

03/10/2026
Regular Meeting- Zoning Board of Appeals
City of Novi
Tuesday, March 10, 2026
Council Chambers/ Novi Civic Center
41725 Novi Road
Novi, Michigan

BOARD MEMBERS:

W.Clift Montague, Chairperson
Linda Krieger, Member
Mike Longo, Secretary
Joe Samona, Member
Michael Thompson, Member
Joe Peddiboyina, Member
Marc Jappaya, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney,
Alan Hall, Deputy Community Development Director
Megan Nardone, Recording Secretary

REPORTEDBY:

MeganNardone
Recording Secretary

Start time: 7:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: I'd like to call to order the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for Tuesday, March the 10th. Pledge of allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited)

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MS. NARDONE: Member Jappaya?

MEMBER JAPPAYA: Here.

MS. NARDONE: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Here.

MS NARDONE: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. NARDONE: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Here.

MS. NARDONE: Member Samona?

MEMBER SAMONA: Here.

MS. NARDONE: Chairperson Montague?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Here.

MS. NARDONE: Thank you. We have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. We'll start with the rules of conduct. We have two cases tonight. Please put your cell phones on silence, or turn them off, if you would. The applicant for each case will be asked to come forward and state their case after they're sworn in by the secretary. You're allowed ten minutes to present your case. Anyone in the audience that wishes to address that case, please raise their hand to be acknowledged, and they will come up and they will have three minutes. I think that's pretty much got that covered. All right. We did not receive the minutes of the February meeting, so I will look for a motion to put off approval of that until next month's meeting.

MEMBER SAMONA: Motion to postpone the approval of the minutes from February.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay.

MS. NARDONE: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. NARDONE: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Samona?

MEMBER SAMONA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Chairperson Montague?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Jappaya?

MEMBER JAPPAYA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Thank you. Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: I thank you. All right. Do we have any changes to the agenda?

MR. HALL: We did not.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. There was a description problem in the advertisement. It's correct on the cases tonight. So there was just a little glitch in the description of the variance requested in numbered case number PZ26-0005. But it is correct on the agenda that you have in front of you. I would look for a motion to approve the agenda.

MEMBER LONGO: So moved.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Second.

MS. NARDONE: Member Peddiboynia?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYNIA: Yes, please.

MS. NARDONE: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KREIGER: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Samona?

MEMBER SAMONA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Chairperson Montague?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Jappaya?

MEMBER JAPPAYA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Thank you. Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you. This is the point in the meeting where we will entertain any public remarks—remarks not associated with the case. If there are any general public remarks that you would like, just raise your hand to be recognized. All is good. All right. Well, thank you. All right, so we will begin our hearings tonight. We have two cases.

Case number one, PZ26-0003, Central Park Estates. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.8.2.C for an increase in the maximum horizontal length of the building to 261.5 ft; 180 ft is maximum, so the variance is 81.5 ft. Section 3.1.8.D for a reduction in the parking setback to 11.5 ft; 20 ft is required, so that's a variance of 8.5 ft. Section 3.8.2.G for the absence of a sidewalk on one side of the driveway; sidewalk on both sides is required. Section 5.10.1.b.VI for a reduction of building setback from the abutting parking spaces to 14 ft; 25 ft is required, resulting in a variance of 11 ft. Section 3.1.8.D to allow areas with less than 50 ft dimension to be considered as usable open space, and to reduce the required open space to 14,600 sq. ft.; 21,200 sq. ft. is required, resulting in a variance request of 6,600 sq. ft.; and Section 5.2.4 to allow eight parking spaces to be located off site. All residential parking is to be located on the premises it is intended to serve. This property is zoned High Density Multiple Family RM-2.

MEMBER SAMONA: Can we get that reread?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay, I'll read backwards; that happens. If the applicant in the room would like to come up and present, please come forward, state, and spell your name.

MR. BOWMAN: Good evening. My name is Blair Bowman, B-L-A-I-R B-O-W-M-A-N.

