

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 24, 2022

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, August 24, 2022 at 7:30 p.m. at the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

Roman Nestorowicz, Chairman
Judy Furgal, Vice-Chairwoman
Paul Jerzy, Secretary
Charles Anglin, Assistant Secretary
William Clift
Charles Perry
Anthony Sieracki, Jr.
Michael Sylvester
David Sophiea

Members of the Board absent:

None

Also present:

Cecil St. Pierre, City Attorney
Steve Watripont, Zoning Inspector
Nicole Jones, Council Office

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Nestorowicz called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

A roll call was taken and all board members were present.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of the Regular Meeting August 10, 2022.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to approve the minutes of August 10, 2022 minutes; Supported by Board Member Clift.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (9 – 0).

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to approve the August 24, 2022 agenda; Supported

by Board Member Anglin.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (9 – 0).

6. PUBLIC HEARING:	APPLICANT: Annette Trayner
REPRESENTATIVE:	Michael Calderwood
COMMON DESCRIPTION:	32430 Columbus
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	13-01-253-002
ZONE:	R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Erect a shed that exceeds 120 ft. (10 ft. x 20 ft. = 200 square ft.)
 - 2) Square footage of garage, shed & covered rear porch combined is 875.56 square ft.
- Note: If variances are approved item #2 of the variance granted on 10/13/2004 will be rescinded.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 7.01 Uses Permitted: (l) Accessory buildings or uses customarily incident to any of the above permitted uses, when located on the same or an adjoining lot and which do not involve any business, profession, trade or occupation. One (1) private garage for each residential lot in which there is housed not more than three (3) vehicles, not more than one (1) of which may be commercial vehicle, shall be considered a legal accessory use, provided, however, any such commercial vehicle shall not exceed one (1) ton capacity, and shall be kept housed within a garage when not in use; and provided, further, that no moving vans shall be housed in private garages. All garages and/or accessory buildings shall not contain more than seven hundred (700) square feet of floor area.

Section 4.20 – Detached Accessory Buildings: (a) All detached accessory buildings shall not exceed one (1) story or ten (10) feet in height measured to the eaves and shall not occupy more than thirty (30) percent of the rear yard. Such buildings shall conform to, and shall not project beyond, the existing side building lines of the principal building on the lot and shall be one (1) foot from the edge of any easement. The construction of all such accessory structures shall be subject to the following conditions: 5. That all accessory structures, excluding garages, will not exceed a total of 120 square feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz said if the petitioner is present, please approach the podium.

(Inaudible)

[INT] Annette Trayner said she is sorry. This is the interpreter and she's going to use her voice for me. She's a little bit nervous, this is her first time in front of this kind of crowd with this kind of meeting.

Chairman Nestorowicz said no problem. He said to take her time, they just need the petitioner's name and address for the record. Then the reason for the request today.

[INT] Annette Trayner said her name is Annette Trayner, this is her roommate, Michael Calderwood. Her husband just recently passed away two (2) years ago, so she is now the owner of the house. The address is 32430 Columbus Drive. She said she is sorry and asked what they wanted her to

say now.

Chairman Nestorowicz said to explain what the reasons are for the request.

[INT] Annette Trayner said first of all excuse her, let her gather her thoughts. They moved to that house in about 2015 and they have a lot of things they have accumulated over that time. When her husband passed away, they got a lot of things, but they still need more room for those boxes. They have a regular, they have a storage unit that they have been putting things in and paying a ridiculous amount of money for two (2) storage units. They cleaned one out, they got one storage unit left. They feel like if they built a large shed in the backyard, because their garage right now, it's already full with her roommate's tools and other things that he has. So, she needs more room for storage. The garage, the things that are in the garage are saws and things like that that can harm that are walking in that are maybe not able to see. Also, her grand children visit and if they go in the garage or whatever and play around, she's afraid they'll get in there and they won't hear them and could get hurt in there. They try to keep it locked up. The reason why, they need extra storage that's why they're asking for this large shed to be built in the backyard. They have a small shed that's already in existence. They use it for their swimming pool equipment. Their chemicals and floaties and things like that. They plan to tear that down because it wasn't built well, and there is mold growing in it. So, that's going to be taken down. Instead of having a small shed, they are hoping to build a bigger one.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked her very much for those comments. This is a public hearing, are there any members of the audience wishing to speak on this? Approach the podium and share their comments. If the petitioner just wants to let the other audience members speak, step aside.

