

CITY OF WARREN  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at 7:00 p.m.,

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at 7:00 p.m., in the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Commissioner's Present:

Delwar Ansar  
Andrey Duzyj  
Michael Holowaty  
Syed Hoque  
Sultana Chowdhury, Assistant Secretary  
Merle Boniecki, Vice Chair  
Warren Smith, Chair  
Henry Newnan, Ex-Officio

Also present:

Ron Wuerth – Planning Director  
Michelle Katopodes – Planner III  
David Crabtree – Assistant Planner  
Amanda Mika – Assistant Planner  
Mary Michaels – Assistant City Attorney  
Patrick Conlin – Communication Department

1. CALL TO ORDER:  
Chair Smith - Calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:
3. ROLL CALL:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to excuse Secretary Mouri, supported by Commissioner Ansar. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Chowdhury to approve, supported by Commissioner Duzyj. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES JULY 14<sup>th</sup>, 2025:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to approve, supported by Commissioner Hoque. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Members of the audience who wish to address the Planning Commission this evening for a public hearing item may do so by first checking in with the court reporter to the right of the stage and will have three (3) minutes to speak.

- A. SITE PLAN FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT; located on the south side of Ten Mile Road, approximately 159.1 feet west of Groesbeck Highway; 14000 & 13970 Ten Mile Road; Section 25; Mark Cicchini (Mark Cicchini/Rayco Utility & Rental Inc.); PSP250013. **Postponed from April 28, 2025 and June 2, 2025.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – Good evening, I'm an Architect, I work for Kem-Tec and Associates, I'm representing Mark Cicchini on this project. Just to give you a little bit of background on this project, this project was originally built 80 years ago by the Macomb County Road Commission. They used it for open storage for their vehicles and equipment; they have a small office building. My client's family bought this facility 40 years ago to use it for the exact same purpose. They are storing their road trucks, equipment, road materials and driveway materials, so it hasn't changed its use in 80 years.

What we are asking for is approval to use this for open storage. We understand that there's a few variances that we will be applying for approval also. We hope that you will consider this.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** Current.

**ENGINEERING:** Preliminary review of this site yielded the following comments from the Engineering Division:

1. Provide a complete and accurate written legal description of the parcel including the parcel identification number.

2. Variances shall be required for the proposed outdoor storage and gravel surface.
3. Site plan shall show the location of all existing underground utilities including their size, material, type, and discharge point in the vicinity of the project ([Engineeringinforequest@cityofwarem.org](mailto:Engineeringinforequest@cityofwarem.org)).
4. Any construction within 10 Mile Road R.O.W. shall require a permit from Macomb County Department of Roads.

**COMCAST:** In response to your utility request for the above project, please refer to the attached map for the location of Comcast CATV/FIBER facilities. Aerial cables are highlighted in orange for fiber and yellow for coax cable. Underground is highlighted in blue for fiber and green for coax cable. If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact us by email at [cccutilityrequests@teamsigma.com](mailto:cccutilityrequests@teamsigma.com).

**MCDR:** Macomb County Department of Roads (MCDR) has received and reviewed the enclosed preliminary plan for the above referenced site. MCDR has the following objection to proposed development at above mentioned site:

1. The Macomb County Department of Roads recommends removing the proposed landscaping from 10 Mile Road Right-of-Way.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (586) 463-8671.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

**MOTION:**

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to approve, supported by Commissioner Duzyj.

**COMMISSIONERS PORTION:**

Commissioner Duzyj – If the maker of the motion can change the performance bond from \$0 to \$1,000 that would make that a lot easier.

Commissioner Holowaty – Yes, I agree.

Commissioner Duzyj – The last thing, do you have any problems with any of these recommendations?

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – No, we don't.

Commissioner Duzyj – We can't approve anything for barbed wire, that goes to Zoning Board of Appeals. And how do you feel about the screening on the fence?

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We'd prefer it, but if the variances Board insists, then we'll add it.

Commissioner Duzyj – Thank you.

Chair Smith – I went over some of the dimensions on the storage areas and the square footage on storage area A is off, I think it was like 20,000, there's 8 spaces 10 x 26, like 2,080 square feet. Then there's another note on there that says 120 x 26.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We've changed this several times as per the request from the Planning Department. One of the things you might notice is basically it's a big empty yard, so we were just guessing where we are going to plot things and keep things and the Planning Department was made aware of that, so they just needed some numbers. It's basically a large lot that they applied equipment and materials as they needed and it changes every month.

Chair Smith – The only problem with that is when you're going for a variance for a certain square footage you have to have the numbers that you're going for the variance for.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – Yes, I'll correct that.

Chair Smith – The variances are going to reflect what your numbers are and it's going to be based on that.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We've moved things around 2 or 3 times now for the revisions on the numbers, but I will make sure that everything coordinates together.

Chair Smith – Thank you.

Commissioner Ansar – Recommendation number 4, directing that you have to go through all those variances.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – That's correct, yes.

Commissioner Ansar – So, my question is, do you want to go through it right now or do you want to postpone this and get the approval from the ZBA and then we can do it.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – I'm not sure I've never done that process.