MEMBER LONGO: Blair, are you an attorney?

MR. BOWMAN: I am not a practicing attorney. Never got my PIN number, so I can tell the jobs to you.

MEMBER LONGO: Promise to tell the truth in this case.

MR. BOWMAN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MR. BOWMAN: Yeah. So representing Central Park South, which is just a technicality to it as part of the overall Central Park Estates property. Planning on being very brief. You may recall that we've been in front of the good board two different times with essentially the same basic types of variances.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Excuse me a second. You got some visuals you can put up for that?

MR. BOWMAN: I certainly do.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Don't mean to interrupt you, but—

MR. BOWMAN: Nope. That's okay.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: It's nice to have something to talk to.

MR. BOWMAN: Sure.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Good for the people at home, too.

MR. BOWMAN: Sorry. So this is that road here on the west side. North of the proposed project is the existing tennis courts and clubhouse, and several of the existing buildings in the existing Central Park Estates project. So that should orientate you. The basis for coming back before you this evening is that we have received very recently unanimous approval and recommendation from the planning commission for a revised preliminary site plan for the project. After coming back for an extension of the previously approved variances, we were engaged in, as I offered to the board, a process where we were looking at how, you know, battling with all of the market conditions, costs, those types of things, but also wanting to make sure that we essentially right-sized the building, had the right product type. We engaged with a really terrific relationship with the new design-build architect and construction contractor, the guys' companies. That really took a look at the site, and what it called for was a reduction in overall density from the previously approved 142 down to 106 units. The building is still at the same height, but it is positioned further away from any of the adjacent residential properties.

And most importantly, it is significantly further out of any of the on-site features, both wetlands and woodlands. We were in a position previously in the preservation area, actually proposing mitigation that was required by the local ordinance. We no longer have to do that. So that

converted into mitigation for wetlands, and the, you know, the whole program and procedure just puts this into a position that we are pleased to come forth with a very much improved plan from the standpoint of the site itself. We are very comfortable and confident. We've even been through the preliminary conceptual approval stage at HUD, with a market study that is consistent and indicates that this should be a very, very competitive and a cooperative product compared to the existing Central Park—like a kind of a co-op petition type of thing—but very complimentary, if you would. And one of the biggest things to understand is that these are

a number of essentially the very same variances. They're slightly different in size and nature, but the key thing is this was always intended to be developed as a part of a master project. And there are extraordinarily large amounts of open space that benefit both the existing Central Park Estates and the proposed Central Park site. So, happy to get into any more detail that you would like, but certainly happy to answer any questions as well.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. That sums it up pretty well. Thank you. Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak to this?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: I see a lot of head no's. I will ask the city for their input.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, you are asking for six dimensional variances tonight. And as you said, I'll recap these again: a variance to allow an 81.5-foot increase in maximum horizontal length of the building; a variance to allow an 8.5 ft reduction in the parking setback per the plan; a variance to allow a sidewalk on only one side of the driveway per the plan; a variance to reduce a building-to-parking setback by 11 ft; a variance to reduce the required open space by 66,000 sq. ft.; and a variance to allow eight required parking spaces to be located off site. The City of Novi Planning Department does not object to these requests. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Correspondence.

MEMBER LONGO: Yes, we mailed out 15 notices. None were returned; there were no approvals, but there were no objections.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. Thank you. All right. We'll open it up to the board. Joe?

MEMBER SAMONA: I have one question, but first I want to make a comment. When you look at it on its face, you look at the amount of variances requested, and the facts are the facts. I definitely would say that I would feel a lot more comfortable supporting this, being that Mr. Bowman is behind it and being what he's contributed to the city and how he's helped it grow. So I don't think that he would bring anything before the city in any aspect that would be nefarious in nature—only goodwill. So that definitely makes me more comfortable.

