

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 11, 2025

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, June 11, 2025 at 7:30 p.m. at the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

David Sophiea, Chairman
Roman Nestorowicz, Vice-Chairman
Paul Jerzy, Secretary
Charles Perry, Assistant Secretary
Michael Assessor
William Clift
Jon Green
Shaun Lindsey
Garry Watts

Members of the Board absent:

None

Also present:

Jennifer Pierce, City Attorney
Steve Watripont, Zoning Inspector
Nicole Jones, Council Office

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

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

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Jerzy would like to make a change to the agenda regarding item 7, 23170 Schoenherr. Have it postponed to the June 25th meeting and have the rest of the agenda submitted as written.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to postpone item 7 and adopt the agenda with the change;
Supported by Board Member Nestorowicz.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (9 – 0).
Chairman Sophiea said if anyone was present for item 7, please come back on June 25th.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Regular Meetings of April 23, 2025, May 14, 2025, May 28, 2025 and June 4, 2025.

Motion:

Board Member Assessor made a motion to approve the minutes of April 23, 2025; Supported by Board Member Clift.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to approve the minutes of May 14, 2025; Supported by Board Member Assessor.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to approve the minutes of May 28, 2025; Supported by Board Member Green.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion:

Board Member Assessor made a motion to approve the minutes of June 4, 2025; Supported by Board Member Watts.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (8 – 0). (Board Member Lindsey abstained.)

6. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Paslin

(Revised from 4/23/2025; Rescheduled from 5/14/25)

REPRESENTATIVE:

Bryan Duquet / William Lince

COMMON DESCRIPTION:

25411 Ryan

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

13-19-478-013

ZONE:

MZ, R-1-P, M-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Install a 15' high x 45' wide (675 square ft.) wall sign on the east elevation of the building and retain a 24" x 24' (48 square ft.) existing wall sign for a total of 723 square ft. of wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.35 – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): c) Total wall signage of a size not to exceed forty (40) square feet shall be allowed for each business

Chairman Sophiea said good evening. Please start with name and address for the record. Richard Burzynski appeared before the board stating he's from Paslin, the Graphics Marketing Manager. They're the ones requesting the variance. Brian here from Signarama has some graphics to show and reasoning why they're requesting it.

Chairman Sophiea said ok great. If he could state his name and address for the record.

Brian Duquet, 36886 Harper, appeared before the board.

Chairman Sophiea thanked them and asked them to please tell the board about their request.

Richard Burzynski is requesting a large sign for the side of the building. It's more like a mural than it is signage for Paslin. They're looking to do something for marketing, branding, to make people aware of their building facility. It is a very large building with little visibility, other than a big beige building and a very small Paslin at the front door. They've requested to do a banner, not a banner, a flex face sign on the side of the building with a full frame. It is approximately six hundred and seventy square feet. This building have four hundred and eighty-five foot of frontage, so it's a massive facility. He apologized, four hundred and sixty-six foot of frontage. It's a massive facility and it's set back approximately three hundred feet from the road, so it's quite a distance back. He thinks what they're asking for for this facility is reasonable considering the size of the building and the distance.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Sophiea closed the public portion of the meeting. He would like Secretary Jerzy to read the Planning impact statement into the record.

Secretary Jerzy thanked him. Per the Planning Department and Planning Director Mr. Wuerth: "No issues were found to impact the abutting, local or generally public regarding this item."

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. At this time he'll turn it over to the board for discussion.

Board Member Clift said to the petitioner he has a couple questions on the sign. The graphics are nice. He knows they need something out there. He lives in the neighborhood. Is this sign backlit? Is it illuminated?

Brian Duquet said no. It's not illuminated and it's a full frame flex face like what would be in all large commercial signs. Like the Meijers, etc.

Richard Burzynski explained it's just for branding and recruiting.

Board Member Clift said flex face. That means they can kind of change out graphics on it from time to time.

Brian Duquet said not quite that easy because the flex face is put in the frame and has to be stretched. You need warm weather to do it. It's not like they're going to flip a panel. That's not the case at all. It's a commercial material meant to last and it's involved putting it together.

Board Member Clift said that was his next question, sir. What's the longevity on the material on the sign? How long before they can expect it to face and maybe get a little ratty looking out there.

Brian Duquet explained a typical sign like that would be at least ten (10) years. These are the same signs they have at the lumber yards. Same material.

Board Member Clift thanked him. Mr. Chairman, he yields the floor.

Secretary Jerzy stated he did miss something on the Planning statement, Chairman Sophiea pointed out to him. He apologizes to his fellow board members and petitioners. Let him finish reading the second part of this impact statement. It also says:

"The east side of the building where the proposed sign would be placed is approximately 250 ft. from Ryan Road. The size of the text on the proposed sign combined with the distance from passing vehicles traveling along Ryan Road would prohibit this sign from clearly being seen by passing motorists. The petitioner may want to consider a reconfiguration for a smaller sign, with larger text and less empty space on the sign, reducing the amount of signage square footage that would require a variance.