Commissioner Ansar – Eventually if we approve it you still have to go to ZBA and get the approval from them.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We're not in any hurry we've been there for 40 years, we just want to go through the process that's required that we normally use, and we will resubmit for the variances and once we get approval we can come back. I'm not familiar with that shortcut, Ron, the gentleman is talking about getting the variances right now.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – To answer the question in this case, if Planning Commission postpones your request and you go to the Zoning Board of Appeals to get your variances, if you don't even get one of these your plan fails, then you can't come back here. The Planning Staff supports this plan with these variances primarily because of the age of the site and all those types of things. We are hoping that ZBA will understand that and go ahead and do it. If you go there and lose one variance your plan fails and you can't operate.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – I guess we don't want to do that.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – So, right now, I think you'd want to have the Planning Commissions support, if you can get that.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – So, if I understand this correctly, if they say yes, then we go for the variance and you're saying if the variance doesn't give us anything then we have to fix the variances?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – You'll have to change the variances. For example, on two of those we discussed, the barbed wire and the fence, if you do those then that takes two off. So, it's best to have a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission and we also send a review letter to the ZBA discussing the same thing because they want our opinion about it.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – I'd like to proceed today and get an approval today and then go for the variance and then we'll work out any issues with the variance. We may have to reconfigure out a design to match up with the variances that they approve.

Commissioner Ansar – Eventually if you don't get the approval from the ZBA you have to come back as the Director mentioned. So, if you postponed it then you can go to ZBA and you can work it out with the ZBA and then you can come back again.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We want to go with what Mr. Wuerth said and get an approval today and then go for the variances.

Commissioner Ansar – Alright.

Chair Smith – That was a motion by Commissioner Holowaty to approve, supported by Commissioner Duzyj, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

- B. SITE PLAN FOR NEW RETAIL CENTER; located on Eight Mile Road between Blackmar Avenue and Syracuse Avenue; 5649 Eight Mile Road; Section 32; Michael Beydoun/NSI Construction Inc. (Justin Kallo/Kallo Property LLC); PSP250026.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Michael Beydoun – Good evening, I’m the Architect for the project.

Mr. Justin Kallo – Justin Kallo, the owner.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – I’ll try and make it simple. As you see in the picture, we have an ugly box building right now on the side and it’s twice the size of what we are actually proposing. We are proposing build up a small plaza and enhance the area with landscaping. I do understand it is an industrial zone. If you look at the landscape plans, we came up with a lot of landscaping to beautify the area.

Also, when I met with the Planning Commission they did actually suggest, since the party store is a separate lot, their suggestion was why don’t we make the party store and the strip center look exactly the same and we agreed to that. We hope you can approve this project for us.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** Current.

**ENGINEERING:** Preliminary review of this site indicates that Planning Commission approval should be contingent upon the petitioner's compliance with the following condition(s):

1. Show how you intend to drain the parcel.
2. The existing approach must conform to the City of Warren commercial drive approach standards.

**FIRE:** As far as the site plan for 5649 Eight Mile is concerned, the Fire Department doesn't see any issues with the plan.

**WATER:** There are no issues with the Water Department regarding this project.

**AT&T:** AT&T does not object to the proposed shopping center. We do have facilities installed in the vacated alley on the north side of the property, but we do not expect them to be affected. Please advise the petitioner to contact Wire Center Engineer, Courtney Dunford, [cd0196@att.com](mailto:cd0196@att.com), 586-842-7758 if any conflicts arise.

**COMCAST:** In response to your utility request for the above project, please refer to the attached map for the location of Comcast CATV/FIBER facilities. Aerial cables are highlighted in orange for fiber and yellow for coax cable. Underground is highlighted in blue for fiber and green for coax cable. [cccutilityrequests@teamsigma.com](mailto:cccutilityrequests@teamsigma.com).

**MDOT:** The applicant applied for an MDOT permit and it is in review.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff:

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Althea Benjamin – Good evening, my mother owns the property right behind the liquor store. I just want to clarify something, are you planning on closing the alley to Syracuse and Blackmar? No, okay, so the alley is going to be open. Therefore, I'm the first person for development, but however, I'm the one that's picking up the trash and you know it. People go behind the alley and they do all kinds of things that I don't want to say in public. I would be out mowing the lawn to the property and see a person come from around the corner handling his business in my alley.

What I'm saying is the development is going to have more foot traffic and I know a whole bunch of people are going to gain some money from this development, but I'm the little person that's cleaning up behind people coming out of the liquor store, throwing liquor bottles under my bushes, I have pictures. My lawn, I just mowed my lawn, and my lawn looks like a whole bunch of paper, and I said wow, all that stuff came off my lawn, and he said yes, unfortunately, I did not take a picture. I did take a picture of my lawn today, full of paper and a whole bunch of stuff that I have to get out of my car every day or when I go to the property and start picking up paper, that's a normal ritual.

