

**CITY OF NORTHVILLE**  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
September 6, 2017 – 7:00 PM  
City of Northville – Council Chambers  
215 W. Main Street

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Silvestri called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL:**

Commissioners: Present: Michelle Aniol  
John Callahan  
Patti Mullen  
Dominic Silvestri  
Jay Wendt  
Douglas Bingham – alternate  
Lou Ronayne - alternate

Absent: Ryan McKindles (excused)

Also present: Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant

**III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

**Motion Callahan, support by Aniol, to approve the agenda as published.**

*Voice vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion unanimously carried.*

**IV. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: August 2, 2017**

**Motion Marold, support by Aniol, to approve the August 2, 2017 meeting minutes as published.**

*Voice vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion unanimously carried.*

**V. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE:**

- A. Case is called.
- B. Appellant presents case.
- C. Board questions & comments.
- D. Public comments on the case.
- E. A motion (usually to grant the variance) is made and seconded; discussed then voted upon; the results are announced by the Chair.

**VI. CASE #17-011**

**MR. SHAWN RILEY  
335 EATON**

**The applicant is seeking a variance to enlarge a non-conforming structure on premises zoned R-1B First Density Residential District, parcel number 48 003 02 0017 002. The City's Building Official evaluated the proposal and determined that two variances are needed from Section 22(5)(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant needs a 2.7-foot side yard setback variance and a 2-foot rear yard setback variance.**

Secretary Callahan called the case, and noted that letters in support of this variance application had been received from the following residents:

- Brian P. Turnbull, 361 Eaton Drive, Northville, MI.
- Bruce Turnbull, 365 Eaton Drive, Northville, MI.

Shawn Riley, 335 Eaton Drive, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application, as was Robert Miller, Principal, REM Design, and architect for the project.

Mr. Miller explained that they had hoped to use the survey from the recently constructed next-door property, which had provided a survey of this property also. They had used that survey to determine the variance needed, and in the meantime had ordered their own survey. When the new survey was completed it had different information in terms of the precise location of the house on the property. Using the more recent information, they discovered that a 3-foot side yard variance was needed, instead of the 2.7-foot side yard variance request that was advertised. Additionally, the necessary rear yard setback variance had decreased from 2 feet to .8 feet. Because the side yard variance request was now greater than that originally advertised, the application was going to have to be re-advertised.

Mr. Miller asked if they could have some general conversation about the variance request, even though a decision could not be made this evening.

In response to a question from Chair Silvestri, Mr. Miller said the survey they were now using was dated August 21, 2017, and had been provided as part of tonight's application.

In response to further questions from Chair Silvestri, Mr. Miller said the variances needed to be heard together, as one variance request.

Mr. Miller explained that the hardship related to the construction process. They wanted to construct a new, second-floor addition on the existing single-story portion of the home by building up on the exterior walls without increasing the footprint or the rooflines, thereby matching what was already there. Stepping back the walls of the new addition would require new structural beams that would span 37 feet across the back of the home, resulting in having to tear out the kitchen and family room ceilings. With the plan as presented, those ceilings did not have to be touched. They also had to get mechanicals and plumbing into the exterior walls.

Mr. Miller further commented that they wanted to maintain the bungalow character and feel of the existing home. They could best do this by matching the exterior walls, and keeping the roofline low – the roofline would only increase by 2 feet. He emphasized that they were not enlarging the footprint.

Mr. Miller pointed out that a variance was granted for the existing addition in 1963. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that variance was for a rear yard setback only. At that time the rear yard setback requirement was 35 feet, and the variance allowed a 24-foot setback. The side yard was not mentioned.

Mr. Riley said the original home was built in 1926 as a small bungalow. They wanted to keep the integrity of the original bungalow construction.

Chair Silvestri said the Board could not give a ruling tonight because of the need to re-notice the side yard variance request.

Mr. Miller said he understood that. He was just trying to give information regarding the basic application.

Chair Silvestri thanked Mr. Miller for the information. More in-depth discussion would occur at the next meeting, after the variance had been noticed correctly.

In response to a question from Member Aniol, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that both variance requests would be re-noticed, although only the request that needed greater relief compelled the renoticing.

In response to a further question from Member Aniol, Mr. Miller reiterated that the back roof line that would be added would be just 2 feet higher than the existing roof line, maintaining the low character of the home. From the street, the new roofline would blend in with the rest of the home.

Member Aniol asked that the eastern elevation be provided at the next meeting.

Member Aniol summarized that the applicant was trying to make sure the addition didn't negatively impact the historical quality of the original building; this was the foundation for the variance request.

Mr. Miller agreed, saying that they felt strongly about maintaining the character of the home. Stepping back the second story addition from the first floor exterior walls would look like a mistake.

Member Bingham asked how the interior of the home would be impacted if the variance were not granted.

Mr. Riley said the upstairs would be negatively impacted if the addition had to be stepped back. Mr. Miller added that they were proposing to use the center of the upstairs by taking out an existing bedroom to create a hallway. If they had to step back the walls, 2 bedrooms would be negatively impacted, as well as having to add a column in the first floor family room in order to support the beams spanning across the house.

Member Bingham noted that earlier conversation had also addressed plumbing and mechanical placement. Clearly there would be additional costs if the walls were stepped back.

Mr. Riley referenced a Northville home that had been sold some time ago that had a similar configuration to the one they were proposing.

In response to a question from Member Aniol, Mr. Miller showed the Board a floor plan of the proposed addition.

Member Aniol asked that a floor plan be provided to the Board at the next meeting.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Silvestri asked for a motion to postpone.

**MOTION by Aniol, support by Callahan, to postpone Case 17-11 to the October meeting, in order for it to be re-noticed.**

Chair Silvestri asked for a roll-call vote.

<b>Wendt</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Marold</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Callahan</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mullen</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Aniol</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Bingham</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Silvestri</b>	<b>yes</b>

Therefore the motion **carried unanimously**.

#### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

#### **IX. DISCUSSION:**

The Board briefly discussed standards of hardship and practical difficulty as it related to the case heard this evening.

#### **X. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Motion Marold, support by Callahan, to adjourn the meeting at 7:31 p.m.**

*Voice vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McGuire, Recording Secretary

Approved as published 10/04/2017