I do have a question. Although the city sent out letters, have you all done anything, too? Because there's so much involved here. Have you done anything to reach out to the community, although maybe not required? Have you all done anything proactively to reach out to the

community and see what their thoughts, questions, or concerns are, just because of the amount of requests here?

MR. BOWMAN: So, and one thing I really want to stress again, too—it probably should have been my initial comment—is many of these are technical in nature because they are technically two different parcels, right? Even though they're—if the imaginary property line wasn't there, several of these ordinances or these variances wouldn't be necessary, at least to the extent that they are. The second question, as it relates to adjacent property owners, I will tell you that over

years, and looking at what we were going to be doing with this property, we've had engagement with most of the residential property owners on the south side of the site, particularly those abutting along 11 Mile Road, that came to the, frankly, the last Planning Commission meeting. I don't think that they came to the last zoning board meeting, where they expressed some concerns—mainly with disruption of the preservation easement area. That is now not going to occur. They were concerned about even grading work in those areas because of the drainage, and of course we are moving the impacts considerably further to the north.

I will tell you that I've engaged with the homeowners association in a number of different discussions about not only this property, but the long-term potential for the whole Grand River corridor redevelopment component of things. And I don't want to put words in their mouth, but I will tell you that there was no objection that was provided at the Planning Commission, whereas there was previously, except for there was one concerning comment about wildlife and, you know, the flora and fauna type of thing. And I frankly talked to the young lady afterwards, and I don't think she was aware of the changes in magnitude as far as amount of impact. And she seemed pretty—not satisfied, because she was still concerned about, you know, what's going to happen to the wildlife and things like that—which we will do our level best. But obviously we're going to be developing portions of the site.

So I don't know if that directly answers your question, because it's not that I've had a considerable amount of additional engagement, but I will—I think it speaks for itself. The plan has sincerely and severely reduced the amount of potential impact. There's a huge buffering barrier between any of the existing residential. That was submitted in an exhibit for the Planning Commission consideration as far as views, so we're very comfortable and confident that this is going to be a very complimentary component to that growth corridor.

MEMBER SAMONA: I'm still not convinced he's not a lawyer, but—

MR. BOWMAN: I did go to law school and pass the bar.

MEMBER SAMONA: That State Fair parking would be nice.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. What else have we got here again?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Okay.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Good.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you, Mr. Bowman. Really appreciate your business and to the City of Novi, always, and also the presentation. I've seen many years on this project, what you are doing is amazing, and being to the City of Novi, we really appreciate that. And coming to this project, I have no objection to support this. Thank you.

MR. BOWMAN: Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: I have one question for the city. This off-site parking—I realize that it's the same owner of the properties, but with it being two different parcels, what kind of problems could that possibly bring up in the past? Say one of these parcels was broken off and sold to someone else—how does that all work? That he's got the eight spots on the other off-site parking, as it's called.

MS. SAARELA: He can do a declaration of covenants that will always preserve the right of the properties to use it only as they are proposing, the site manager.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay.

MR. BOWMAN: We will be doing a parking easement, and it was reviewed that that is available area. It's not necessary for the existing Central Park, so it is access, and it literally takes eight spaces where they would have to be located. It would go right again into some wooded and wetland areas. So instead, we're using existing surface area that we're going to be able to actually just stripe and then reconfigure, where the new connecting road—because there'll be a connecting road and walkways and pathways. And really, I should even mention that for the long term, if we're successful and honored to be able to move forward with the larger-scale plan, there'll be even walking and bike paths that will connect into the future development for the city west vision along the Grand River corridor as well.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay.

MEMBER SAMONA: So Beth, we don't need to mention that as part of—okay.

MS. SAARELA: No.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Yeah, I appreciate that he didn't cut into more wetlands to do that.

MR. BOWMAN: Yeah, that's existing pavement.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: We just want to make sure there wasn't an issue we need to address in our motion. So anybody else got a question or comment? No? Then I guess I will entertain a motion.