I want it to be developed, but there has to be some constraints on the paper, the people coming behind the liquor store doing their business on my property. All I'm saying is, I'm the person that's in the grime and grit that's doing all of this. So please consider the residential part of that strip between Syracuse and Blackmar. I don't know if we can come up with some kind of solution but I'm saying that there's going to be more foot traffic, more cars coming down the alley, more people doing their business behind the liquor store and on my property because I share that alley with the liquor store. I don't even do anything on the side of my house because it smells like urine. So please come up with some solution.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to approve, supported by Vice Chair Boniecki.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Commissioner Duzyj – First thing is to Ron, the Planning Director. 6A has got me confused, the alley is 20 feet wide and it says here to construct a new building 11 feet from the center of the alley when 20 feet is required. Why do we have to go 20 feet from the center of the alley?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Your first question, why is the alley 20 feet wide?

Commissioner Duzyj – Yes, let's start there.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Okay, it was platted that way. Part of the subdivision 20 feet wide east and west. The petitioner's property from Syracuse to Blackmar, if the alley is vacated, then they own ½ of it all the way through there. The north side should be owned by the people on the north side of the alley, if it's been vacated. If it's not vacated, and they are operating as if it is not, then it's a public alley. So, with that said, to answer your question about the building being setback, that's in the variance, right?

Commissioner Duzyj – Right.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – To construct a new building 11 feet from the center of the alley when 20 feet is required. It's in the Zoning Ordinance with setbacks.

Commissioner Duzyj – So the extra 10 feet is a setback?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It is a setback. You've got to know where you're going to setback from and they use the center of the alley not the property line of the alley.

Commissioner Duzyj – If the liquor store is 11 feet from the center of the alley, for the development, be bizarre to move it up 10 feet and then you have other stuff going on east of there where the dumpster and trash encloser and everything else. Is that alley vacant?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It shows it open to the petitioners, okay, let's just say it's vacant, the petitioner is using it primarily and the other half of it belongs to the people to the north.

Commissioner Duzyj – So it's not considered a public alley?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It is not, so the public shouldn't be in there. The ideal thing would be to gate it off at both ends to keep traffic and people out of there. They can unlock the gate if they need access to the back for their doors all the way down through there, it's just a suggestion it might be costly to put it up. You still have to figure out the issue of whether it's public or vacated.

Commissioner Duzyj – Right, and that's the key thing here. I understand the lot to the north is having its set of problems. Once all of this comes down, the building comes down, and the development continues; if the alley is vacated, that's one thing, if it's still a public alley, that's another thing. Judging from the center of the alley to how much of a setback we need, if we need a 10-foot setback on the new development that's one thing, but we are still going to have a problem with the party store on the corner.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – This is all joined together, that's why we ask that the properties be combined.

Commissioner Duzyj – He’s already leveling the building that’s there and I’m not sure how big that building is, but that’s going to be a lot coming down.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It’s an L shape, you can see it, that brownish looking roof and a white roof over there to the right, that’s what’s being removed.

Commissioner Duzyj – That whole thing is coming down. If we move that up or south, if you will, from the alley that still leaves the party store where it is, or are they going to have to redo the party store also?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It’s legal non-conforming, that’s why we are not touching that, it just stays the same, the new stuff gets a variance.

Commissioner Duzyj – I think it’s a terrific idea and a development in that area is probably going to help that entire area. Is that alley lit up, are there lights up and down that alley now?

Mr. Justin Kallo – Yes, I installed lights in the back.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – Can I comment on the alley itself?

Commissioner Duzyj – Sure.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – I thought there was a note from Planning Commission, I could not find the resolution from City Council, but they said if we can find the title work. As a matter of fact, as I was driving here, he sent me the deed, and it says it’s a vacated alley. If it’s vacated, I think it’s a good idea to put a gate both ways to keep the neighbors happy so no one can go through the back. We actually don’t need the alley for anything.

Commissioner Duzyj – That’s the main portion of all this; we want to keep the neighbors happy.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – We will do that, now we know it is actually vacated, and we can provide the evidence and title work to Planning so they can take a look at it and that will solve that issue actually.

Commissioner Duzyj – That means that the new development has got to be 10-foot south.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – I thought it was supposed to be 11 feet from the center of the alley, if it’s vacated.

Commissioner Duzyj – It's confusing because of that.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – The party store has been there for probably 80 years.

Commissioner Duzyj – So the party store is 11 feet from the center of the alley, at that point of time, but now that the alley is vacated everything is from the center. So, you have to go from the center of your alley, which is your property 20 feet for the setback, that's why you have to move it up another 10 feet.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – That will kill the project to move it forward. We will not have enough maneuvering lane in the front. What we have right now is twice the size of the building that we have, we are even minimizing the size of the square footage. I guess we will have to go in front of Zoning to ask to waive that 10 feet.

Commissioner Duzyj – That would solve a whole bunch of this. If we are going to go forward with this, he's got to go to ZBA one way or another. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Smith – I'm going to make a comment on that. Our note in our findings says that the ½ vacated alley between lots 20 and 27, the Planning Staff was unable to locate a resolution supporting this vacation. Do you have a record of the vacation where the City Council says it's been vacated?

Mr. Michael Beydoun – Not the resolution, (inaudible) oh if you can find something in the title search, title insurance, or in the deed that says we do. I checked the City's website, it says vacated, but then I went back into the deed itself, it says vacated, so they must have did their search for some reason. I wasn't there 80 years ago to do the variance, but the title search does indicate it's a vacated alley.