The Planning staff found no issues with the existing signage."

He apologized again.

Board Member Nestorowicz is very familiar with this building and this location since he grew up in the neighborhood behind it. This sign to him is not just about giving identification to the building, that's a billboard. Everything on there, it's the kind of signage you would make if you were making a billboard that's going to go along the expressway. If they were just looking for signage to identify the building, they could go with a simple smaller Paslin sign without their tag lines and all that sort of stuff. He thinks this sign is too large. Second, when driving south on Ryan they're not going to see it because next to this property is houses with trees and all that. By the time they actually pass in front of it, they're not looking to the side. It's not going to be getting any motorist. He just personally thinks this sign is too big and would be a detriment.

Secretary Jerzy thinks the petitioner came initially before the board and the initial reaction was they weren't initially in favor of it. The petitioner said he was going to come back with a better plan with a smaller sign. That doesn't seem to be the case. It seems like they kicked the can down the road. He personally doesn't see where the hardship is to need the sign. To him, he thinks it's completely self-imposing. The business has been there as long as he's been a resident of the city. So, it's been there probably thirty (30), forty (40) years.

Richard Burzynski said 1937.

Secretary Jerzy said yeah correct him if he's wrong, probably even longer. They've done very well in those facilities. They've expanded their operation to Ten Mile and all doing so with an illegal sign that was on the building to begin with. So, to see to try to convince him that they need more signage to kind of help the business or promote the business or market the business more, the business has marketed itself over the course of time. To him, he just thinks it's a self-imposing sign. He doesn't see the hardship, to be honest with him. He does appreciate that it's not going to be lit if it does get passed. For him, it's probably going to be a no vote. He yields the floor.

Board Member Watts said to the gentleman at Signarama they talked the last time they were here. He knows they asked about downsizing the sign.

Brian Duquet did bring that with them, but obviously Rich wasn't here at the last meeting. A couple of other board members weren't here. He figured it was only fair to bring them up to speed before they address some of the concerns. One of the things they talked about was the size of the sign. That was a concern the last time they were here. Kind of put things in perspective, City of Warren he believes is forty (40) square foot for allowance for signage on a typical tenant space. Typical tenant space is twenty (20) foot wide, twenty (20) foot tall, sixteen (16) foot tall, about ten (10) percent of the building. Viewing distance, maybe fifty (50) feet, maybe seventy-five (75) feet tops. In this case they're looking at a building that is four hundred and sixty-six feet long, twenty-two (22) feet tall with over ten thousand square feet of frontage. If they use that same forty (40) square foot for a building that size, obviously, they're not even a small percentage of the building. He was trying to figure out how he can represent to the board the difference in the size of the sign. So, before he turns this around, he knows they can all agree that if he attaches this to the size of his car. How big would this look? Pretty big, right? If he attaches it to the side of a fifty-three (53) foot semi, how big would it look? Pretty ridiculous, right? He could not get the full building in this photograph scaling the sign from the curb to the building. So, yes the square footage sounds large, but when put into perspective of two hundred and fifty foot of frontage and over five hundred feet of frontage of the building, it's not a very big sign. It's all about viewing distance. So, even when they look at a billboard on the side of the freeway, they're generally really close to the freeway and they're up high in front of you. This sign is going to be very low, in perspective, and set way back. So, they did look at shrinking the sign, but they went a little bit further to put it in perspective and they shrunk it by one hundred and fifty square feet. They're starting to get to that postage stamp look. It's much smaller. He knows the ordinance is in place to try to keep it fair for businesses, but it's hard to compare a business with five hundred foot of frontage with a three hundred foot setback to a store front of twenty (20) foot with a seventy-five (75) foot frontage. Now, in terms of the signage on this, most of the time signage is considered the advertising that's on the sign. Paslin that's on the sign is sixteen (16) square feet. The rest of it is all design like a mural. Very little signage, barely has their name on it and it's just a big something to enhance the building. They kind of did a comparison and just drove the area. They can see this is a pretty small impact. This is not going to look like much based on the size of the facility. If they go right down the street and look at U-Haul, how big of an impact do they have? There's signage everywhere. They're advertising. They're not looking to advertise, they're looking to bring brand awareness. They're not looking to get more people to come to the front door to bring business, they're looking to market to hire employees. They're trying to make themselves aware to the public and the people, they're here, they're the engineering company, they're the manufacturing company that builds the products that they ride in, drive on and do this. They're not trying to sell something. They're just simply trying to make them aware they're here and part of the daily life whether they realize it or not.

Board Member Nestorowicz understands the petitioners request. If they're just looking for signage and identification of the building, because... along those lines. Simple monument sign along Ryan would cover everybody heading north and south, everybody would see the sign.