MEMBER SAMONA: Mr. Chair, I move that we grant the variances requested in case number PZ26-0003, sought by Central Park Estates South/NOBE Property Group II, LLC, for the six dimensional variances as requested on their application, because the petitioner has shown practical difficulty requiring development of a high-density residential property that is constrained by its shape, size, existing easement areas, wetland impacts, and adjacency to back road right-of-way, making strict compliance with the ordinance, with dimensional standards in the ordinance, unreasonably burdensome. Without the variance, the petitioner will be unreasonably prevented or limited with respect to the use of the property. Because of the parcels configuration, easement areas, wetland constraints, and the required 60ft setback from the back road right of way, significantly reducing the buildable area, making it impossible to develop a

Permitted high-density multi-family in compliance with all dimensional standards.

Simultaneously, the property is unique because it is constrained by multiple easement areas, on-site wetlands, a variable-width back road right-of-way requiring a 60 ft setback from centerline, and its overall shape and size—conditions that do not apply generally in other RM-2 zone properties in the vicinity. Petitioner did not create the condition because the easements, wetlands, road right-of-way, and parcel configuration were preexisting conditions on the property and were not caused by any action of the current or previous property owner.

The relief granted would not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties, because the proposed development is consistent with the RM-2 zoning designation, provides adequate parking at a ratio of 2.03 spaces per unit, includes meaningful amenity and open space areas, and the City of Novi Planning Department, as mentioned, has reviewed the request and does not object to any of these variances sought.

The relief is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance because the variances are the minimum necessary to allow a permitted high-density residential use on a constrained parcel. The overall development meets the intent of the RM-2 district, and the deviations from dimensional standards do not compromise public safety, the character of the neighborhood, or the purpose of the underlying zoning regulations. Now I'm going to read it in Spanish.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: I second.

MR. HALL: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Can I have the motion to amend the motion to include the six dimensional variances that were described in the meeting specifically?

MEMBER SAMONA: You want me to state them specifically?

MR. HALL: You can just say—

MS. SAARELA: You can say, as opposed to “so,” we just changed—

MR. HALL: So you can say the six that were mentioned—they're not being changed—the six that were mentioned in the meeting.

MEMBER SAMONA: I'll amend my motion to approve to add that the six variances requested that are mentioned at the meeting, and that were mentioned prior to calling the petitioner up as a result of this case—and those are the six that I'm referring to.

MEMBER PEDDABOYINA: I second.

MS. NARDONE: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Samona?

MEMBER SAMONA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Chairperson Montague?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Jappaya?

MEMBER JAPPAYA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Peddiboyinya?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Yeah. Yes, please.

MS. NARDONE: Thank you. Motion carries.

MEMBER KREIGER: Best wishes.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you very much.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Congratulations, Mr. Bowman.

MEMBER SAMONA: About the State Fair parking?

MR. BOWMAN: We're working on that.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. Okay. Case number two, PZ26-0005, from William Moore. The applicant is requesting variances from the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance Section 3.1.1 for a side yard setback of six feet; 20 ft is required, so it would result in a variance of 14 ft, and an aggregate side yard setback of 29 ft; 50 ft is required, so that would be a variance of 21 ft. The property is zoned Residential Acreage (R-A). Is the applicant here to present? Okay. Please come and say and spell your name.

MR. MOORE: William Moore, W-I-L-L-I-A-M M-O-O-R-E.

MEMBER LONGO: Are you an attorney?

MR. MOORE: No I'm not.

MEMBER LONGO: You promise to tell the truth? In this case,

MR. MOORE: I do.

MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay, if you put a visual up, that would be great. See how we can help you tonight.

MR. MOORE: Well, I was actually in here May of 2025 for a variance, and what was approved—I was bringing it from the 50 down to a 30. We were looking to do 20 on the west side to the neighboring home and the east side. Adjacent to the east side is the City of Novi acreage that they purchased—I believe it was probably about seven years ago—and there's about 13 acres there, a lot of wetlands and woodlands.