Chair Smith – Okay, because we probably need something to show that because if it was vacated then you own half the alley, but if it's not then the alley goes all the way through. On the drawing it says a vacant alley, which is a vacant alley, that doesn't mean it's vacated unless it was done with a resolution.

Mr. Micheal Beydoun – Correct, we can't find the resolution, maybe we can just contact the title company and see how that came up, they actually put on the legal description as a half-vacated alley.

Chair Smith – Okay. Looking at your drawing, basically you’re lining up the new retail with the back of the liquor store and then you have a dumpster over to the right and then you have some landscaping over to the other end. The other end comes out over by Syracuse, I couldn’t tell, is that end closed off.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – It is closed off. We do have a brick face wall, I’m closing the whole area by the dumpster with a brick face wall.

Chair Smith – There’s no access to the alley from Syracuse.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – There is no access to the alley for the property whatsoever.

Chair Smith – It looks like it’s going to be a nice development. I can understand the lady’s concerns about people going behind the building and doing things you’re not supposed to be doing. You said you have lights back there.

Mr. Michael Beydoun – We have on the plans that lights will just shine downward. Hopefully we will come to an agreement; we will build a gate and fence, we will give her the key, and she go back there and she can use it as she wants, if she wants a garden she can. We will help maintain it and we will help clean it up, once it’s closed you still have to cut the weeds. We will have the landscaping company clean up behind the alley.

Chair Smith – That was a motion by Commissioner Duzyj, supported by Vice Chair Boniecki, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

- Commissioner Duzyj..... Yes
- Vice Chair Boniecki..... Yes
- Commissioner Ansar..... Yes
- Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes
- Commissioner Hoque..... Yes
- Assistant Secretary Chowdhury..... Yes
- Chair Smith..... Yes

- C. SITE PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL USE ADDING 1 HOUR MINISTERIAL SERVICE ON SUNDAYS; located on the southwest corner of Thirteen Mile Road and Cousino Drive; 4860 Thirteen Mile Road; Section 8; The White House Wedding Chapel by Lavdas, LLC (Nicholas Lavdas/Dan Ivanovic); PSP250029.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Dan Ivanovic – I’m here representing Mr. Lavdas in this matter. I understand this was deemed that the uses are approved as is and we don’t have to seek any further approval for what we are doing there.

Chair Smith – We do have a note based on the determination from the Planning Staff. They recommend that this item be removed from the agenda as the main use of the property will continue to be the Wedding Chapel. If the use changes in the future the site plan approval might be required. Being it’s the recommendation of the Planning Department to remove this item from the agenda I need a motion.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to remove this from the agenda, supported by Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

- A. SITE PLAN FOR SEASONAL OUTDOOR RETAIL SALES FOR FIREWORKS; located on the southeast corner of Schoenherr and Thirteen Mile Roads; 30810-30830 Schoenherr Road; Section 12; Schoenherr 13 LLC/Ryan Kattoo (Family Fun Fireworks/Mike Kanakry); PSP230003. **Approved on March 13, 2023. Conditions never completed. Expired on March 13, 2025.**

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to recognize as an expired site plan, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

- Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes
- Commissioner Hoque..... Yes
- Commissioner Ansar..... Yes
- Commissioner Duzyj..... Yes
- Chair Smith..... Yes
- Vice Chair Boniecki..... Yes
- Assistant Secretary Chowdhury..... Yes

- B. SITE PLAN FOR ISLAMIC CENTER FOR WORSHIP; located on the south side of Thirteen Mile Road, approximately 512 feet east of Washington Boulevard; 8360 Thirteen Mile Road and 13-10-126-002; Section 10; Khairul Amin/Tufazzul Haque Amin/Omar Faruque (Zaid Arabo/ZA Design Build); PSP250015. **Letter from the Planning Director to the petitioner regarding the extensive cutting of trees and other vegetation on the above-mentioned site.**

Chair Smith – Normally this is a correspondence item, I don't know if anyone is here to speak on this. We did receive a letter from Mr. Amin regarding this item, so I don't know if they want to come up to discuss it. If they do we need a motion to suspend the rules and allow them to come up and comment on this.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to suspend the rules if anyone wants to come up and discuss this, supported by Vice Chair Boniecki.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

- Commissioner Duzyj..... Yes
- Vice Chair Boniecki..... Yes
- Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes
- Commissioner Ansar..... Yes
- Commissioner Hoque..... Yes
- Assistant Secretary Chowdhury..... Yes
- Chair Smith..... Yes

Mr. Zaid Arabo – Good evening, my name is Zaid, I'm from ZA Design Build, I'm here to represent Mr. Amin the owner of the building. Back in late April the Islamic Center was approved with conditions, we are working on these conditions right now with Civil Engineering and Photometric Study. At some point, the gentleman from the Islamic Center approached Property Maintenance to ask if they could remove trees. At that time, they looked at the computer and they said we don't see an issue with you removing trees from the property.

