



**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ACTION SUMMARY**  
**CITY OF NOVI**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2024, 7:00 PM**  
**Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 Ten Mile Rd**  
**(248) 347-0415**

- Call to Order:** 7:00 pm
- Roll call:** Chairperson Peddiboyina, Member Sanghvi, Member Thompson, Member Longo, Member Montague, Member Krieger, Member McLeod
- Present:** Chairperson Peddiboyina, Member Sanghvi, Member Thompson, Member Longo, Member Montague, Member Krieger, Member McLeod
- Absent Excused:**
- 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:

**PZ24-0041 (Katherine To) 21101 Cambridge Drive, north of Eight Mile Road, east of Meadowbrook Road, Parcel 50-22-36-328-002.** The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 4.19.1.J to allow a sixth detached accessory structure (5 existing) for a lot having more than 21,780 square feet of area (maximum of two allowed, variance of 4 additional); Section 4.19.2.A to allow an accessory structure in the front yard (accessory structures are only permitted in the rear yard). This property is zoned One-Family Residential Acreage (R-A).

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ24-0041 sought by Katherin To, for a sixth detached accessory structure an addition structure, and an accessory structure in the front yard. Without the variance the Petitioner will be limited in their use of the property because their property is protected by wetlands. They are doing a good job by not disturbing those or asking to take those out, which I greatly appreciate. The property is unique because it is a really large property with large separation between the adjacent properties. They did not create the condition because they bought the house, and the lot as is. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with any surrounding adjacent properties. as a matter of fact, you won't be able to see this from there because it is such a large lot, and the sidelines are after you get onto their property. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it allows the resident to use their property for this green house and what looks like a beautiful garden. It will be a great addition to their property.

**Motion Maker: Montague**  
**Seconded: Sanghvi**  
**Motion Carried: 7:0**

**PZ24-0042 (Lawrence MacDonald) 45530 White Pines Drive, north of Nine Mile Road, west of Taff Road, Parcel 50-22-28-426-002.** The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.4 for a rear yard setback of 31.88 ft. (35 ft. required, variance of 3.12 ft.); This variance would accommodate a covered deck on the rear of the home. This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-3).

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ24-0042 sought by Dr. Lawrence MacDonald for a rear yard setback because Petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring approval to build a bigger rear deck. Without the variance the Petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because of the shape of the property. The property is unique because it backs up to the woods. Petitioner did not create the condition because they were not the original home builder. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because it's such a minimal request. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance with the new deck being smaller and all of the approval letters from your neighbors and you HOA. You made that one easy for us.

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

**PZ24-0043 (Ryan Francis) 45827 Galway Drive, south of Nine Mile Road, west of Taff Road, Parcel 50-22-33-280-002** The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.2 for a side yard setback of 12.5 ft. (15 ft. required, variance of 2.5 ft.); This variance would accommodate a garage addition. This property is zoned One-Family Residential (R-1).

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ24-0043 sought by the Francis Family for a side yard setback for 12.5 feet to the side because Petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring the 2.5-foot variance. Without the variance the Petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to use of the property because of their growing family. The property is unique because the location and it was an already existing one car garage on the property to assist with the creation of the addition. Petitioner did not create the condition; it is not a lot split and its already existing. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, it is consistent with the neighborhood. There are other homes who have garage doors facing Galaway as well. The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because it is a reasonable request.

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

**PZ24-0044 (Houston Hot Chicken) 43339 Crescent Boulevard, north of Grand River Avenue, east of Novi Road, Parcel 50-22-14-351-063.** The applicant is requesting a variance from the City of Novi Sign Ordinance Section 28-5(a) to allow an additional wall sign (1 wall sign allowed, variance of 1 additional wall sign). This property is zoned Town Center (TC).

I move that we grant the variance in Case No. PZ24-0044, sought by Houston Hot Chicken, for a sign variance because Petitioner has shown practical difficulty including exposing the business on both sides of the building. That the request is based upon circumstances or features that are exceptional and unique to the property and do not result from conditions that exist generally in the city or that are self-created including two sides of the building are visible by the public. That the failure to grant relief will unreasonably prevent or limit the use of the property and will result in substantially more than mere inconvenience or inability to attain a higher economic or financial return because the business would not be easily seen on the back side or front side. That the grant of relief would be offset by other improvements or actions, such as increased setbacks or increased landscaping, such that the net effect will result in an improvement of the property or the project so that the business is visible on both sides. That construction of a conforming sign would create the removal or significant alteration of natural features on the property because it will not modify the property. The grant of relief will not result in a use or structure that is incompatible with or unreasonably interferes with adjacent or surrounding properties, will result in

substantial justice being done to both the applicant and adjacent or surrounding properties, and is not inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the chapter because they are in a group of buildings that also have signs on both sides.

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

**Other Matters:** None

**Meeting Adjournment:** 7:53 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).