After we received the approval, we were working with the surveyor and also the architect for the property, and that's where we were coming in with some difficulties. The plot plan shows that the lot is approximately 85 ft in width, whereas the requirement for residential acreage is 100 and 50 ft. I'm sorry—100 and 20 ft minimum.

And so, with the plot plan being done, the surveyor mentioned that the 85 ft footprint—or between the two lot lines—he mentioned they're not parallel. So we should be working with 84 ft between the lines from front to back.

So, when coming up with a design for the home—also, I am a real estate broker, and I've been just shy of 30 years—I also did some research from Ten Mile Road to Eight Mile Road, from back to Napier, which covers a mile each way off of Nine Mile. All the homes that I was able to find from 2000 to present all have side-entry garages.

So, because I imagine that's one of the things, why don't we just do a front-entry garage? The standard, at least for the last 20 years, what I was able to find—every house that was built within that time has a side-entry garage. We are also kind of kitty-corner from Evergreen Court. Their bylaws request that, and again, we're not part of it, but it just kind of goes to show what's

going on around there: four-car side-entry garage, Terra Court—those are all side-entry garages within walking distance.

And then also, as far as impact, again, the hardship was not created by myself. It's that the actual zoning of the property doesn't meet the zoning restrictions, but I do live about 200 yards from the property.

So, in the notice that was given out regarding the hearing, I actually personally received one too. I wasn't going to send it back saying that I approve it, but obviously, that's what I'm looking for. When we came in, or when I came in in May, I was asking for 20 ft to the west side of the property. That house we built and sold last year in July.

And ten feet to the east again, siding to the Novi property. This time, we're looking for the property that's to the west that we built—actually increasing the setback three feet. So instead of 20 ft, we would actually be looking at 23 ft to the neighboring property, and the reason being is we want to do that side-entry garage.

We also need the three feet of green space between the driveway or the siding tree and the neighboring adjacent lot. There is currently a house on the property that we are going to be tearing down; that footprint's width is 55 ft. The house that we're proposing to build—the width is 55 ft—so it's exactly the same.

However, where the issue comes up with the setback is because of the side-entry driveway, to have that green space on the side of the driveway. Also, the Novi property—I did send something this afternoon on that based on Novi wetland maps. You can actually draw a line, do measurements for where we're looking. We're looking to kind of line up the house somewhat—not exactly, but almost in line with the property that we built last year.

Doing that to the Novi property is just under 27 ft from where the wetlands start. So if Novi was ever going to sell it or build or anything like that, there are wetlands there, and it's not like we would be impacting them, or there would be any kind of fire requirement to have a fire rating on the side of the house at six feet. We're not at five feet. So even in general, we would not have to fire-rate that side of the house. But I don't think anything in the future would ever be built there just because of the wetlands.

Also, I was talking to Mike Weber, and he mentioned Novi never sells their land. So we said, too—no. And again, I don't know if that's true; I'm just saying what I was told. So we signed to Novi land and back to the ITC land, which is the ITC trail. So there shouldn't be any building in proximity to that.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay. Does that pretty much cover your—

MR. MOORE: I mean, that's really it. I mean, I've got some photos from the silt fence that we have up now for the demo and for the build. I did include some photos yesterday that were sent

in, and they show the silt fence. And then you can actually see the water for the wetlands to show that nothing would be impacted. Thank you.

It's kind of the same, but I don't know if you guys can see that really well, but it shows the water in that section there. At the bottom here, this is the silt fence, and then up in here is all you can still see—there's water. Although we have had snowmelt over the last few weeks and things like that, it does retain water there.

The one that I sent today shows, again, from the plot plan—and I'll put it up next—there is the length of 26.44 ft, approximately where we're looking to center the house from the wetlands on the side of the property. Oh, that's the bottom. Okay, okay.

