

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 14, 2024

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, August 14, 2024 at 7:30 p.m. at the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

Roman Nestorowicz, Vice-Chairman
Paul Jerzy, Secretary
Charles Perry, Assistant Secretary
Charles Anglin
Kevin Higgins
Shaun Lindsey
Anthony Sieracki, Jr.

Members of the Board absent:

David Sophiea, Chairman

Also present:

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

A roll call was taken and Board Member Sophiea was absent.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to excuse Mr. Sophiea, he contacted that there was a conflict; Board Member Anglin supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (7 – 0).

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Jerzy would like to make one minor change to the agenda. He would like to move item 11 to the August 28th meeting and keep the rest of the agenda as written.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to adopt the agenda with previously mentioned changes; Board Member Anglin supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz wanted to let, if anyone in the audience was here to speak or give comments on item 11, which was 13734 Twelve Mile, this is their notification for the rescheduling to August 28th.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of the Regular Meeting of July 24, 2024.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to table the minutes of July 24, 2024 to August 28, 2024; Supported by Board Member Sieracki.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (7 – 0).

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 6. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Mark Fowler |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Same as above. |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 23221 Lauren |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-25-451-016 |
| ZONE: | R-1-C |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Erect a 1,000 square ft. garage, to within 3' of the south lot line and within 10' of the rear wall of the principal building.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.19 (A) – Detached Garage Buildings: All detached garages located in the side rear yards and within ten (10) feet of the rear wall of any principal building shall comply with all yard requirements applicable to the principal structure in the district. In no even shall such garages be located closer than five (5) feet from any side lot lines.

Chairman Sophia explained the petitioner is not here tonight. He's going to open the public portion of the meeting first. This is the first time that the petitioner is not here. He would like to ask the city attorney if that's appropriate that it's ok they hear the item without the petitioner present. His concern is that often times they make a compromise on the items requested, and the petitioner has to consent to the compromise, so he's not sure how that is going to work tonight.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the applicant is present. Please approach the podium. For all applicants, when coming to the podium give name and address and then the reasons for the petition today.

Mark Fowler appeared before the board asking for a special variance to build a 1,000 square foot garage at 23221 Lauren.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked him to explain his request to the board.

Mark Fowler explained the old garage is leaning and has to be torn down. When he put in the application he explained to them that he doesn't have a basement at this residence, which is the need to build a larger 1,000 square foot.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for that explanation. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone else in the audience that wants to speak on this item? Please approach the podium. State name and address for the record.

Tom Brewer, 23243 Bolam, appeared before the board stating there are several places in the neighborhood that they've added that work to be the garages and they eventually turn them into little rental places. The few homes in the neighborhood that have put up bigger garages like that were 1,000 square feet, that's as big as many of the houses there. They're running a business in a residential neighborhood. It's zoned single family, not for little mini businesses or mini apartment complexes. There's homes there right in this letter they sent out. It says that there's more than four (4) people at that residence they'll just post it on the building. It's a residential neighborhood. Single family homes. This is a mini apartment building that they're posting it there. There's been more and more going on there now it's getting to be too much.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. Is there anything else he wanted add or are those his comments?

Tom Brewer said that's it he guesses.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments. Is there anyone else in the audience wanting to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him and said he could go back to his seat. Not seeing any other comments from the audience, he will close the public portion of the meeting and turn it over to the board for question and discussion.

Board Member Anglin said to the petitioner, what size is the lot? He doesn't see that information in here.

Mark Fowler said one hundred and three (103) by sixty (60) he thinks.

Board Member Anglin asked sixty (60) foot across the front and one hundred and three (103) depth.

Mark Fowler replied yes.

Board Member Anglin asked what size is the house.

Mark Fowler replied 2,000 square feet.

Board Member Anglin normally doesn't have an objection to a little larger garages when it's on more of a property than this piece is at. For that reason, he's not in favor of this size of garage. He thinks it's building too much on too small of a piece of property. Especially, with the house at 2,000 square foot. He doesn't believe that leaves enough green belt around it. He is looking at the drawing. If he built a smaller garage he wouldn't need these setbacks. A 1,000 square foot garage is actually considered a five (5) car garage. One (1) car garage is two hundred (200) square feet.

So, if he's got a 1,000 square feet, that's a five (5) car garage.

Mark Fowler explained it's not for five (5) cars, it's a two (2) car...