Part of his approval though, we know now, the gentleman should have gone to Planning to ask for any tree removal. At that time, they advised him that as long as he stakes the corner of his property, make sure you're not cutting trees outside your property, he should be able to clean off your property. Imagine the property being about 250 feet about 2/3 of it is being developed for a parking lot for the Islamic Center, which is an existing structure. The back third was wooded, not protected, just wooded, that part of the approval was to keep that buffer. There are many different buffers that you can have under Section 2.26 of the Zoning Ordinance. One is to have an 8-foot landscape buffer, one is a 6-foot wall, but they just went ahead and removed all the trees. So we are here to see what the panel thinks we should do. My personal opinion is, since the trees are already gone, we prefer to build the 6-foot screen wall because we are currently revising the drawings, per this letter, to also reflect an 8-foot landscape buffer, we showed a 5-foot landscape buffer on the two sides, the east and the west. We are proposing an 8-foot landscape buffer all the way to the back and then we want to propose, as part of the revised drawings, a 6-foot simulated masonry construction wall with slopped coping.

So that's where the confusion happened, he went to the wrong side of the aisle. He should have gone to the Planning Department, but he actually went to Property Maintenance. To my knowledge none of these trees are protected, they just gave a nice little buffer between the residence and some shade. There's always the possibility, as the Islamic Center grows, that they were going to come back in a year or two from now to expand that parking lot eventually and of course meeting all the Ordinance recommendations.

Chair Smith – Thank you for your comments, sir. Mr. Wuerth, can you come up for a minute please.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Does everyone have copies of the communication from Gerald Hasspacher?

Chair Smith – We just got it.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Would you mind reading that, it's correspondence to the correspondence, and I have a couple of comments about what was just said.

Chair Smith – We are going to read the letter from also and then read the letter from Mr. Hasspacher.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury reading letters into the record.

This letter was from Tufazzul Haque Amin on July 25, 2025, to the Planning Commissioners.

To Whom It May Concern:

Respected Planning Director of the City of Warren, I hope this email finds you in the best of health. Honorable Director, I would like to inform you that on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025, I approached the desk at Property Maintenance and advised them as to what I need to do to remove the trees on my property. I made mention that I may remove some or all the trees, and they advised me that there was no protocol in regard to this site, after checking the computer, and for me to be able to remove the trees, but to make sure you stake the corners to ensure that you are not removing trees from your neighbors. After getting this information we hired a surveyor and staked the property and proceeded to remove the trees. It is never our intention to cause any problems with the City as you have been wonderful to work with.

I was really surprised when I heard there was a complaint against us for removing the trees at the last Planning Commission meeting. Right after I got the news I went to the City the very next day to find out the reason behind all of this. When I approached the City and discussed the matter with them, I also told them that you guys granted us permission to proceed with the removal of the trees. The Planning Department felt sorry and informed us that there was miscommunication from the City because it's not the job of the Property Maintenance Department to inform us whether we can remove the trees or not. I also was informed that I will be receiving a letter from the City about the next step, then we left City Hall. We will attend the next hearing with our representatives, Zaid Arabo, to figure out things, thank you so much.

Sincerely,  
Tufazzul Haque Amin

Mary Clark CER-6819  
July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury – There was also a letter from Gerald Hasspacher.

Hello Mary,

I am unable to attend today's 7/28/25 Planning Commission meeting. I request that my comments below be read aloud and entered into the record.

Our window of opportunity to effectively address climate change, a crisis that poses catastrophic consequences and an existential threat to humanity, is rapidly closing. Ongoing discussions around climate tipping points suggest we may have already passed the threshold for meaningful intervention or are dangerously close to it. Given their role as one of the planet's most effective natural carbon sinks, trees must be recognized as a top priority at every level of government.

The recent destruction of a mature forest at 8360 Old Thirteen Mile Road represents a serious loss. These trees are no longer able to absorb atmospheric carbon, and the carbon they stored will now be released through decomposition, further contributing to climate change.

In my view, several factors contributed to this regrettable outcome:

- The current Tree Ordinance lacks language requiring the identification and preservation of specific regulated and landmark trees. A provision mandating the preservation of a certain percentage, such as 50%, would likely have required an on-site inspection and led to the protection of the existing trees.
- The Ordinance also fails to require the regular public reporting of key data, such as the number, size, and species of trees planted or removed that should be easily accessible to promote transparency and accountability.
- A critical gap exists in educating residents about the urgency of climate change and encouraging individual's actions that can meaningfully reduce personal carbon footprints.

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend this meeting and will miss the opportunity to hear comments. I respectfully request to be placed on the agenda at a future Planning Commissioner Meeting.

Chair Smith – So, you said you talked to the Planning Department about doing a 6-foot wall?

Mary Clark CER-6819  
July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Mr. Zaid Arabo – No, one of the Planners was out of the office the day I called, after we received the letter, so I spoke to a young lady, I apologize, I forget the young lady's name, I told her we'd be attending, and we would be speaking to Planning about our intention and what to do. So, our Civil Engineer is currently revising the drawings to meet all these requirements. Now we have this new issue we are dealing with. My recommendation to my Civil Engineer and the owners are to build a 6-foot screen wall per the Ordinance in the back. If you look at the pictures, there are still a few trees that are on the perimeter in the back. We are probably going to walk away from the property and let those trees be where they are at and the revised Civil Engineering is going to reflect the new screen wall. So, a new screen wall in the back, an 8-foot buffer all the way from the front of the property to the back of the property and the new plans will reflect that.