Board Member Clift would like to respond to his colleague. The petitioners open statement had the word recruiting in it. They're not only using it for identity, they're using it for recruiting.

Chairman Sophiea asked Mr. Nestorowicz if he had another comment.

Board Member Nestorowicz continued saying he noticed they're other facilities, like the one in Shelby Township, he doesn't see a sign like that on the outside of that building.

Richard Burzynski said they have a window graphic that goes from the top of the door to the top of the building. It's quite a bit more than, it's about five hundred square feet. On the Shelby Township building. The graphic matches what they're trying to put on the Ryan building. Once again it's just for brand awareness and they're trying to progress and project a higher tech company than they've been known as.

Board Member Green says they've had a bunch of these come in front of the board and it seems to be the trend to put these very large signs. If you drive down I-75 and see the hospital there they have a sign that's very large. They had one of the signs come before the board recently. So, for the board it's a matter of they need to make a decision in what direction they're going to with these signs, because they'll be more coming, because it's the trend now. He personally thinks they look like billboards and they're not for providing direction, they're not providing anything but branding. This particular sign is the same as the ones they've had before them on a couple other items. He hates to see them voting yes and no, yes and no, yes and no. He thinks it's something they need to rethink about when they think about what direction they want to go with this, because it's going to come before the board again.

Chairman Sophiea has a question for Mr. Watripont. Would there be some sort of way... It sounds like tonight they want it shrunk, obviously, but could they separate the signage request from the design element when making a motion? Or would that be too difficult given that it's all one piece?

Steve Watripont explained without having those numbers, it might be too difficult tonight. He doesn't know if they would want to go there. He knows gas stations do it a lot, but he doesn't know if they really had many other businesses do it from time to time. He knows they've done it at a Taco Bell here and there and stuff like that, but they have those hard numbers before it comes before the board.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes sense and thanked him.

Board Member Clift wanted to go on the record that this is yet another case of antiquated ordinances not keeping up with the times and the trends when it comes to differentiating signing from branding from art elements and you now. They're constantly put in this position where they have to debate these things that other municipalities are relatively clear and easy to deal with it. He just wanted to go on the record stating that. He yields the floor.

Chairman Sophiea has one more question for the petitioner. He thought he heard him mention that

the length on the side of the building here is like four hundred.

Brian Duquet said four hundred and sixty-six. That's the entire building.

Chairman Sophiea explained the rendering the board has it appears to be the full.

Brian Duquet said it's only that one section of the building.

Chairman Sophiea sees edges on both sides. He sees trees on the one side.

Brian Duquet explained he's only looking at the one piece of the entire complex.

Chairman Sophiea asked if it pops out.

Brian Duquet explained when they do a rendering, they try to show where it's at on the building and that's why he did this, because how does he piece this whole building together to show the full building because it's massive. It's city blocks long.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes more sense. He's comparing the forty-five (45) foot of length to the one sixteen along the building that's indicated, but that's just the part to the right side of the building when facing it.

Brian Duquet thinks that's part of the perspective they were having trouble with before and that's why they tried to look at something to show that this is a massive building.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes more sense, thank you.

Board Member Clift asked if there would be any consideration this evening. It sounds like the majority, or at least half of the board members up here tonight want to see some kind of reduction in the overall square footage. He's just going to state that he personally doesn't have a problem with what he's presented because it makes perfect sense to him and several different facets in different ways. In the event that it might come down to that, has he preplanned with a figure in mind in the event that the board wanted to see a reduction in the overall square footage. Was he ready to entertain a motion to that?

Brian Duquet brought a rendering of the version of the sign is shrunk.

Chairman Sophiea asked him to speak into the microphone, please.

Brian Duquet brought a rendering so they can see what a smaller version would look like. The original is six hundred and seventy-five square foot. He believes this one is four hundred and sixty-six square foot. It's just to give a perspective to the building. So they can see the difference. In the photos the board has, they have a UPS truck in front of the building. That's midway up the parking lot and you can see it kind of looks like freckle in that photo. But it's kind of perspective for the size of the sign. This is showing it the full size that they originally requested, this is a slightly shrunk size and can see again, it looks small.

Board Member Clift asked if he could bring those up closer to they can all see them.

Chairman Sophiea allowed it.

Brian Duquet wanted to state they cannot get the full size of the facility in there, it's just to kind of give an idea perspective wise.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him.

Steve Watripont said to answer his question a little further now after he had a chance to look. If they wanted to put something in there that it can't exceed fifty (50) percent, that would be on them to give them whatever that number is and they would cut out the actual wording at that point in time. If they wanted to do something like that. If they did decide to do it today, it's possible and they would be required to comply with what they did. He doesn't know those numbers, so he can't say yes or no that it would comply with what they have submitted.

Board Member Clift believes he still has the floor. Would they be able to calculate that figure for them tonight. What the actual square footage of...