Board Member Anglin said he's just saying what code reflects. He's a builder. He's been building these things for a long time and two hundred (200) square feet is considered a one (1) car garage. Two (2) car garage is four hundred (400) square feet. If he's got 1,000 square feet, then that would make it a five (5) car garage. Whether you can get five (5) cars in it or not, but that's what the square footage he's asked for.

Mark Fowler said when you add the factor of...

Board Member Anglin said he's not asking, sir. He wasn't asking the petitioner a question, just trying to make sure he understands why he's saying what he's saying. For that reason, he thinks he's over building on the lot. That's all.

Secretary Jerzy said his concern in addition to the size was the garage going right across the side door. He's got the garage extending past the side door, and he knows he said he doesn't use the side door.

Mark Fowler explained if you pull in the garage you can walk straight into the house from that side door. It's just like having an attached garage.

Secretary Jerzy said here's the other problem. It's not. They're leaving hardly any room. If he had a fire break out that close from the garage to the house, everything is going to catch on fire. His concern is since he has the space to the south, and if he was going to completely go right down to the cement and get rid of the old garage. He went by the house, the garage is a mess. He does need a new garage to some degree or another. But his thing would be to just try to move it over. Move it over away from the house a little bit to make it look a little bit more aesthetically pleasing to the lot, too. It gives him a little bit more space on the other side and in between the house and the garage. If something happens when a fire breaks out, EMS has to get in there. He doesn't even know if there's enough room to get a fire hose and stuff down there. So, that's his biggest concern. If the next home owner after him gets it, that to him is a safety concern. So, with that he'll yield the floor.

Board Member Anglin said just to kind of add on to what his colleague here stated. Make sure he's getting it right. It's two (2) feet six (6) inches. That's thirty (30) inches. A thirty-two (32) inch entry door won't open, that's how close it is.

Chairman Nestorowicz agrees with his comments. He thinks the 1,000 square feet, he means, it's a very large garage compared to the property. A new garage is needed, and he feels they could give him a larger garage, but not this large. That's his concern. Any other questions, discussion, or any motions?

Board Member Anglin would like to make a motion. On the size of the lot and the size of the garage. The garage is too big, that's his explanation for that. He feels at that point, it would be a detriment to an area.

Chairman Nestorowicz was hoping to stop him before making the motion. Would the board maybe want the petitioner to have a chance to come back with a smaller garage?

Board Member Anglin said he would be happy with that.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if anybody else on the board...

Board Member Anglin said he would be happy with him if he came back. If the board could give him an opportunity to where he doesn't have to pay for this again. He'll agree with him.

Chairman Nestorowicz said that's why he was going to say come back. He doesn't want him to get denied and he didn't hear any motion for in favor. They could table the item if he wanted to go back and think about a smaller garage.

Mark Fowler asked what is allowable on this size lot. He doesn't want to have to build a shed for his lawn equipment, snow blower and stuff like that.

Chairman Nestorowicz explained what is allowed is a seven hundred (700) square feet would be allowed. He wouldn't even need the boards approval. It's those over seven hundred (700) square feet that he needs the boards approval. So, if he was building a seven hundred (700) square foot garage he could go forward and have no problems. If he came back and said he needed eight hundred (800) square feet, then he would have to come back to the board. He just doesn't want him to have to...

Mark Fowler asked if he says eight hundred (800) hundred he has to come back for eight hundred (800) or can they go on that here now.

Chairman Nestorowicz said unless he wants to say something like that here now and see what if that's... Does he have a size that would work?

Mark Fowler said he would have to call back to the steel building place, but they said they kind of build to suite, but that's the quote they gave me was 1,000 square feet. So, he's not sure. He's not sure exactly on the size, but if he goes back and says eight hundred (800), is that forty (40) by twenty (20)?

Chairman Nestorowicz replied yep. Probably, yeah. That's why he doesn't know if he actually just wants the board to table it so he can talk to his builder and then come back. He would hate for the board to come up with the square footage that he agreed to and then come back and say no, now he doesn't need that amount.

Mark Fowler asked what is the maximum allowable he could get out of the board today.

Board Member Anglin and Chairman Nestorowicz both replied seven hundred (700).