Chair Smith – Mr. Wuerth, this new plan that he is proposing what's your thoughts on it?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – I'd like more time to think about it, first of all I think they've misconceived what the 5-foot area along the east and west property lines, there's supposed to be a greenbelt, I don't think they understand what a greenbelt is. In this particular case, if they are going to have any kind of greenbelt, it's going to be 20 feet wide not 5. I thought they were going to build a wall along the east and west property lines where the parking lot is. There's a lot that's not been communicated correctly to us. They will need to amend their site plan and make that request to the Planning Commission. Maybe the only remedy right now is to put a wall around the entire perimeter of the site, I guess that's what should be done. I'd prefer that they go and plant all the greenbelts, that's just me.

Chair Smith – This is just correspondence; this is not a public hearing, there's not supposed to be any discussion other than we were going to receive comment from the petitioner about the letter. I'd like to make a suggestion that the petitioner get with you, we can't replace those trees, they have been there over 100 years.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – They have no idea what they did. I don't know what they were thinking at all, cutting all those trees down. I don't care who they spoke to in Property Maintenance, they had site plan approval by the Planning Commission, they should have come here and asked you or they should have come and talked to myself or Michelle Katopodes, the top Planners here, to discuss it.

It never happened, they ended up with another group, somebody told them Property Maintenance. What is Property Maintenance? Property Maintenance gets complaints, that's what they are, driven by. Their job isn't to advise people at the desk on what you can do with your property, especially about cutting trees down. We've got a Tree Ordinance that we've been working on for a long time. The Mayor has worked on it along with Councilman Newnan, and he would like to talk tonight. We will meet with them, and we will have to come to some kind of consensus on what to do. Just a final statement, they cut all those trees down, but they left a few in the front, those are gone too.

Commissioner Duzyj – Are the trees that were cut down on your property or on somebody else's property?

Mr. Zaid Arabo – Our property.

Commissioner Duzyj – You're sure about that?

Mr. Zaid Arabo – Yes, they staked the four corners and they cut everything within the property and there's still some trees left within the property.

Commissioner Duzyj – I took a ride through there and I find that entire process and everything about it disgusting. There was a forest, and now there's junk, and building a 4-, 5-, or 6-foot wall or a berm, that doesn't help any of this and I'm not so sure that all the trees cut were on just your property. I'm not a surveyor, I don't know how to do that, but what I do know is that what you did is unconscionable.

You didn't do it, somebody else did, and whoever did should have thought about what they were doing before they did it. By the looks of it, and after everything is said and done, nobody thought about anything, just cut the heck out of it and be done with it. I don't agree with it, I'm very upset about it, and either 6- or 8-foot wall or greenbelt doesn't help this entire situation.

I'm seriously thinking on whether or not we should say if you're going to redo the site plan and everything else why don't we dismiss the old site plan and be done with it until you come up with a new one. I have no idea how you can replace what you've done because I don't think it's replaceable. Just for your information I'm very upset about this.

Mr. Zaid Arabo – I can hear that. Are those trees in a protected land, were those protected trees, Mr. Wuerth? We are going to meet with you and come up with a solution, I'm just asking. I've been doing this for a long time, so if you cut trees in a woodland when you're not supposed to, unless you get permission or replant, were those trees protected trees or just on the property. Should we add to this parking lot in the future would we have the right to remove those trees and follow the Ordinance which is 2.26, let me read this really quick.

Chair Smith – Sir, before we start getting more involved in this, we are already more involved than it was supposed to be.

Mr. Zaid Arabo – Yes sir, can I just say one thing, I'm sorry to cut you off.

Chair Smith – Go ahead.

Mr. Zaid Arabo - In this recommendation letter they were asking if we were going to receive these different variances, which we weren't going for any variances, if the petitioner desires to waive the 6-foot-high required fence wall or 8-foot-wide greenbelt along the east/west property line that's a variance. We are not proposing that, we are proposing an 8-foot greenbelt, and I know what a greenbelt is, on the east and west. Our revised drawings are going to reflect that, it doesn't take away from you being upset about trees being removed but unless those trees are protected, and again in 2 or 3 years if they were to come back to expand the parking lot, what's to stop them from removing the trees at that time to build a bigger parking lot per Ordinance. That's all I have to say, thank you.

Chair Smith – Councilman Newnan wanted to say a few words, I just wanted to say one thing. It was wrong cutting down all the trees because the site plan showed the trees being there, but now we need to focus on the trees are cut down and what are we going to do to fix the problem. There's nothing we can do about the trees that were cut down, so we need to concentrate on what can be done to correct the situation to try and make amends for what was done.

Councilman Newnan – Ex-Officio from the Council, Henry Newnan. I think that the letter that Director Wuerth has in the packet probably should be read into the record so that anyone who maybe doesn't read well might be able to hear it and have someone translate it for them. To make sure that they see what's being asked for now because it seems clear that they did not understand what was being required of them from the first time.

I also have a letter from a neighbor one of the people complaining, Rosanne LaFata, she says: My condominium faces what was the wooded area behind where the new Islamic Center on Thirteen Mile is being built. They have removed trees that were beyond their property line, I'm glad I took before pictures. The property line is where the red tie is on the trees.