And so on the plot plan, there's a part where there was a shed previously on the lot line. I think it was actually partially on the Novi-owned land. I think the previous owner built two sheds on the property there. We have since removed those. But the back corner of the house is about the midpoint of the shed and the plot plan, and that's where we're looking to set the new residence there.

And then the last thing—this is from BSA online. This shows the footprint of the current structure on the property, and we've got the 31 ft, six feet, 14 ft, and another four feet, which equals 55 ft. So it's the exact same footprint of the house that we had designed. Like I said, the only thing that's making it not work is the concrete driveway to enter into the garage.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. Got it covered?

MR. MOORE: I believe so.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. Anyone from the audience wish to speak? Yes, sir. Come up and, with your name and start, please, for the microphone.

MR. JARA: All right. Good evening. My name is Jason Jara, J-A-S-O-N J-A-R-A.

MEMBER LONGO: Are you an attorney?

MR. JARA: No.

MEMBER LONGO: You promise to tell the truth on this?

MR. JARA: I do.

MEMBER LONGO: Thank you.

MR. JARA: So, I am the neighbor directly adjacent on the west side to the proposed parcel, and I very much want to see this house built. I saw renderings of it; I think it's beautiful. I think it'll be good for the community.

My concern is the variance down to a six-foot setback. I'm actually the one that purchased a property in July that we referenced, and my plan was to build a fence maybe this spring. I'm worried specifically about the drainage. So if there's only a six-foot setback, that's going to increase water runoff onto the fence. Depending on how I build the fence, depending on the materials, it could lead to soil erosion, rotting of the fence, or a weaker foundation that might affect the structure of the fence.

That's one of my main concerns. But also, I worry if there's only six feet of space, how are we going to have large construction equipment coming and going, building the proposed home without damaging my property? Without damaging my fence if it's already there? Then even afterwards, into the future, if there's any other maintenance required on the home after it's built—if we only have six feet of space, is that even a safe enough amount of space? If there's a ladder or something that needs to be done?

Again, thinking about the safety of the person who's doing maintenance on the home, but also thinking about the safety of my property and it being damaged. So again, I very much want to see this house built. I think it'll be great for the community; I just have those specific concerns, and I would be happy for a compromise. Instead of maybe a six-foot setback, perhaps something like a 12-foot setback. That would significantly reduce drainage concerns, create more space for safety, and minimize any potential impact to my property. I would also request, if we're making such a drastic variance, that we receive a certified grading and drainage plan, as well as a formal construction protection plan, to ensure my property is not damaged in any way. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. Hang in there—we'll see. Yeah. Let's get the city input first, and then we'll come back and go with the discussion.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. They are seeking two dimensional variances tonight: a variance to allow a 14-foot side yard setback reduction, resulting in a six-foot setback on the side in question, and a variance to allow a 21-foot reduction to the aggregate side yard setback. The existing structure would be demolished and a new structure would be built. The side-entry garage is not a requirement; it is a design feature. Any more questions? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay. Correspondence?

MEMBER LONGO: We mailed out nine notices. One of them was returned. There was one objection and no approvals. Frankly, the objection was Mr. Jason Jara, and I think he explained it better than I could.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay. Thank you. All right. Would you like to respond?

MR. MOORE: Sure. For residential acreage zoning, the minimum setback is 20 feet. The way we're proposing the house, that 20-foot setback is adjacent to their home, plus an additional three feet for green space from the driveway. So instead of having just the minimum 20 feet from their property line, we're proposing 23 feet. We're only looking to have the reduction on the

side adjacent to the city property. It should not negatively affect their property at all—they would still have 23 feet for drainage or equipment. The driveway will be 20 feet wide at the garage entry, plus the three-foot green space. There would be no negative impact to their side property.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right.

MEMBER SAMONA: So... could we—because the variance request talks about the site, it talks about the number of feet, but it doesn't state which side it's on. Where am I, or am I...

MEMBER KREIGER: Do you have a rendering? You can put on the screen for us to.