Board Member Higgins stated seven hundred (700) and with the correct distance from the lot lines. It's all right there. If he goes back and builds to the specs, seven hundred (700) feet or less within

the right specs to the lot lines. Go ahead and build it, he'll get a permit. He won't need a variance.

Mark Fowler understands that, but he needs a little more than seven hundred (700). He's been over that.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there's a square footage amount that he would like to request that is more than seven hundred (700) to see if the board would agree to.

Mark Fowler explained they told him to narrow it down two (2) feet knocks a hundred (100) square feet off of it automatically. He heard voicing the concern about the distance from the house. To narrow it down two (2) feet knocks a hundred (100) square feet off of it.

Secretary Jerzy said not saying narrow it down, he's just saying move it over.

Board Member Anglin doesn't see where he can move it over. He's looking at this. He doesn't have any objections to setting these lot lines the way they are here. His objection is to the size of the garage. If he puts a seven hundred (700) square foot garage, wants to maintain the twenty (20) foot width, which would require it to be a two (2) car garage, then he has no problems putting a motion in to grant him the easements variances. His problem is the size of it for the size of the lot. Like they've said, they've had people with an acre and they didn't really smile too much going bigger than a 1,000 square foot, and they got an acre of ground.

Mark Fowler asked that he's allowed to be as tall as the house. So he can put a storage area above the garage.

Chairman Nestorowicz said to his knowledge, no, but Steve can approach the podium and actually answer that for the board.

Board Member Anglin said the height of the peak is twenty-one (21) feet.

Steve Watripont explained a garage can only be one (1) story and ten (10) feet to the eaves. So, if it had a little rafter maybe a little bit of storage, but no second story and no building up higher. He doesn't know how high his house is, but ten (10) feet to the eaves is the max.

Board Member Anglin asked if it's eighteen (18) feet to the peak. Get the pitch.

Steve Watripont replied he's not a builder.

Board Member Anglin said he is.

Steve Watripont explained the ordinance doesn't take the pitch into consideration.

Board Member Anglin said if he has a builder that wants to give him the maximum peak to make it a storage area up top that would be up to him them.

Chairman Nestorowicz said that's why he's suggesting...

Steve Watripont explained (inaudible) a second floor.

Board Member Anglin said it couldn't be because you can't stand up in it.

Mark Fowler explained it's a steel building anyway. Anything above that would have to be framed out.

Chairman Nestorowicz will just ask the petitioner. His best two (2) options are either if he wanted to quote a size now that the board would vote on or see if there's support for, or he can go back to his builder and come up with something that would work. Then come back to the board at that time.

Mark Fowler asked eight hundred (800).
Board Member Anglin said he would vote no.

Mark Fowler exclaimed eight hundred (800).

Board Member Anglin thinks that's too big for that lot. But he would grant the easements. So he can make it twenty (20) foot wide. Size and shape of the lot.

Board Member Higgins asked if they should just table this all together. He doesn't feel negotiating with either. He can go ahead and build it to seven hundred (700) within in the right lot lines or come back with a new plan. Lets move on. Doing this horse trading, he's not in favor of that. He's about ready to make the motion to table it and he can come back and see the board later. Or do everything within specs so he doesn't have to come back at all.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked Mr. Anglin if he wanted to go back.

Board Member Anglin said he'll withdraw his motion.

Motion:

Board Member Higgins made a motion to table to next meeting August 28th; Supported by Board Member Anglin.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (7 – 0).

The petitioner's request was **RESCHEDULED** to August 28, 2024.

Chairman Nestorowicz explained the board tabled his item to August 28th. That will give the petitioner a chance to contact his builder, figure out the size he wants to come back to the board with, and then he would say talk with Steve in the Building Department to figure out the smaller garage. If he still needs the same easement variance or something has changed.

(Inaudible)

Chairman Nestorowicz said setback. That's what he meant. He meant setback, sorry. But if anything would change, if he comes with a smaller garage he might not need the same setbacks.

Any questions? Otherwise, he'd say talk to Steve in the Building Department.

Mark Fowler asked seven hundred (700) and he doesn't have to come back to the board. But if he comes back with eight hundred (800) he'll have to deal with the same thing.

Chairman Nestorowicz said anything over seven hundred (700).

Steve Watripont explained at seven hundred (700) he still will have the issue with the setbacks, because the twenty (20) foot wide is still going to him in that area. So, if he was able to move that in, he'll be at the house and all that. So, it depends on the location at that point. It's possible he still would have to come back even if its at seven hundred (700).