She has a lot of pictures here. I spoke to the workers today and I think after a short time they realized what I was saying and what they did was not correct but did not know what to do about it. The pictures show how much was removed beyond the property line, they also show the density of the wooded area that was there. I spoke to a worker a few days ago, he said they were removing inside the property line. When it comes to what to do about it, the greenbelt sounds like a very good idea, probably walls, as Director Wuerth was saying, around where he said they should be would be a good idea.

There's a concept of what's called a pocket forest, it's a scientific idea, it grows faster than a normal forest, and it combines a variety of different types of plantings that support each other and also provide biodiversity for wildlife, and I think that's something from my extended conversation with Rosanne or talking to Gerald Hasspacher.

It would be something that would benefit that area, it would improve the air quality, and it would improve the water coming out. One of the things that I believe has happened here is that it isn't a water shed (inaudible) it's a floodplain. It's more than an acre of disturbance, I'm not very conversive with all these terms. It's disturbed the floodplain, and the trees help to protect against the flooding. If they understood all this, they would want those trees there and the quickest way to get those back would be a pocket forest. It's something that the Mayor knows about, she's planting them in various parts of the City and other experts know about it.

I'd be happy to provide guidance to anyone that wants it. We want to be welcoming towards everyone in the City, we don't mean to be upsetting to people who are trying to set up a place of worship, but we do need to have the rules followed. We do need to have more consultation with the Planning Department in cases like this. Not to cry about spilled milk, but going forward we need to make sure that people understand the points in their plan, maybe give them flash quizzes on do you understand this and that, and if they don't, then help them. I know it's not for me to tell you how to operate your business, but it would be good to have the site plans followed and the process made clear to people to make sure they know. Thank you so much, I hope I haven't prevailed on you for too long.

Commissioner Hoque – I have a few questions for the applicant please. Did you cut any trees beyond your property line?

Mr. Zaid Arabo – Not to my knowledge, the corners are staked, I'm happy to meet anybody from the City and we can walk the property to see if there were any trees cut beyond the property. This is the first time I'm hearing that trees were cut outside the property. So, we are here because the City is upset that we cut trees without asking Planning.

Commissioner Hoque – Mr. Wuerth, what was said on the plan that we passed last month regarding the trees?

Mr. Zaid Arabo – I can read if you'd like.

Commissioner Hoque – Yes, because they are mentioning when the parking lot is extended the trees would be gone anyway, right, you mentioned that.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Are we going to have a hearing here?

Chair Smith – No, we are not going to have a public hearing.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Good question Commissioner Hoque, but I think we better move on, we will have a meeting on this.

Commissioner Hoque – We are trying to find a solution, whatever has happened has happened, but we need to find a solution.

Chair Smith – Commissioner Hoque, one second please. Like I said this is correspondence, it's not a public hearing, so they have to figure out what they can do. They need to meet with Mr. Wuerth and Councilman Newnan, right now it's not doing us any good to carry this conversation on, because it's something they have to get together and do.

Commissioner Hoque – I understand that, I'm saying it so the petitioner can sit down with the department and find out the solution.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury – It looks like both parties are agreeing they know the mistake that has happened, there was a miscommunication. We need to make sure that everybody is on the same page, I think they need to set up a meeting where they can figure out how to resolve this, we are not getting any resolutions right now. Councilman Newnan, Ron and the petitioner all need to sit down together brainstorm ideas on how we can resolve this. What's done is done. I think a miscommunication happened the trees are not growing up soon. My idea is, have a meeting and go from there.

Commissioner Hoque – And maybe amend the site plan.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury – Based on what they discuss in their meetings with Mr. Newnan, Ron, and the petitioner.

Commissioner Ansar – I agree with Assistant Secretary Chowdhury, instead of going back and forth, a mistake and misunderstanding happened, so, as she said, the petitioner, director, and our councilman have to work together to solve this issue. It was miscommunication from both sides, I think, so we should not go back and forth with the same thing. Also, as Councilman Newnan mentioned can we make a motion to put the letters in the record.

Chair Smith – Need a motion to recognize both letters for our files, and this item will have to come back on a public hearing item, after everything has been discussed with everyone, at a later date. I don't know how much time you need to make a decision on what needs to be done. You can set that up with the Planning Department, and then we will have it back as a public hearing. Right now, being this is just correspondence, we are going to recognize the letters for our file and move forward. The motion was by Commissioner Duzyj, supported by Vice Chair Boniecki, to receive and file the letters.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

8. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. REVISED SITE PLAN FOR EXPANDING EMPLOYEE PARKING; located on the south side of Ten Mile Road; approximately 292.35 feet east of Warner Avenue; Section 30; 3000 Ten Mile Road; Brad Brickel (MMC Management/Michael Campbell); PSP230015. **Originally approved on September 25, 2023. The revised plan indicates a reduction in EV Stations and the addition of shrubs around the electrical facility.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Michael Campbell – Good evening, Michael Campbell with MMC Management, the owner of the property. Just looking for a couple revisions to an approved site plan. Our operational needs have changed we no longer need 10 EV Stations, just 3. The original plan called for a concrete wall around the transformer. We decided to do greenery instead we thought it would be an improvement, but obviously we will need approval to do that. We are looking for 2 changes to the site plan.