MEMBER SAMONA: Can we make. Yeah. That to make it contingent. On what what side it's like that it's not on the side facing specifically parcel number. I mean, I see the house that you have designed, that you have to be build job listed. On real comp, but can we make it? If we were to approve it, could we make it contingent on that, that variance not being on the side abutting 49825 9 mile road.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: I don't see why not. I mean, we're approve. And let's just look something up. We're approving a plan, which has the setbacks marked? Correct? Basically.

MR. MOORE: Correct. The plot plan does have the setbacks.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: It's on there. But we need to add some verbiage that it be on. What would that be?

MR. HALL: You can do that. I believe that the neighbors here is on the east side.

MR. MOORE: Hes on the west side.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry the west side. So it would be the east side. It would be the, the opposite of him would be the opposite side for the variance.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: So it would be appropriate that we can add that in?

MR. HALL: You can. Absolutely.

MEMBER SAMONA: So the plans are not specific to the. Sorry. The variance is not specific to what side of the property is time. If we if we granted the variance as is, it would be as is. And he can use that variance on either side, if we granted it as is, correct?

MS. SAARELA: Yes.

WILLIAM MOORE: The application does specifically say we are only asking for the east side. But yeah, I would have no problem if that was a stipulation put into it.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Anybody else? So. Yes.

MEMBER KREIGER: Where are you going to have a crawlspace again or make a basement?

MR. MOORE: It's going to be a basement.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So the wetland impact into the basement will be taken care of.

MR. MOORE: When you say the wetland impact, I'm not.

MEMBER KREIGER: The warmth cause like, it's melting now, correct? Probably by August, October, it'll be dried up and not to worry about, but in the always in the spring melt or, heavy rain, the, whoever buys the house is going to have, water impact.

MR. MOORE: Well, right now, based on the wetlands map of Novi from the property line, it's 27ft. And then if you add the, we're probably, what, 33ft from the beginning of the wetlands. So there shouldn't be an issue with that.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then the tree that there so the new house is going to be behind that tree?

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Okay. So it would align better with the road. And then there is plenty of land there. And I see that there's the fencing around it because I drove by.

MR. MOORE: Correct, yes.

MEMBER KRIEGER: So the and then turning into the garage, is there enough space for the vehicle to turn into the garage and back out? Or if they wanted to leave it out in the driveway?

MR. MOORE: There would be. We just did one on 11 mile. And the owners, we're really pressing the width of the home, and they actually did a variance for a, I believe it was an 18ft wide site entry garage. Like the path leading to it. They haven't had any issues with it. I mean, we're looking at 20. We should be fine. But I don't see any issues with that. I have, like, again, I live, about 200 yards down. I have two side entry garages on my lot, and I've got 20ft in between them. So.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Motion. Right.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then to clarify, it's six feet on the east side with the city property.

MR. MOORE: Correct.

MEMBER KRIEGER: And then it'll be?

MR. MOORE: 23ft.

MEMBER KRIEGER: 23ft. on the west side.

MR. MOORE: And 20ft is the minimum.

MEMBER KRIEGER: 20ft minimum. Because the 3 ft for the,

MR. MOORE: Green space. But I mean, the area is 20ft minimum on one side, but total aggregate of 50.

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yeah, a whole different ballpark compared to driving around Wallad Lake and looking at homes.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I got a question. So the driveway that's there, how far is the driveway edge on the property line?

MR. MOORE: I would say at one spot it's probably about 2.5ft, if that. Because we put in, I think, seven posts across the front of the house that, we purchased there, there is a stake there. They have some, cobblestones that side the driveway of the property that, we're looking to replace. And I would actually say that the house itself, it has the house and then the garage. As far as for its footprint. I would say that where the garages is probably about ten feet from the property line, a portion of the garage, because it's on an angle. So we would actually, you know, be adding about 13 more ft from the property line, from the current footprint.