Brian Duquet said what he did calculate before he left that the actual name Paslin is sixteen (16) square foot. The other verbiage that's on it isn't marketing, it's just verbiage that's on it. He kind of used the rule of thumb. If he's doing signage for a customer and they're doing a doctors office and it happens to be first aid business or urgent care, most places don't count urgent care as a name. the minute they put the brand or office name, now it's considered signage. The rest is considered direction.

Board Member Clift would measure on the side of caution on that. That's why he asked.

Brian Duquet figured out the square footage of the advertising portion, which was Paslin.

Board Member Clift asked if that includes the globe graphic behind Paslin.

Brian Duquet did not count any of the graphics.

Board Member Clift asked just the lettering.

Brian Duquet said just the lettering so they knew what percentage was Paslin.

Board Member Clift yields the floor.

(Inaudible)

Brian Duquet said yeah, sixteen (16) square foot is Paslin.

Chairman Sophiea wasn't a huge fan of this request, but after seeing the board and how massive the property is, he could get behind the smaller version. He thinks that's still pretty generous given the forty (40) square foot ordinance. It's setback, they've indicated it's not really for street traffic to view, it's more for the trucks coming and going, internal use. He'd also like to see some type of restriction on the amount of signage. It sounds like they could put some sort of generic, no more signage than fifty (50) percent of the size of the overall sign.

Board Member Clift said he's lousy at math, but he came up with just by eyeballing it. He estimated that sixteen (16) square feet repeated about six and a half times, as far as lettering on that sign comes to his guess approximately one hundred and four square feet of actual lettering signage. He'll yield the floor. That's twenty-five (25) percent of what they're asking. What's the total? Six seventy-five.

Chairman Sophiea said his suggestion was to reduce. What was the reduced size he showed? Four hundred and seventy-five square feet?

Brian Duquet said the reduced one is four hundred and thirty-two square foot. Again, he didn't pick a particular size, just something to reference it. It went from fifteen (15) feet tall to twelve (12) feet tall. Just so it was an idea to show the reduction. Just kind of give, again, perspective to the size of this facility.

Chairman Sophiea said four hundred and thirty-five square feet.

Brian Duquet said four hundred and thirty-two.

Chairman Sophiea said four thirty-two and it dropped the height to twelve (12) feet.

Brian Duquet said yes.

Chairman Sophiea asked with the same length.

Brian Duquet replied no.

Chairman Sophiea asked if the length shrunk also.

Brian Duquet said perspective they did perspective. It went from forty-five (45) feet to thirty-six (36) feet. Obviously, they can do any kind of combination in between. It was just to give perspective for them to have something to see. It's hard when you're here, it's hard to picture that from a proof. So, putting it on the building and seeing what they're going to see from the road, most people don't realize the size because of the viewing distance. Somebody realizes the size of a billboard until they are standing in front of it. When looking at it from the road, it doesn't look like much.

Chairman Sophiea said right. Let him ask them, they heard the comments so far tonight. They're going to go to a motion pretty soon here. They heard the hesitation with the current size. Would they be in agreement to reduce to four hundred and thirty-two square feet.

Richard Burzynski would have to get approval. If that's what was decided here, that's what he would present.

Chairman Sophiea said once they decide it, it's final. So, he's not sure if he would want to... He was under the impression that he was coming here tonight with the authority and final number.

Richard Burzynski said he's right, yep.

Chairman Sophiea asked if he would be comfortable with that amending the request to four hundred and thirty-two square feet.

Richard Burzynski replied sure.

Chairman Sophiea said ok. Are there any other comments from the board? Or possible motions?

Board Member Clift said if nobody else has any comments he'll make a motion. He'll make it on the reduced size as agreed upon. He asked for the dimensions again. They went from fifteen (15) feet high to what, twelve (12)?

Brian Duquet said twelve (12) by thirty-six (36) from fifteen (15) by forty-five (45). Like he said, they'll be comfortable if they were happy to split that down the middle and do something thirteen and a half by the middle if that's an option. As the board can see from the visual he brought, the twelve (12) foot looks pretty small on the building. They are very low on square footage only advertising on the sign is Paslin, the rest is automation powered by innovation, not advertising. Providing solutions since 1937, that's not advertising. They could count the Paslin.com as advertising.

Board Member Clift is going to pause his motion. Mr. Watriont please. The other option is he can read it as written and if it gets denied, he could come back with something else. Talk to him about the square footage on the lettering.

Steve Watriont explained anything that has anything to do with advertising would be. Any words, any description. Actually, the sign ordinances any graphics are included, and what they've done is design element, taking that graphic aspect out. That's the only thing they've taken out of the calculation is that design element out of there.

Board Member Clift said it's so much easier with an ordinance where they're allowed x amount of square feet based on the x amount of square feet of frontage on a building for appropriate sign signage sizing. That's where his comment about antiquated ordinances come in, but he digress.

