of Minutes: **Approved**
Approval of Agenda: **Approved**
Public Remarks: **None**
Public Hearings:

PZ25-0018 (William Schlie) 41725 Sycamore Drive, south of Ten Mile Road, west of Meadowbrook Road, Parcel 50-22-26-277-007. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.5 for a 29.27 ft rear yard setback (35 ft required, variance of 5.73 ft). This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-4).

I move that we grant the variance in case PZ25-0018 sought by William Schlie for the 5.73-yard setback because the petitioner has shown difficulty working with a 35-foot setback. Without the variance the petitioner would be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property with the current extension already going on to some pavers or patio that was already laid. The property is unique because it goes back to the wetlands. It's not going to affect any other neighbors. The petitioner did not create the condition because of the lot dimensions. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with the adjacent of surrounding properties. They're not going to see it. The main one would be, again, the wetlands back there, like you said, both your neighbors approve of it, so the people that are going to see it the most have no problem with it. The relief is consistent with the spirit and the intent of the ordinance, again, mainly just back up to the wood and being a small setback.

Motion Maker: Thompson
Seconded: Krieger
Motion Carried: 5:0

PZ25-0019 (BSR Deck Construction) 1241 East Lake Drive, on East Lake Drive, south of Fourteen Mile Road, Parcel 50-22-02-151-048. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.32.10.A.ii.a to allow a 560 sq ft floating deck accessory structure on the lake lot (100 sq ft allowed, variance of 460 sq ft); Section 3.32.10.A.ii.b to allow 35% lot coverage (5% allowed, variance of 30%). This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-4).

I move that we grant the variance in case PZ25-0019 for BSR Deck Construction on 1241 East Lake Drive. The applicant is requesting variances to allow 560 sq ft floating deck accessory structure on the lake encompassing the deck, the floating deck and the stairs. One hundred sq ft is allowed, variance of 460 for an allowed variance request of 30%. The petitioner has shown practical difficulty from the given data and the presentation. That the current deck will be removed and staircase and replaced to encompass the newer area, which will be aesthetically pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood. The area is a very steep area but has the best sunset pictures. Without the variance petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because it be more unsafe to encompass a smaller area for the stairs and deck together. As explained, the floating deck will be better lasting. The property is unique because it is on one of the higher parts of the lake causing the steepness of this from the street line to the waterline. The petitioner did not create the condition because a explained. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties. It will enhance the area. And relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of ordinance. Because the petitioner will be consistent with the street level, the home and the water level, and neighboring areas.

Motion Maker: Krieger
Seconded: Samona
Motion Carried: 5:0

PZ25-0021 (Great Lakes Ace Hardware) 41800 Ten Mile Road, north of Ten Mile Road, west of Meadowbrook Road, Parcel 50-22-19-400-012. The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Sign Ordinance Section 28-5(a) to allow two additional wall signs on the east elevation (1 sign allowed, variance of 2). This property is zoned General Business (B-3).

I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ25-0021 sought by Great Lakes Ace Hardware for a two-sign variance because petitioner has shown practical difficulty, including making one sign and not more square footage requiring two additional signs based on the following. That the failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more no and substantially more than mere inconvenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return because the store's frontage is wide enough that the two additional signs present no problem. The grant relief will not result in the use of structure that is incompatible or unreasonably interferes with the adjacent or surrounding properties and will result in substantial justice being done to both the applicant and the adjacent surrounding properties and is not inconsistent with the spirit and intent of this chapter, and the signs present no distraction.

Motion Maker: Krieger
Seconded: Samona
Motion Carried: 5:0

PZ25-0022 (J Michael Homes) 49805 Nine Mile Road, on Nine Mile Road, west of Garfield Road, Parcel 50-22-30-476-004 The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a side yard setback of 10 ft. (20 ft. required, variance of 10 ft.); aggregate side yard setback of 30 ft. (50 ft. required, variance of 20 ft.). This property is zoned Residential Acreage (R-A).

I move that we grant the variance in case number PZ25-0022 sought by Michael J Homes for the dimensional variance as requested. Ten-foot side yar setback variance, 20-foot side yard aggregate reduction variance because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the variances for a garage due to the lot dimensions and the layout of the home. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or

limited with respect to the use of the property because of the narrow lot which would otherwise not allow for a side car entry garage and very limited space for any garage. The property is unique because of the lot dimensions, location and main road frontage. Petitioner did not create the condition because the necessity for a variance has been there prior to this owner owning the home. The lot size already would require a variance regardless of what the size of the home was. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it sides to wetland and back to the ITC. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is consistent with the adjoining properties and the lot would not be useable if a variance was not granted because of the width.

Motion Maker: Samona
Seconded: Krieger
Motion Carried: 5:0

Other Matters:

Meeting Adjournment: 8:23 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).