Chairman Nestorowicz said understood. So, he would say if he decided to do seven hundred (700) square feet or so, he could do his lay out and see if he needs the setbacks. If he doesn't need the setbacks, he doesn't come back to the board, but if he needs to get the variance on the setbacks then he would need to be here on the August 28th meeting.

Mark Fowler asked if these are his only options. Do the seven hundred (700) within the setbacks.

Chairman Nestorowicz said it's been tabled till the 28th so it gives him a chance. He can come up with a size and where that's going to be located on his property. Talk to the Building Department to see if he needs any variance. Come back on August 28th if he needs that variance. If he doesn't, then he doesn't have to come back.

Mark Fowler said ok.

Chairman Nestorowicz said next item.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Oleksii Gopchenko**
REPRESENTATIVE: Daryna Gopchenko
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 28027 Walker
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-17-151-030
ZONE: R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct an oversized shed (24' x 24.5' = 588 square ft.) shed in addition to an existing 415 square ft. attached garage for a total of 1,003 square ft. of accessory structure area.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.20 – Paragraph (a) Item (5): That all accessory structures, excluding garages, will not exceed a total of 120 square feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for them to start with name and address for the record, and then explain the request.

Dorana Gopchenko, 28027 Walker, appeared before the board stating she is presenting for her father Oleksii Gopchenko.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked her to explain their request.

Dorana Gopchenko explained they want to get rid of the shed that they currently have. It wasn't built very well, it's small. In terms of not being built very well, she thinks they did the foundation wrong so there is water all the time. They want to build a larger shed. So, the need for a larger area due to them having a boat and his dad having a trailer for his work. He works as a contractor. According to the ordinances, the city ordinances, they are not allowed to keep those on the driveway for over seventy-two (72) hours. So, that's why they need to put them into the garage and that leaves them with no storage space for their garden equipment and just all the other stuff.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for that explanation. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience that wants to speak on that item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and turned it over to the board for discussion. Board Member Anglin said his question as this point, they've got two (2) boats showing up in the backyard. Is this old?

Dorana Gopchenko explained that's just for parts. Her dad was repairing the boat.

Board Member Anglin asked her to say that again.

Dorana Gopchenko explained her dad was repairing the boat himself, so the other boat is just the parts of it left. So, he was taking the parts out of it.

Board Member Anglin asked how they got the boat back there. He doesn't see a drive going around the side of the house.

Dorana Gopchenko explained they have the back gate from the backyard. There is a church parking lot. They have an agreement with the church priest to do that. He allows them to drive from there, but they don't use it regularly. They just asked permission to do it once.

Board Member Anglin said there's something in the code about accessing a garage through another piece of property. He's not sure what it is. He asked Steve to help him with that. He asked if he knows what that is. He thought they couldn't access for a driveway through somebody else's property.

Steve Watrion explained there's nothing that says anything about how they access. The ordinance requires a hard surface to a garage. This is being called a shed at this point in time. So, the ordinance on a shed does not require hard surfacing to. If it was hard surfacing to the driveway would not be allowed through the rear yard in that case.

Board Member Anglin asked that they are using that other property as driveway to the shed. He'll let somebody else talk for a minute.

Secretary Jerzy asked if both boats are still there.

Dorana Gopchenko replied yes, currently there. It's not drivable anymore.

Secretary Jerzy asked why keep it.

Dorana Gopchenko said it's going to be taken out by parts.

Secretary Jerzy explained his issue with what they've said already. First off, it sounds almost like a business being run out of the house. They have a trailer in front of the house already. Obviously, he has to move every three (3) days. So, obviously, he gets why he has to put it in the garage or pay money for a storage lot. With granting them additional storage for an oversized shed, he understands why they would need it, but his concern it would just fill with more contractor stuff and business related stuff is his concern going forward.

Dorana Gopchenko asked if she may address the concern.

Secretary Jerzy said yeah, hold on. He's almost done. Obviously the egress back and forth through the church is also a concern, too. He doesn't know if it's just... It's a lot to digest on this one. As far as the shed goes, for extra storage, he gets it because of the garage. He'd like to see the property cleaned up a little bit more to things of that nature. Just kind of a confusing situation to him. He understands the point, but he also understand that it maybe a slippery slope on the other side of it. He'll yield the floor.