Brian Duquet said his number is more accurate.

Board Member Clift doesn't have a problem with the way it's written, but he's sensing some of his colleagues may, and he thinks they've shifted some opinions maybe with his demonstrated graphics, but he's incline to read it as it's written and see if they get what they came here to get. If he can't, maybe they have to try again.

Brian Duquet asked if they can take a vote on the full size, and if they don't come to agreement, vote on...

Board Member Clift said they have to resubmit. Would have to go through the whole process again.

Brian Duquet said at this point it's up to you.

Secretary Jerzy said real quick point of order. The first time this gentleman came here, they kind of gave them the run of the land. So, he came back, was going to bring back another scaled version,

which was fine, but he feels like they're trending down a slippery slope when they're asking applicants is this ok, does this work. It's up to the board to come up with numbers, ideas, motion. If they live with it great, if they don't great. But they can't be going back and forth. Like they had the petitioner last week where they asked for a redo because they don't have a full board. No, if he knew the lottery numbers tonight he wouldn't be here. He feels like they're doing the same thing with petitioners. That's just his point of order. He yields the floor.

Chairman Sophiea asked for any other comments or opinions regarding the reduced size. Again, he thinks the four thirty-two he can get behind. That's a thirty-five (35) percent reduction. That seems reasonable to him. They knew they weren't happy with it the first time, came back and...

Board Member Clift said just in all fairness, he doesn't know if he was at that meeting in April when they came up here first.

Secretary Jerzy said correct. He wasn't there.

Board Member Clift said he's starting fresh here.

Secretary Jerzy gets that.

Board Member Clift stated his intention is to try to come to some kind of a compromise (inaudible) how he feels about the ordinance.

Secretary Jerzy understands Mr. Clift. He's right.

Board Member Clift is going to go ahead and make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to give permission to install a **twelve (12) foot by thirty-six (36) foot, 432 square foot** wall sign on the east elevation of the building and retain a 24" x 24' (48 square ft.) existing wall sign for a total of **480** square ft. of wall signage.

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

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Mr. Clift, supported by Mr. Perry to approve the request as read. Just to clarify, the wall sign is twelve (12) feet by thirty-six (36) feet, totaling four hundred and thirty-two feet, four hundred and eighty square feet total. Roll call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion failed (4 – 5).

Board Member Clift
Board Member Perry

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

Board Member Green	No, doesn't demonstrate a hardship
Board Member Nestorowicz	No, detriment and self-imposed hardship.
Board Member Assessor	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	No, self-imposed.
Board Member Watts	No, too big and doesn't fit the area.
Secretary Jerzy	No, self-imposed and it's also not necessary, doesn't meet those two requirements.
Chairman Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The petitioner's request was **DENIED** as read.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Terraval LLC (Ramona Cean)**
(Rescheduled from 5/14/25)
REPRESENTATIVE: PEA Group (Becky Klein)
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 23170 Schoenherr
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-25-351-006
ZONE: M-1

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Allow 20,158 square ft. of open storage to a property that the primary structure is 5,008 square ft.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 17.02 – Industrial Standards: (S) Open storage other than junk. ... the designated area may not exceed fifty (50) percent of the gross floor area of the primary structure on the site...

This item was rescheduled to June 25, 2025 during the adoption of the agenda.

8. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: John and Rebecca Patterson**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 14918 Jacobs
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-12-428-023
ZONE: R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct a 16' x 26.5' deck in rear yard to within 21.8' of the rear property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 7.08 – Rear Yards: Each lot in R-1-C Districts shall have a rear yard depth of not less than thirty-five (35) feet.

Chairman Sophiea said good evening. If they can both state name and address.

John W. Patterson and Rebecca Patterson stated their name, 14918 Jacobs.

Chairman Sophiea thanked them and asked them to please tell the board about their request.

John W. Patterson explained their request is to build a new deck. The one that is there is old and it was there when they moved in. They've been there going on nine (9) years. They're trying

to improve it. It's a wood deck and kind of rotted in several places. So, they decided they would like a little smaller deck. They have a company that has agreed to do that, but didn't realize that whoever built the deck did not permit the building. They're kind of in limbo here. All they want is a smaller deck.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Sophiea believes they have one (1) email or message that got sent to the office they'll read into the record.

Secretary Jerzy thanked the Chair. It says:

"Good Morning,

We would want to let you know that we have no objections to the construction of the 16' x 26.5' deck , address 14918 Jacobs, that John and Rebecca Patterson have requested to be built in the back yard. Regretfully, due to a car accident and a lot of pains, I will not be able to attend the PUBLIC HEARING on Wednesday, June 11, 2025 at 7:30 PM.

Sincerely,

Sinan Krikor"

Secretary Jerzy said it sounds like a neighbor. He doesn't give his address though.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. At this time, he'll close the public portion of the meeting and turn it over to the board for discussion. He's reviewed the petition. He personally doesn't have any problems. The deck has been there a long time and upgrading it in the same size and location. He doesn't have a problem with it.