Ronald Bojarski, 32427 Beechwood, appeared before the board stating he has been a resident, homeowner there since 1993. His property backs backs up to the property in question. The property already has a very large pool on the property. Children are out there, play sets, garden, very large garden, and there is already a shed on the premises. A ten (10) by twenty (20) shed is very large. And if it goes on the corner to the fence that abuts up to his back property fence, the ground is already low. This structure will be above ground and put more rainwater that will hold along his back fence. Now, the people have already had a temporary ten (10) by twenty (20) in the yard all winter long. For some reason, it had been taken down. It was an eyesore there to begin with. He doesn't think anybody in their subdivision has a ten (10) by twenty (20) shed. These aren't very large homes; they aren't three thousand square foot homes that would require an extra shed like that. Like he said, there is already an existing shed there, a small one. Probably, maybe, five (5) by ten (10) or eight (8) by ten (10). That should be enough for any outdoor equipment and/or pool stuff. The house also has a two-car garage attached garage and full basement. These people don't have the room to put the stuff in their house, there should be something wrong. There shouldn't be an extra ten (10) by twenty (20) structure on the property. It would be an eyesore. And it would abut up against the neighbor's fence too. He talked to the three (3), himself and the other two (2) property owners behind, and the one (1) property owner on the one side. And they're all of same idea. It's a very large structure and it shouldn't go up. There should be no reason for it.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to add further comments for this? The petitioner has to wait until there are any questions directed towards her. No. Any questions would come from the board. Are there any other comments from the audience on this item?

Ronald Bojarski said he knows some of the other neighbors have made their phone calls known.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he knows, they'll get to that in a moment. Thank you very much for his comments. Did you want to read the one comment they had, Mr. Jerzy?

Secretary Jerzy said he had correspondence from the neighbor Mary. She is opposed to the shed, worried about it causing more flooding issues in surrounding yards. He did receive an impact statement from Planning Department that finds no issues with it impacting abutting properties, local or general to the public. That's all he had, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for questions and discussion.

Board Member Sylvester said to the petitioner, if he could. Obviously, it seems like she has a lot of items, emotional items from her husband and family. But a house is only so big, a shed can only be so big, and at some point, you have to kind of thin things out. Has there been any attempt to thin out some of the items that she has?

[INT] Annette Trayner said first of all, she does have a question for them.

Board Member Sylvester asked if she could get closer to the microphone, please.

[INT] Annette Trayner asked if their house is on the corner or is it behind her. She doesn't think she has ever seen him or met him in person.

(Inaudible)

Chairman Nestorowicz stated any questions that are being answered should be answered to Mr. Sylvester, as no other communications or everything should be coming to the board.

[INT] Annette Trayner stated she has tried to ween down what she has. For example, today when they were measuring things and trying to figure out what they needed. They are planning to remove the small shed from that area and then the swimming pool will be removed soon. Because they cannot keep the maintenance with the swimming pool by herself now that her husband is gone. She can't maintain the pool by herself, and they are planning on moving soon. That means her backyard will be completely empty because they'll have everything out of it.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other questions from the board.

Board Member Anglin said the pool is coming down anyway. Because a ten (10) by twenty (20) is actually a one-car garage. They're removing the shed that's, and he's not sure if that's east or west on the side of the property where that shed is at. But that shed is actually hidden from the neighbors' yard, behind the neighbor's garage. He would have no objections to downsizing that to a ten (10) by fifteen (15) and since they're taking the pool and shed down anyway, moving it over to where the old shed is at and that gives her enough setback, and it is actually sitting completely behind the house and the other direction is behind the neighbor's garage. At that point, he doesn't feel it would

be a detriment to the area. That's what he would like to see done.

Secretary Jerzy mentioned she just stated she's going to be moving. If's she's going to be moving, then what's the need for the shed?

[INT] apologized and said the interpreter misspoke. She will not be moving.

Secretary Jerzy thanked her for clarifying. That's all he has.

Board Member Anglin said he would like to see if there are any other board members that agree with his opinion on downsizing this to a ten (10) by fifteen (15) and moving it. Then he'll make a motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he would agree to a downsize shed, a ten (10) by fifteen (15) as opposed to a ten (10) by twenty (20). Would the petitioner be willing to accept a ten (10) by fifteen (15)?

[INT] Annette Trayner replied yes, that would be fine.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked Mr. Anglin to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to:

- 1) Erect a shed not to exceed 10 ft. by 15 ft. = 150 square ft. The shed will be built on the side of the yard that the old shed is sitting on. The old shed has to be removed.
- 2) Square footage of garage, shed & covered rear porch combined is 825.56 square ft.

Note: If variances are approved item #2 of the variance granted on 10/13/2004 will be rescinded.

Reasons being: Size and shape of the lot; Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Perry to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Mark J Dardzinski**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 30115 Mirage Ct.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-10-256-016
ZONE: R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Allow a pool in the side yard, 50 feet from the front property line and 11 feet from side property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 7.06 – Side Yards: Pools are not permitted in a side yard.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present here today. For all petitioners when they come up, start by stating name and address for the record.

Mark Dardzinski, 30115 Mirage Ct., appeared before the board.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked him for the reasons for his request today.