Assistant Secretary Chowdhury – No correspondence.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendation of the Staff:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to accept the revised site plan, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

- B. MINOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN FOR CHANGES TO SOUTH BUILDING AND SPLIT INTO TWO BUILDINGS; located on the northeast corner of Mound Road and Nine Mile Road; 23250 Mound Road (23500 Mound); Section 28; NP Mound Road Industrial LLC (Mark Koenigsknecht). Minor Amendment is for changes to building height, quantity of truck docks, and fencing for Building 3 only. PMA240007. **Approved on October 21, 2024. Petitioner is withdrawing their application for minor amendment to site plan.**

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to remove the application for minor amendment, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

9. BOND RELEASE:

- A. SITE PLAN FOR NEW GLEANERS BUILDING; located on the northeast corner of Eight Mile Road and Sunset Avenue; 4401 Eight Mile Road (13-32-357-014), 13-32-357-009, 13-32-357-013, 13-32-357-012, & 13-32-357-011; Section 32; John Kastler/Gleaners Community Food Bank of Southeast Michigan (Kathleen Rupp/Ghafari Associates, LLC); PSP230028. **Approved on September 25, 2023. Surety bond posted in the amount of \$33,000. Project complete. Release the bond.**

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to release the bond, supported by Commissioner Duzyj.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Commissioner Duzy.....	Yes
Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

- B. SITE PLAN FOR NEW TACO BELL BUILDING; located on the north side of Ten Mile Road, approximately 400 ft. west of Schoenherr Road; 13343 10 Mile Road; Section 23; Matt Yanda (Paul Stodulski); PSP180056. **Approved on October 8, 2018. Surety Bond posted in the amount of \$22,000. The property was sold on March 29, 2019. The new owner completed the project, and the new \$36,000 surety bond was released on July 14, 2025. Release the original \$22,000 surety bond.**

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Hoque to release the bond, supported by Commissioner Duzyj.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Hoque.....	Yes
Commissioner Duzyj.....	Yes
Commissioner Ansar.....	Yes
Commissioner Holowaty.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Chowdhury.....	Yes
Vice Chair Boniecki.....	Yes
Chair Smith.....	Yes

- C. SITE PLAN FOR SEASONAL OUTDOOR RETAIL SALES FOR FIREWORKS; located on the southeast corner of Schoenherr and Thirteen Mile Roads; 30810-30830 Schoenherr Road; Section 12; Schoenherr 13 LLC/Ryan Kattoo (Family Fun Fireworks/Mike Kanakry); PSP230003. **Approved on March 13, 2023. Cash Bond posted in the amount of \$500. Conditions never completed. Expired on March 13, 2025. Release the bond.**

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to release the bond, supported by Commissioner Duzyj. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

10. NEW BUSINESS:  
None at this time.
11. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:  
None at this time.
12. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS:

**A) Planning Director's Report:**

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It was another short 2 weeks for me, I had some vacation time. We had our Planning Commission meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July, on July 15<sup>th</sup>, there was a meeting with people at the M-97 Groesbeck Highway, I can't call it a junk yard, its arts and pieces and everything else that has to do with automobiles that they store on the site. So, we had a meeting with the architect. We continue to have problems with the accuracy of the plan and even the accuracy of the survey, so we went over that for a while. They might be coming to us for an amendment.

On the 17<sup>th</sup>, we meet with the first petitioner, Mark Cicchini, and Jeff Graham to work over the plan. We finally came to agreements with some of the things, the variances, they'll have to work with the Zoning Board. I did a lot of findings. I had a ½ day on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, then the 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, and the 28<sup>th</sup> off, except I'm here doing the meeting. So that's about it as far as my activities.

The one thing I wanted to mention, and David Crabtree brought it to my attention, we indicated to you that there's a Zoning Board of Appeals Certification Course. David decided he would work it and he completed the course, so he's now certified with that particular course, it's very similar to Citizen Planner. Now, it gets you into the Zoning Board of Appeals ways of doing things. Congratulations, David.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – I just want to make one announcement. There's a community event happening this Wednesday, the new Fire Station #5. There's going to be a community open house going from 12:30 until 7:00 pm. There's a parade at 10:00 am from the current Fire Station #5 to the new one located on Schoenherr Road, which is 30619 Schoenherr. There will be a dedication ceremony at 11:00 am as well. Thank you.

#### **B) Planning Commission Discussion and Concerns:**

Commissioner Duzyj – I'd like to commend Assistant Secretary Chowdhury on her fine job as Assistant Secretary, well done.

Chair Smith – Yes, very good job.

Commissioner Duzyj – From the Planning Staff, Amanda Mika has been involved in a whole bunch of this, well done too.

Chair Smith – I'd like to thank Mary Michaels, our City Attorney, this evening.

#### 13. CALENDAR OF PENDING MATTERS:

None at this time.

#### 14. ADJOURNMENT:

##### MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Duzyj to adjourn, supported by Commissioner Holowaty. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

---

Warren Smith, Chair

---

Sultana Chowdhury, Assistant Secretary

Meeting recorded and transcribed by  
Mary Clark - CER-6819

**E-mail:** [maryclark130@gmail.com](mailto:maryclark130@gmail.com)

DRAFT