Board Member Watts asked if the current deck is attached to the house.

John W. Patterson replied it is not. The one they're going to have built is four (4) feet smaller.

Board Member Watts asked if the new one is going to be attached to the house.

John W. Patterson said the wood is not connected to the house, no.

Board Member Watts has a question to Mr. Watripont. Is a permit required if it's not attached to the house.

Steve Watripont explained the permit is required for all decks in the City of Warren.

(Inaudible)

Board Member Watts was lead to believe something different.

Steve Watripont explained within the building code there is a difference whether it's connected and whether it's considered part of the building and different. As far as the construction, it does require a permit and within the ordinances.

Board Member Watts thanked him. He's in agreement. He doesn't have any problem with this. He'll definitely vote to approve this for sure.

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

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to construct a 16' x 26.5' deck in rear yard to within 21.8' of the rear property line.

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

Board Member Nestorowicz supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Secretary Jerzy, supported by Mr. Nestorowicz to approve the item as read.

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 Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 9. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Even Moshe |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Same as above. |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 22241 Van Dyke |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-33-276-014 |
| ZONE: | C-2 |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain 32 square ft. wall sign on the south elevation, in addition to a previously approved 32.25 square ft. wall sign on the north elevation for a total of 64.25 square ft. of wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.35 (C) – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts: Total wall signage of a size not to exceed forty (40) square ft. shall be allowed for each business in commercial business and industrial districts zoned C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Chairman Sophiea asked if the petitioner is present for item 9.

No response.

Steve Watripont does not see him. He dealt with him at the counter multiple times and he knew he was looking forward to coming to this, so he doesn't know what's happened, but he does not see him in the audience.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to postpone till June 25, 2025; Supported by Board Member Assessor.

Board Member Green asked if he could ask a question. In a situation like this, he means, could they go ahead and vote on things when the petitioner is not here if they desire.

Secretary Jerzy thinks legally they could. They have denied in the past.

Board Member Green directed it to the city attorney then.

Jennifer Pierce said they could. All they're missing is their presentation, but they've got the petition in front of them. They have all the information they need to make a decision.

Chairman Sophiea said that's a good point, Mr. Green. But he likes to give a courtesy one time.

Board Member Green said the point of his question was that they have one petitioner who is on number 3 now. He'll leave it at that. He doesn't want to get in that situation again. Thank you.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. They have a motion by Secretary Jerzy, support by Mr. Assessor to table to June 25th.

Voice Vote:

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

The petitioner's request was **POSTPONED** to June 25, 2025.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 10. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Frank Jarbou |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Atwell – Erik Miller |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 6014 and 6015 Ten Mile |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-28-101-032 and 13-21-353-023 |
| ZONE: | M-1 |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Waive 39 parking spaces at 6015 Ten Mile parcel #13-21-353-023 and 12 spaces at 6014 Ten Mile parcel #13-28-101-032 for a total of 51 waived. Spaces.
- 2) Allow 19.6' wide two-way maneuvering lane to the east of existing building at 6015 Ten Mile parcel #13-21-353-023.
- 3) Waive 8' greenbelt on parcel #13-21-353-023 where it abuts parcel #13-21-353-015 and 13-21-353-022.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.32 (#23) – Off-street Parking Requirements: One (1) parking space for each one thousand two hundred 1,200 square feet of gross floor area.

Section 4.32 (i) – Off-street Parking Requirements: Two-way off-street maneuvering lanes required 20' width.

Section 17.02 (c) – Industrial Standards Greenbelt: None, except when a side or rear yard abuts a zoning district other than industrial then eight (8) feet wide as per Section 2.26.

Chairman Sophiea said good evening.

Travis Okana appeared before the board stating he's representing the ownership ship, 4327 Delmar.

Secretary Jerzy stated he should re-read that. It has all the parcel numbers that he should probably read into the record before he starts.

(Secretary Jerzy read the variance request into the record with parcel numbers.)

Chairman Sophiea thanked him and told the applicant he has the floor now.

Travis Okana explained they're here tonight just to request formal approval of the three (3) variances just mentioned for the storage facility project at 6015 and 6014 Ten Mile. Again, the parking variance, lane width variance, greenbelt variance. These variances have already been approved and incorporated into their conditional rezoning agreement back in October. Since then, they've amended the site plan, which actually improves all these conditions. The major change here is they've lowered the square footage from (inaudible) to roughly 90,000 square feet by eliminating several buildings, which has increased the buffer areas.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Sophiea asked Secretary Jerzy to please read the impact statement into the record.

Secretary Jerzy stated this is from the Planning Department.

"After the review of the request,, no issues were found to impact the abutting, local, or general public."