Mark Dardzinski explained they are wanting to put in a pool in their yard. Unfortunately, what his backyard gives them, they have an irregular lot, it's more of a pie shape. It has about 160-foot frontage that narrows down to about 52 feet off the backside. In their backyard, they have a hardship there with plenty of utilities. All of their utilities are buried. They have a transformer in the yard that powers the entire side of their subdivision; it's a cul-de-sac. There are about 20 houses on the property, if they know the street. They also have all the AT&T utilities, the WOW! Utility, the Comcast utility boxes, all in the backyard. Everything is buried there. So, there is no opportunity have that pool put into their backyard, whatsoever. They have a very wide front and side yard, and they wanted to put the pool, it's a fifteen (15) foot round pool, tucked in close to their master bedroom deck of the side yard. There is absolutely no utilities there. All they have there is their sprinkler system, which would have to come out. They have a lot of room to the front, well more than fifteen (50) feet. As it mentioned, at least eleven (11) feet from the property line by their neighbor to the east.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for discussion.

Board Member Anglin said looking at the site plan on this, he sees what he's talking about having a normal side yard, really no backyard. If somebody wanted a pool, he doesn't see where else he could put it. So, he has no objections to this.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there were any other questions.

Board Member Sieracki said he sees everything, he drove by the house, and it's a unique situation that he has. But just the thought of the pool being visible like right there. If they tucked in the back of the house, would there be any plans to try to dress it with any kind of landscape or anything. Instead of just having a pool right there.

Mark Dardzinski said they thought of that and absolutely. They're going to put up a five (5) foot tall fence, not a privacy type fence, but a black vinyl type fence. With probably the slots through them. It's going to be... half of it is going to be blocked by the landscaping that they have. They have a fruitless cherry crab apple tree that's going to block quite a bit of it and tucked in there, part of it will be exposed. So, yes, they're going to put a fence around it. Not a gray or white privacy, but a black vinyl chain link and with the slots in there. Decorate it with some shrubs and trees. It really won't be seen. The pool itself is fifty-four (54) inches tall. The fence that they're going to put up is fifty (50), it's five (5) foot or sixty (60) inches high. So, that pool will probably be at least, after they take the sod out, it will probably be an inch or two down below. So, you won't even be able to see the pool there. If he's standing up, they'll be able to see his head, but that's about it.

Board Member Sieracki stated he doesn't have any issues with that.

Board Member Sophiea said he looked up the property on Google Maps, he's not sure how recent the imaging was, but he did notice it is a very large side yard, massive. Probably two (2) or three (3) times the size of their backyard. In the image online there was a shed in the backyard and a trampoline. He wasn't sure if those items were still in the backyard or not.

Mark Dardzinski replied they're still there. The shed is right off the very edge of the west side of the property line, it's an eight (8) by six (6) shed that was there back when he built the house in 1997. He put it up immediately. It was one of those Lifeproof, that's still there. The trampoline sits in the yard, that's no hinderance. They don't have to dig down for a trampoline. It sits on the grass. They move it when they cut the grass, they move it to different areas. Underground wires don't affect the trampoline.

Board Member Sophiea yields.

Secretary Jerzy asked Steve Watripont, the structure that he's talking about, the fencing that he's talking about putting up around the pool. Would that be something that he would need approval from the city from or is that within the guidelines.

Steve Watripont explained he talked to the contractor yesterday going through stuff. His understanding it was going to be a four (4) foot fence, not a five (5) foot fence. A five (5) foot fence he'll be back before the board to ask for a variance, if that's the case, but with the pool it's going to require a fence anyways.

Secretary Jerzy asked if it has been discussed though.

Steve Watripont replied yes. It has been discussed and the permits are waiting on approval tonight to apply for it.

Secretary Jerzy thanked him.

Board Member Sylvester asked if he had a fence around his yard right now.

Mark Dardzinski replied no.

Board Member Sylvester said this fence that they're talking about with the slats and everything is going to be specifically for the pool.

Mark Dardzinski replied correct.

Board Member Sylvester asked if there would be a lock on the gate so nobody can get in when he's not there.

Mark Dardzinski replied right.

Board Member Sylvester thanked him.

Secretary Jerzy said if no other board members have anything else to say he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to allow the pool in the side yard 50 feet from the front property line and 11 feet from the side property line.

Reasons being: Size and shape of the lot; Uniqueness of the lot; Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Anglin supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Jerzy, support by Mr. Anglin to approve the request as stated in the motion. Roll call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

8. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Holy Cross Lutheran Church**
REPRESENTATIVE: Maurice Hintze
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 30003 Ryan
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-07-279-031
ZONE: R-1-B

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Conduct an outdoor family fun fest/car show on Sunday afternoon, September 25, 2022 from 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.35: Festivals require the approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Maurice Hintze, 30003 Ryan Road, appeared before the board.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked what his request is for today.

Maurice Hintze stated it's for the family fun car show, yes.

Chairman Nestorowicz stated it's a public hearing, is there anyone from the audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and turned it over to the board. So, basically the request is the same the board has approved every year, correct? No changes?

Maurice Hintze replied no.

Board Member Anglin said if no other board members have a comment, he would like to make motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion for approval to conduct an outdoor family fun fest/car show on Sunday afternoon, September 25, 2022 from 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Needs board approval.