MR. HALL: And you're saying there's a three foot greenbelt from the edge of concrete to the property line, is what you're saying?

MR. MOORE: Not currently. I wouldn't say that there's 3 ft. because they don't even have a real driveway. It's, gravel at best. I mean, you can. When we were maintaining the yard over the time, they would use the lawn mowers on the driveway.

MR. HALL: So what are you proposing new?

MR. MOORE: A concrete driveway.

MR. HALL: No, I mean, what the distance from your new driveway edge to the property line?

MR. MOORE: The 3 ft. greenbelt that's required.

MR. HALL: Just clarifying that. Thank you.

MR. MOORE: Probably by the street, most likely, though, we would not be near the probably the 3 ft. I'm assuming we would probably be more like 10 to 15ft. Would probably be more towards not quite center of the house, but then have it wrap to the side.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: The gentleman is asking the compromise. What is the compromise? You mentioned the last word. Can you come to the podium, please?

MR. MOORE: I'm not sure if my compromise is relevant. If we're only changing the variance to the, east side of the property. What I had mentioned was 12ft. Thinking that they needed the variance on the west side of the property. My only concern was the west side of the property. From my understanding, the driveway, will be, on the west side of the home adjacent to mine. There's not going to be any like roof or structure that would lead to, water drain off. So I think actually, my concern is not relevant in this case. I think having 3 ft. of, green space. I mean, there's really, I wouldn't expect any ladders or anything like that to be right next to a fence, or I wouldn't expect any more if it's if there's a driveway there. I wouldn't expect to have any damage to my property or anything of the sort.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Okay. All right.

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINA: Motion time

MEMBER KRIEGER: I move that we grant the variance in case number is that PZ26-0005 for William Moore on 49805 9 mile road west of Garfield. Sought by the petitioner because he has shown practical difficulty for the placement of a house on the this, area plot of, property. Without the variance, the petitioner will unreasonably be prevented or limited with respect to the use of property because of the placement of the property lines on the lot, and will match with the surrounding neighbors that, the house will be aligned, better with the neighboring house to the west. The east side is the city property. The easement will be the six feet on the city side on the east, and then on the west there will be the, for the petitioner, the three foot, greenspace area for the, neighbor to the west. The property is unique because of its, location west of Back Road and topography. Which when the house is built, the topography also will be aligned to assist with the drainage in the area. The petitioner did not create the condition because it's not a divided lot. The relief granted will not unreasonably interfere with adjacent or surrounding properties because of the width of the house would be the same as the current house that is sitting that will be removed. The relief is consistent with the spirit, intent and the ordinance because, for the plot plan, the request is consistent with neighboring homes and the intent of the build and shall reiterate the variances or am I good?

MS. SARRELA: I will just say that the, 6ft variance is for the

MEMBER KRIGER: The east side with the city. Okay, the six foot variance, is for the east side of the house, with the city and aggregate side yard of 29ft, request a variance of 21ft. And for the west side of the house will be the, 23ft with the 20ft, for the driveway.

MEMBER LONGO: I second.

MS. NARDONE: Member Samona.

MEMBER SAMONA: Before I say yes, do we have to mention the west side since he's not seeking a variance on that.. Sorry, I misheard it. I apologize. Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Chairperson Montague?

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Jappaya?

MEMBER JAPPAYA: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Thompson?

MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Peddiboyina?

MEMBER PEDDIBOYINYA: Yes, please.

MS. NARDONE: Member Longo?

MEMBER LONGO: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

MS. NARDONE: Thank you. Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MEMBER LONGO: Thank you. Appreciate your input. Jason.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Any general comments anybody wants to make?

MEMBER KRIEGER: I move to adjourn.

MEMBER SAMONA: Second, third and fourth.

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right, all in favor I?

(Carried unanimously)

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: Any opposed?

(Carried unanimously)

CHAIRPERSON MONTAGUE: All right, there we go. Thank you.

(Meeting Adjournment 7:47 p.m.)