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. At this time, he closed the public portion of the meeting and

turned it over to the board for discussion.

Board Member Green has a couple questions. Looking at some other storage units and just to get a feel for this. He notices that on the outside of the property at some of these storage places, they have boats, RV's, outside storage going. Is that going to happen here?

Travis Okana replied no. No outdoor storage area.

Board Member Green stated the main building, used to be the banquet hall. On the site plan, it says this property will be used only for the purpose of operating and maintaining a self-storage unit as well as associated retail businesses that are normally permitted in a C-1 zone classification. Explain that to him. What does that mean? Are there going to be other retail businesses in that main building?

Travis Okana explained this is all going to be one (1) self-storage user. He guesses that retail portion it's referencing is literally just the welcome area for members who are signing up for the first time so it's small square footage, but that building is going to be all self-storage.

Board Member Green thanked him.

Chairman Sophiea asked for any other comments or discussion from the board.

No response.

Board Member Clift said hearing no other comments from his colleagues, he'll make a motion on this item.

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to give permission to:

- 1) Waive 39 parking spaces at 6015 Ten Mile parcel #13-21-353-023 and 12 spaces at 6014 Ten Mile parcel #13-28-101-032 for a total of 51 waived. Spaces.
- 2) Allow 19.6' wide two-way maneuvering lane to the east of existing building at 6015 Ten Mile parcel #13-21-353-023.
- 3) Waive 8' greenbelt on parcel #13-21-353-023 where it abuts parcel #13-21-353-015 and 13-21-353-022.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Resulting of some downsizing of the overall project.

Board Member Lindsey supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Mr. Clift, supported by Mr. Lindsey to approve the request as read.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 1).

Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Nestorowicz	No, not right for that property there.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

11. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: CTT LLC**
REPRESENTATIVE: Bobby McIlquham
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 6500 Eleven Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-21-126-027
ZONE: M-3

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Allow open storage of trucks/trailers to within 19' of the front (north) property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 17.02 (s) – Industrial Standards: Open Storage other than junk. In M-3 and M-4 zones outside storage may not be closer than one hundred fifty (150) feet from any street right-of-way line.

Chairman Sophiea said good evening.

Bobby McIlquham appeared before the board stating he is representing CTT LLC. Here this evening to respectfully request the approval for variance submitted regarding the open storage of truck and trailers.

Chairman Sophiea asked for his address, please.

Bobby McIlquham stated 6500 Eleven Mile Road. The property falls within the proper zoning district as designated with the City of Warren with an M-2 zoning. However, due to the properties total square footage from north to south of that property, the recommendation per the site plan was to have the truck and trailers storage park one hundred and fifty feet from the north of Eleven Mile. Given that recommendation, they requested a variance as they do not contain enough square footage to park a truck and trailer with the number of parking spots that they do have. That being said, they're seeking approval for a variance request to, again, allow truck and trailer parking within nineteen (19) feet of the roadway or easement in accordance with the guidelines established within the City of Warren. They appreciate the boards consideration with this.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Sophiea believes there is a Planning impact statement.

Secretary Jerzy said per the Planning Department:

"After review of the request, no issues were found to impact the abutting, local or general public. The petitioner received site plan approval with conditions for open storage for truck and trailer storage on November 18, 2024. As a condition of site plan approval, the petitioner shall plant two (2) evergreen trees or shrubs and two (2) deciduous trees or shrubs to provide screening to traffic traveling along Eleven Mile Road."

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. At this time he'll close the public portion of the meeting and turn it over to the board for discussion.

Secretary Jerzy said he has a unique property there. He's been to a lot of different areas in this town, but none that have a complete power line that's right smack dab in the middle of the yard. His question is out of curiosity, how do they get trailers out of there. Does he have to back them out on Eleven Mile. Can you actually maneuver around?

Bobby McIlquham explained they can maneuver trucks and trailers to make a complete one eighty turn. However, if they cannot, if the approval for the variance is not considered tonight and they have to move that up one hundred and fifty feet from the Eleven Mile, north of their property. They would basically have less than thirty (30) feet to back a trailer in and then they have the issue of the power line directly on the property, extremely limiting their availability to park trucks after making daily runs.

Secretary Jerzy said just the way the property is situated already kind of, he means, they're packed in like a sardine can for that little tiny property, but they're kind of maximizing everything they got. When he initially drove by it, he kind of wasn't really in favor of it. Now, looking at the property and he was just curious making sure they weren't backing trucks onto Eleven Mile all day, every day. He was just curious about the maneuvering within the premises of the property. As long as they can maneuver everything within the premise of the property and meets the site plan approval with the screening requirements for Planning, he doesn't actually see any real impact on that general area either. The one thing he might want to recommend to whoever makes a motion, maybe, is not to allow... He'll ask the city attorney about this. Add a condition to this to where they don't see campers, boats stored on the property. It's just strictly trailers and strictly trucks and trailers. Can they add a provision like that? In his past on the board, he's seen this type of situation kind of morph into a little bit more down the road. Not necessarily with said petitioner, it's with another property owner, where they get the variance and it just becomes a kind of hot mess. He's just trying to prevent that in the future. Not to say this gentleman would do that, but just trying to prevent that on the property in the future.