Board Member Sieracki supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Sieracki to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Board Member Anglin
Board Member Sieracki

Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

Board Member Sophia	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Fungal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

9. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Target Corporation / Matthew Flansburg**
REPRESENTATIVE: Kimley-Horn / Gary Heath
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 28800 Dequindre
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-18-101-012
ZONE: MZ, C-2, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Erect two (2) 12 ft. tall solar powered directional signs, larger than allowed (16 square ft. apiece) for the drive-up parking area.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.13 (F) Traffic Control/Directional Signs: Traffic control/directional signs located in parking districts smaller than two (2) square feet in size.

Section 4A.35 – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): (B) One freestanding on-premise sign or advertising display of a size not to exceed seventy-five (75) square feet shall be allowed in commercial business and industrial districts zoned C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Jeffrey Immel appeared before the board stating Gary Heath couldn't make it tonight. He works for Kimley-Horn as well. The office is at 7965 North High Street. What they're proposing tonight is basically part of Target's drive-up program. If you're unfamiliar with the program, it's a service that they offer where they can order items online or through the Target app. Then when arriving to the store you are directed to designated drive-up area, via these directional signs they're proposing. Then when parking in a designated drive-up space, you mark on the app that you're there and the Target employees bring your groceries or items out to you and load it in your vehicle. That's basically the just of it. He feels these signs help improve the efficiency of this service, which has grown in popularity in recent years. Demand is high for it. They also feel it helps improve the safety, because of this drive-up program, because a lot of pedestrians going back and forth with Target employee's going back and forth between the Target building and these directional signs just help improve traffic and pedestrian safety in that way. So, ready to answer any questions the board might have.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him very much for that explanation. This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and turned it over to the board for questions. They

did get a, from the Planning Department, they did get a statement from them saying that they have no issues were found regarding this item.

Secretary Jerzy said he just had one question real quick. He asked why this wasn't brought up when they came before them in July for the variances for the signage.

Jeffrey Immel asked if he's referring to the variances for...

Secretary Jerzy said July 22nd, for the Target, for the logos.

Jeffrey Immel explained the way Target has been going about this is they separate the remodel of the exterior building, separate from the drive-up portion. That's just...

Secretary Jerzy said kind of what he thought, that's all he wanted to hear. Thank you, sir.

Board Member Sylvester said what they want to do right now, and he's seen all the boxes outside the store and everything, so they're remodeling, probably remodeled that store two (2) or three (3) times already. What they're looking to do did not exist twenty (20) years ago, did it? Correct?

Jeffrey Immel asked the drive-up service.

Board Member Sylvester said what they're doing and asking for this signage and everything, they wouldn't have had that same situation in their store twenty (20) years ago, right?

Jeffrey Immel replied he would say that's a safe assumption.

Board Member Sylvester said so what they're doing is just coming up to the times, this is what people do, this is what their store is offering, and they need to be able to advertise it. Ok, thank you.

Secretary Jerzy said if nobody else has anything else to say, he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to allow the petitioner to erect two (2) 12 ft. tall solar powered directional signs, larger than allowed (16 square ft. apiece) for the drive-up parking area.

Reasons being: Size and shape of the lot; Rebranding of the business; Not a detriment to the area at all.

Board Member Anglin supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Jerzy, support by Mr. Anglin to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Secretary Jerzy

Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

10. PUBLIC HEARING:	APPLICANT: McDonald's USA, LLC / Joe Minorik
REPRESENTATIVE:	Venture Engineering, PLLC, Jeff Brinks
COMMON DESCRIPTION:	23000 Van Dyke
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	13-27-355-039
ZONE:	C-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Retain and expand an existing drive-thru restaurant that is less than 200 feet from an intersection.
- 2) Waive required chain-link fence requirement for the existing, to be expanded drive-thru restaurant.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 14.01 – Uses Permitted: (K) Drive-in restaurant, an establishment whose principal business is to serve food that may be consumed in the building on the premises, on the premises outside the building, or off the premises. Drive-in restaurants shall be permitted upon approval of the Planning Commission, after a public hearing has been held and it is found that the proposed drive-in restaurant meets all the requirements of the Zoning ordinances and the following standards: 1. Be so located and designed to eliminate undue congestion in the public streets: (a) be two hundred (200) feet from the intersection; and (b) be limited to two (2) curb cuts and if the property is less than one hundred fifty (150) feet wide, be limited to one (1) curb cut. 4. Drive-in restaurant properties shall be completely enclosed with a chain-link fence with a height of four (4) feet; however, when abutting a residential property, a decorative masonry screening wall constructed to a height of six (6) feet shall be provided.

Jeff Brinks appeared before the board stating he is with Venture Engineering representing McDonald's here this evening. As the board is aware, McDonald's is proposing to make improvements to their drive-thru facilities by adding an additional order point for customers to access. Again, sign of the times, drive-thru has become increasingly important to McDonald's business model, especially over the last few years. So, that is the purpose of the improvements. Along with that, McDonald's has worked with Planning staff to eliminate some unneeded parking and increase the green space on the property. So, they are reducing some impervious surface out there by eliminating excess parking spaces and making it a little more green as well. The variances they're requesting, obviously this is an existing business, so the ordinances changed over time and sometimes the businesses are kind of caught up. Obviously, the McDonald's is in this location currently, so the request for the business 200 feet from the intersection is kind of hard to overcome at this point. Given that it's already there. Regard to the chain link fence, because it is a corner

location, surrounded on three (3) sides. Well, two (2) sides by streets and then also to the north is a street. It is fully landscaped and vegetated and discussing with Planning as well, the chain link fence seems a little unnecessary given the location. Basically, there's driveways and streets on all sides. With that, he'd certainly be happy to answer any questions they might have, and he appreciates their consideration on the matter.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him very much for those comments. This is a public hearing, are there any members of the audience wishing to speak on this please approach the podium. Just state your name and address for the record.

Adnon Y. appeared before the board stating he owns the center next to the McDonald's. The only thing he has (inaudible) from Nine Mile entrance to his center. He doesn't have any objection with them. He knows they're going to do a drive-thru and they're going to cut a lot of parking from their lot, probably start parking in their lot center. He knows it probably won't matter to them, but are they going to gate... There's an exit that goes from Nine Mile to McDonald's, are they going to fence that or are they going to keep it open. That's the only question he has.

Chairman Nestorowicz said so, from Nine Mile...

Adnon Y. said from Nine Mile. He knows they're going to do the entrance from Van Dyke. Are they going to come double drive-thru, but he owns the center next door. Is it going to effect to be used to go through the entrance or not. That's the only question he has. Otherwise, he has no objection if they do anything with their lot.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he will ask the petitioner that question. Thank you. He asked the petitioner if he understood the comments from the audience.

Jeffrey Immel said he believes so, yes. So, the driveway along the east property line will remain an access easement that is shared by both properties. They have tried to situate the drive-thru lane so customers that come to McDonald's from that entry, it's going to be really difficult to get into the drive-thru, so that they don't block that driveway and they'll have to go around, basically, to get in line. It is an existing driveway and McDonald's has had access to that from the beginning. With regard to the removal of the parking as mentioned. Mostly, that was done in working with Planning staff in order to make the site more in compliance with current zoning requirements. So, previously McDonald's had an excess of parking with regard to what the ordinance requires, and they downsized that in order to make it comply more closely with the zoning requirements.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting, but he does have a question in terms of... How many parking spaces are they downsizing by? He knows they're still within the ordinance, but he was just wondering how many they're...

Jeffrey Immel said he believes it was fourteen (14), he believes. He might be able to count and tell him exactly, but it's in that neighborhood.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he knows he's still within the ordinance of what is required, so it's a... ok.

Jeffrey Immel believes the ordinance requires twenty-one (21), and they're still at thirty-one (31). So, it's still above the ordinance, but it's considerably closer than it was before.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there are any other questions.

Board Member Sophiea said he sees in their variance request that they're expanding the drive-thru. Most of them are familiar with a McDonald's drive-thru, this is going from a single lane to a more common double lane?

Jeffrey Immel replied correct.

Board Member Sophiea said he just wanted to confirm that, thank you.

Jeffrey Immel explained they will have double entry into it, so that will increase the amount of stacking. Also, if working properly, considerably decrease the amount of time people spend in the drive-thru.

Board Member Sylvester said looking at the drawing, the overhead view, on the east side there, he never noticed that before, but is that a drive into his parking lot.

Jeffrey Immel replied yes.

Board Member Sylvester asked what is to the east of that.

Jeffrey Immel asked to the east of the driveway.

Board Member Sylvester replied yeah.

Jeffrey Immel said he believes that's the gentleman's property that was up previously. There is a business to the east.

Board Member Sylvester asked if there has been any complaints or anything with McDonald's using that and going on that property.

Jeffrey Immel explained it's within an easement.

Board Member Sylvester said yeah?

Jeffrey Immel explained it was permitted when McDonald's built. So, there's an easement there that allows the shared use of that access.

Board Member Sylvester said he has a question for Mr. Watripont. Is what he is saying true?

Steve Watripont explained when directed a question, he does have to answer on the record, a nod will not be accepted that way, Mr. Sylvester.

Board Member Sylvester said sorry.

Steve Watriont said he does not... Zoning is not involved with easement's or anything else, it's handled at the Planning Commission and Planning Department. If there's one there, he's sure there is one there, it would have been brought up. He believes it's notated on the plans that he sees there, stamped and sealed. Architects put their license on that and everything else.

Board Member Sylvester said he has just never seen it before.

Steve Watriont said the Planning Commission has already approved this conditionally on the variances.

Board Member Sylvester thanked him. No further questions.

Secretary Jerzy asked if the economical viability of that location require the double drive-thru. Is it that much of an economic impact not to have the second drive-thru, he guesses is his question.