Jennifer Pierce said absolutely she thinks the board can put that condition in place.

Steve Watripont agrees with the attorney. One of the things they have done internally is

try to be specific on the request. That's where they put the trucks and trailer on there, so if there was a boat they could hold them accountable, too. That's something they've done internally, because before they used to approve open storage. Now, they try to make it specific to help the board and them in enforcement.

Secretary Jerzy said perfect.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him.

Board Member Cliff has a suggestion on how they might word that motion, sir. If they'll indulge him. If it was him, he would have to read that out as allow open storage of semi tractor trailer. He apologized, semi tractors and semi trailers to within nineteen (19) feet of the front north property line and that will eliminate the parking legally of any other type of vehicle or equipment or trailer or recreational vehicle on that parcel.

Secretary Jerzy likes that idea, too. With trailers on there, it kind of leaves it open ended down the road, possibly. Very well stated. Thank you, sir.

Bobby McIlquham has a question with that. Their employees park at the location and take the truck, semi tractor trailer to and from. Is that ok?

Secretary Jerzy said oh yeah, absolutely.

Bobby McIlquham just wanted to make that clear.

Secretary Jerzy said there's still employees and they have to park there. They just don't want them coming and setting their fifth wheel up there and living there.

Bobby McIlquham just wanted to make that clear. Thank you.

Chairman Sophiea said this is the definition of unique.

Secretary Jerzy said it's beyond unique. It's bizarre. God bless them for inhabiting this.

Board Member Cliff said he has some words that his dispatch has sent him in there. He gave that up a while ago, so. If nobody else has anything to say, he'd go ahead and make that motion.

Board Member Watts has some questions. He's reading the application here. Under not self-imposed. It says it was not discoverable by the owner at the time of purchase. How does that happen? They're paying big money for a piece of property like that, they know what they're going to put in there. Wouldn't you want to get the requirements before they spent that kind of money?

Bobby McIlquham said he's not the owner of the company, but he thinks it was the understanding of the current owners. The previous building was a trucking operation, so he thinks falling within that zone they felt those requirements would be met.

Steve Watripont explained the previous company they had in there legally and everything else was actually a towing company. They had permission to have towed vehicles up to that point at that point in time. This is a different use than that. He knows someone went in before they went in, but didn't go through the property channels and then they came in seeing what they had saw, he believes. There was a previous variance for the towed vehicles on the property and he thinks to the nineteen (19) feet also.

Jennifer Pierce believes it said seventeen (17) feet. She apologizes. That was granted in 2011. It did say seventeen (17) feet.

Steve Watripont said there was a previous variance and because it wasn't towed vehicles and it's trucks and trailers he had to come before the board. If there is a motion to approve, if the board sees fit to rescind all previous variances in that regard, it would make his job much easier in the future.

Board Member Watts said here's his problem. He personally thinks it was self-imposed, number one. Number two, he sees it as a detriment to the area. Looking at these trucks backed up here, they have Tacom across the street. Nice office building, nice manicured lawns, stuff like that. Then they have all these semi trucks backed up here. So, when going down the service drive on one side you have this nice building, on the other side you got this look. He thinks it's a detriment to the area. He thinks it was self-imposed and he'll definitely be a no vote. He yields.

Board Member Clift asked if there is anybody else.

No response.

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to give permission to allow open storage of **semi-tractors/semi-trailers** to within 19' of the front (north) property line **and rescind all previous variances for this property.**

Reasons being: Uniqueness to the size and shape of the lot.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Mr. Clift, supported by Mr. Assessor to approve the request as read.

Jennifer Pierce said point of order. She asked if they wanted to add to the motion that with the granting of this that the variance granted on June 22, 2011 will be rescinded.

Board Member Clift said he rescinded everything there.

Steve Watripont thinks there has something to do with the building on some of those. He thinks he would limit the rescinding to the outside storage.

Board Member Clift said ok.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes more sense.

Jennifer Pierce said to rescind any variance, previous variance, related to outdoor storage. She thinks that's sufficient.

Motion:

Board Member Clift made a motion to give permission to allow open storage of **semi-tractors/semi-trailers** to within 19' of the front (north) property line **and rescind all previous variances pertaining to outdoor storage.**

Reasons being: Uniqueness to the size and shape of the lot.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Mr. Clift, supported by Mr. Assessor to approve the request as read.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 1).

Board Member Clift	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	No, detriment to the area and self-imposed.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Sophiea	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

12. NEW BUSINESS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

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

Voice Vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Paul Jerzy
Secretary of the Board

APPROVED