Jeffrey Immel jokingly said that's above his pay grade to answer, but based on the number of these, he works with McDonald's all over the state and they're doing as many of them as they can do. It makes a huge difference. McDonald's does... over seventy (70) percent of their business goes through the drive-thru. Where they can find efficiencies in that portion of their business, it always makes financial sense.

Secretary Jerzy thanked him.

Board Member Sophiea said if there are no other comments, he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Sophiea made a motion to approve the variance requested:

- 1) Retain and expand an existing drive-thru restaurant that is less than 200 feet from an intersection.
- 2) Waive required chain-link fence requirement for the existing, to be expanded drive-thru restaurant.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Necessary for traffic flow.

Board Member Sylvester supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Sophiea, support by Mr. Sylvester to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

11. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Jeffrey Scott Howard -USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Mark S Demorest, Esq.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 3970, 3942 and 3952 Nine Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-31-226-011, 13-31-226-032 and 033
ZONE: C-1

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to -USE-

Expand an existing non-conforming business in a C-1 zone with 4,250 square ft. of outdoor storage per the plan.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 13.01 – Uses Permitted: Open storage is not permitted.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke appeared before the board stating she is from Demorest law firm, stepping in for Mark, who's not available to attend.

Jeff Howard appeared before the board stating Howard's Outdoor Power Equipment, the owner, 3970 East Nine Mile Road.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke explained they did submit two (2) different use requests, she only sees one on the agenda. The other one was to pave the parking lot that is currently unpaved on the property. She has a copy of the application if needed. Both are depicted on the site plan if they have that.

Chairman Nestorowicz said let's get clarification on that, because he sees both forms are actually on here. Nicole, did those get combined somehow? Did we miss one?

(Inaudible)

Steve Watripont said if he may address that. As he looks at the plans, he does see that there was two (2) requests. The use variance for parking lot, there is no use variance requirement for a parking lot, so that would not be required. He believes the original plans, there was issues with the parking lot being too close in the front setback. He believes they moved it back.

Jeff Howard said correct.

Steve Watripont explained he doesn't believe that variance was required anymore, and he doesn't know if that's where the conflicting information is. He'll leave it to the petitioner, see if they can explain it a little better. He's looking at the plans and he'll be over there looking as she explains it, if that makes sense.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke stated her understanding, based on last years indication from the Planning Commission that the unpaved parking lot, which is shown on the plan. It's to the left of the existing structure. It's currently an unpaved parking lot, the petitioner would like to pave it. The only reason they applied for that is because this was an existing non-conforming use, for the paving of the currently unpaved parking lot. So, if that's not, they'll just move on to the other issue. The other issue that is on the agenda is regarding the open storage area, which is labeled as lot 25. If they have the colored version of the site plan, it has the red bubbled line around it.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked this area over here.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke said it's right down here. It's labeled lot 25, cross hatched, and it's got kind of a bubbled hat around it. That area is currently being used for open storage. So, the proposal is to get a variance to use that as open storage. She'll allow her client to explain a little bit more about what his business is.

Jeff Howard explained they are a outside power equipment store. They have been there since 1997. They're trying to be compliant at the store.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke asked what he uses the storage area for.

Jeff Howard said it's for lawn mowers, basically.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments and explanation of that. This is a public hearing, is there anyone from audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and turned it over to the board. He did just want to state that they did get a, from the Planning Director Ron Wuerth, they did get a statement that basically says... In summary, after review of the request, no issues were found to impact the abutting local or general public. Jus wanted to state that from our Planning Department.

Board Member Sylvester asked if they just said he was storing lawn mowers there, or did he hear wrong?

Jeff Howard explained when a customer brings a lawnmower in and picks them up, they set them there. Then when they pick them up, they give them to the customer. It's in the back.

Melissa Demorest-LaDuke explained it's in a fence area behind the building. Cement area.

Board Member Sylvester asked if he's looking at the right drawing, A1.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yeah and pointed to an area on the drawing; lot 25.

Board Member Sylvester asked if that's the only thing they're discussing on there is just that lot.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yeah, outside storage for the storage of the lawnmowers.

Board Member Sylvester thanked them. That's all.

Board Member Furgal said she can shed a little bit of light on this. Howard's has been in their community for many, many years. He was around the corner and then that building came available, so he bought that. He built a new one, didn't you? But there was a fence company next door, and now he's purchased that property and he wants to turn that into his parking lot, because his business has grown, and he does a really good job. He sells new and also repairs them. That's what he started doing, was repairing them. So, he has to have a place to keep the lawnmowers that he's repairing. That's what he's doing, right?

Jeff Howard replied correct, yes.

Board Member Furgal thanked him.

Board Member Clift said he's in his neighborhood and he tries to be a regular customer, but some of the junk he works on they don't have what he needs, but regardless. Just looking over his entire plan and what he plans to do, he thinks that's going to be a great thing for their neighborhood. Considering, what he's kind of having to do now, and he can also attest that as far as the open storage behind his building, none of that is visible from the roadway or public way or anything. He doesn't see it as being an issue. He can support this as well and he yields the floor.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other questions or motions or...

Board Member Anglin said he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to expand an existing non-conforming business in a C-1 zone with 4,250 square ft. of outdoor storage per the plan.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Size and shape of the lot; Seems like the board members love having this guy in their neighborhood.

Secretary Jerzy supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Jerzy to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

Board Member Furgal
Chairman Nestorowicz

Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

12. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: PGL Building LLC -USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Imad Potres
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 26220 Groesbeck
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-24-276-009
ZONE: MZ, C-3, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to -USE-

- 1) Allow 4,576 square ft. of outdoor storage as follows: **(USE)**
 - A. 3,876 square ft. of mulch storage.
 - B. 700 square ft. of storage for parking and loading of trucks.
- 2) Allow 19, 640 square ft. of gravel surface for mulch storage, and parking, loading and maneuvering of trucks.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 15.01 – Uses Permitted: Outdoor storage is not permitted use.

Section 4.32 – Off-street Parking Requirements: (K) All off-street parking areas shall be provided with adequate ingress and egress, shall be hard surfaced with concrete or plant-mixed bituminous material (base may be stabilized gravel or equivalent), shall be maintained in a usable dustproof condition, shall be graded and drained to dispose of all surface water, provide protective bumper curbs as per Sections 4.32 (i) and 16.07, and shall otherwise comply with Section 2.46 and 16.05 of this ordinance.

Section 17.02 – Industrial Standards (S): Open storage other than junk. The designated area shall always be hard surfaced.

Imad Potres appeared before the board stating he is with Futuristic Design Consultant, 37525 Hacker Drive. The owner of the property is here as well.

Zaid Hanna appeared before the board stating he owns PGL Building, the address is 26220 Groesbeck Highway.

Imad Potres explained the business is a landscaping company and he has been doing this for quite a few years. They're always in demand to have some of the stuff they use for landscaping, things like mulch. They bring it and have to leave it over night and take it the second day. They wanted to do it the legal way just to store the mulch and they will be in the process of taking this on daily basis. That is the reason they apply for outdoor storage and besides that they are the in the business for truck loading to stay overnight, that's part of the business. They're business is like four (4) or five (5) months of the year, that's summertime. Wintertime it will be different, they will not have that, but they will have this storage area if they get approved so they can use it for business. That's why they're here. Any questions, him as the owner, he has to respond.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and turned it over to the board for discussion and questions.

Board Member Sylvester said the southeast, the rear side of the lot, there's a, he doesn't know if they're from the aerial view, what is that building or what is that property behind them? Southeast of them.

Zaid Hanna replied a metal shop.

Board Member Sylvester asked it's a what.

Zaid Hanna replied a metal shop.

Board Member Sylvester asked metal shop.

Imad Potres explained they do, it's like a metal manufacturing. It's industrial.

Board Member Sylvester asked if they know what they want to do.

Zaid Hanna said they have not talked to them, but the lady next door, which is Johnny B's, she knows. He has a good relationship with her.

Board Member Sylvester asked how much dust, or whatever, will be generated from what he wants to do.

Zaid Hanna asked dust.

Imad Potres explained it's all contained in containers. These are like containers, everything comes contained. The reason they got approved from Planning Commission, they did a buffer zone in the back where it's all landscape, they did a lot of landscaping in the area, too. He believes that will be something that not that much...

Board Member Sylvester asked if they have been preparing to do this.

Imad Potres replied yes.

Board Member Sylvester thanked them.

Secretary Jerzy said that was actually a concern when he went by the property was the rear property abutting to the residential, but it looks like in the plan they're going to have a twenty (20) foot greenbelt there that's going to shield all the residents from all that.

Zaid Hanna said absolutely.

Secretary Jerzy said ok, that's all he has.

Board Member Anglin said if no other board members have any questions, he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to:

- 1) Allow 4,576 square ft. of outdoor storage as follows: (USE)
 - A. 3,876 square ft. of mulch storage.
 - B. 700 square ft. of storage for parking and loading of trucks.
- 2) Allow 19, 640 square ft. of gravel surface for mulch storage, and parking, loading and maneuvering of trucks.

Reasons being: Size and shape of the lot; Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Sylvester supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Sylvester to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 13. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Raymen Yaldo |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Same as above. |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 23285 Blackstone |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-26-377-014 |
| ZONE: | M-2 |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Retain existing building no less than 19.9 ft. from the front (east) property line.
- 2) Allow a building addition no less than 19.9 ft. from the front (east) property line.
- 3) Retain an existing building directly abutting the side (south) property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 17.02 – Industrial Standards (A): Front yards. M-2 25 ft.

(B) Side yards. M-2 20 ft.

Steve Dumont appeared before the board stating he is from Designstruct, 23617 John R Road. Here representing Mr. Yaldo in 23285 Blackstone. It's an existing building. The setbacks have been in this condition for (inaudible) he believes. The new use was approved by Mr. Yaldo purchasing the property. They just put in a small addition on the front of the building, basically filling in the corner of the building, so not exasperating the setbacks on either the front or the side setback. He got a call from Planning that they were looking for a nine (9) by twenty-two (22) parking spot on the side, which is no problem. But they do have a two-way aisle there that is not sufficient, but again, it's an existing building. There's really not a lot of property left after the building, so they're trying to make the best of it, but there's only going to be three (3) or four (4) employees in this building. If there are any questions.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public hearing portion. Steve, he believes he has a comment on it. He just wanted to state for the record that from Ron Wuerth, the Planning Director, they did get an impact statement saying that after review of the request, no issues were found to impact the abutting, local or general public. So, Steve.

Steve Watripont said the items he talked about with the parking and everything, will have to come before the board at a later date. It was caught after the process and everything. He wants to get going with the construction and everything else, that's why they only focus on the setbacks for the buildout at this point in time. The parking will have to come before the board, in one shame or form, at a later date.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Steve for that clarification. So, basically, the addition is just squaring out the existing building on that property, which is very limited on size as it is.

Steve Dumont said twelve (12) by twelve (12).

Secretary Jerzy said he drove by, too. Where's he going to add to this property? He had to see it for himself. He was kind of shocked, too.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there are any other questions or comments from the board on this item.

Secretary Jerzy said he would like to make a motion if no other board members have anything else to say.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy said he would like to grant the petitioner permission to:

- 1) Retain existing building no less than 19.9 ft. from the front (east) property line.
- 2) Allow a building addition no less than 19.9 ft. from the front (east) property line.
- 3) Retain an existing building directly abutting the side (south) property line.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Unique shape of the lot; It's not self-imposed.

Board Member Anglin supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Jerzy, support by Mr. Anglin to approve the request as stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (9 – 0).

Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sophiaea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sylvester	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Furgal	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** as written.

14. NEW BUSINESS

Board Member Sylvester said a couple of meetings ago, he made some comments. He doesn't know everything, and he's probably not the smartest one up here, but they effected Mr. Watripont. Mr. Watripont and him have spoken many times prior to him making that statement. He thought they had a friendly relationship. He would like it to still continue to be a friendly relationship. He would like to be able to ask him questions, and maybe what he did that meeting should have been done privately. He has gone over it and over it and over it in his head. He wants to be able to talk to Steve, he's very knowledgeable. He was not accusing him of not doing his job, not doing enough, not being a good employee for the City of Warren. He's got respect for Mr. Watripont, always have. So, he's hoping what he's saying right now in front of all the board members and Mr. Watripont, that he offers his apologies. He will make sure that if he's saying something that's a little off base and shouldn't be heard by others and he has a question directed for him, he will ask him directly. So, he'll end it with that, and he hopes the relationship can be built back up again. Thank you.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him.

Board Member Clift said last meeting they talked about inclusion with each request of code enforcement violations be provided to them for properties. He didn't see not one in any of the agenda packet tonight. He was just wondering to the Secretary through the Chair where they are at with that.

Secretary Jerzy asked if Mr. Watripont could shed some...

Steve Watripont said he can address that and thank you Mr. Sylvester. They are implementing

that. He thinks what they need officially is probably a letter from the Chair to their director, Building Director James Cummins, asking for that, for an official. He knows they have included it in ones that were processed. All of these were probably processed before that meeting. So, they would have had everything two (2) weeks before. And they won't have enforcement items on all items, but they are going through and trying to do that and move that forward.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he does need a letter from himself?

Steve Watripont stated he thinks that would be more appropriate so at least there is a legal writing on it and everything else and go from there.

Nicole Jones stated it can be from the Secretary.

Secretary Jerzy said that's fine, he can submit a letter.

Board Member Clift asked if they need to do a vote on that.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they did a vote previously on the request. That covers them.

Board Member Clift thanked him.

Board Member Furgal said enforcement items should only be what's appropriate to the item that they're hearing. Sometimes there are enforcement things that have nothing to do with what they're hearing, and she doesn't think it's right to hold those things against somebody. That's all. She's not going to be here, so she doesn't care. That's just her opinion.

Steve Watripont explained as they know they have a new master plan and everything. They've been working on zoning ordinances and everything else. At this point in time, they're trying to break it down. They broke it down to about ten (10) items of concern. He addresses the concerns that mostly affect the board, the items that come before the board. The next biggest item they're going to work on is the signs. If the board has any concerns of an ordinance that's out there, and he thought of one today, that four (4) foot chain link fence that's required on drive-through's that get waived all the time. To have that removed as well, he's going to push for that, too, to get removed. If they have things, they are seeing a lot, that they're granting a lot, because it's so old. Sent him an email, let him know their thoughts on things.

Chairman Nestorowicz said will do, Steve. Thank you very much.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made the motion to adjourn the meeting, Supported by Board Member Anglin.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (9 – 0).

The meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Paul Jerzy
Secretary of the Board

APPROVED