Board Member Anglin explained his concern. When they get something twenty-four (24) by twenty-five (25) feet, in his mind it is no longer a shed. Even though it doesn't have a driveway and doesn't have this. That is a large building be putting up strictly as a shed. If he needs something to store his boat in, what's the boat eight (8) feet wide, nine (9) feet tops with the trailer. Ten (10) feet maybe.

(Inaudible)

Board Member Anglin said looking at it here, it's not a huge boat by no means. It could be twenty-two (22), twenty-three (23) feet. But it's no wider than ten (10) feet. So, if it was a ten (10) by twenty (20) or twenty-four (24) to give the depth he wants. That is more of a shed. At this point, that size he's going to classify that, in his mind, a garage and it's an oversized shed not having an egress to it in any way.

Secretary Jerzy said it's not bigger than the existing garage they got.

Board Member Anglin said yes.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other questions or discussions from the board on this item.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there are any motions.

Board Member Anglin wants to explain himself before he makes this motion, like he tried to do earlier. He's going to make a motion to deny permission for the fact that he feels it's an oversized shed for

that property.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked to interrupt Mr. Anglin for a second. Did he want to propose a smaller one to the petitioner?

Board Member Anglin would not mind. If the petitioner wants to except a smaller size but big enough still to put his boat in, he would suggest that he would go for depth twenty-four (24) feet. Correct. The boat is nine (9) feet wide from the axle.

Dorana Gopchenko asked if she may address the concerns now.

Board Member Anglin said sure.

Dorana Gopchenko thinks it's going to clarify some points. There is no goal to put the boat or the trailer into the shed. They're going to be stored in the garage. The stuff that's currently in the garage needs some place to go. They're not planning to put up any driveway to the shed or a garage door, or anything of that sort. It's only going to be used to store the extras. The gardening equipment, her parents do a lot of gardening. They are planning on getting the drivable lawn mower in the future and other equipment for the garage. So, they want to make sure they can store it there while also complying with the city ordinances and keeping the boat and trailer in the garage that has the driveway. Pretty much the goal of this whole requesting is wanting to clean up as well. That right now they have things laying around in the backyard that have no place to go and the boat will be taken out, the donor boat that's not operable will be taken out as well.

Board Member Anglin understands that now. It makes it a little bit clearer, because the boats are sitting there. You'd think the boats are going to go. You can't store them. But even a twenty-five (25) by twenty-four (24) foot, to him, is still bigger than a shed. Or are bigger than a shed should be on that type property in that neighborhood. If he wants to go down to a different size, he's at six hundred (600) square feet.

Dorana Gopchenko replied it's 588.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked to propose a ten (10) by twenty (20).

Board Member Anglin doesn't care what the shape is. Lets just give him a square footage that fits that. So, if they do a twenty (20) by twenty-four (24). Sorry, a ten (10) by twenty-four (24), that's two hundred and forty (240) square feet. That's still a big shed, for a shed. For as long as he's been sitting here on this board, he can't recall them ever allowing a two hundred and forty (240) square foot shed.

Chairman Nestorowicz wanted to ask the petitioner since he hasn't heard any other comments from board members. If the board proposed they could build a shed, but no larger than two hundred forty (240) square feet. That way he can play with the exact dimensions whether it's ten (10) by twenty-four (24). They can change as long as it's under two hundred and forty (240) square feet. Would that be something that would acceptable that they will accept or not?

Dorana Gopchenko doesn't believe so. First of all, it would not even require this hearing, she believes.

Chairman Nestorowicz explained anything over a hundred and twenty (120) square feet would require the boards approval. So, they're at two hundred and forty (240), they're actually getting double of what's allowed without permission.

Dorana Gopchenko explained their existing shed is 415. It's full.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked how big the existing structure that's coming down.

Dorana Gopchenko apologized and said their garage is 415.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yeah. This would give them an extra 240, so a total of six hundred and fifty-five (655) square feet of storage total.

Dorana Gopchenko asked if they're saying their maximum allowed is 240.

Chairman Nestorowicz replied yes.

Dorana Gopchenko explained they got the idea of doing that because their neighbor two (2) houses down did the exact same thing.

Chairman Nestorowicz said every property is unique. He doesn't know what their neighbor did two (2) houses down, but all properties are unique.

Dorana Gopchenko said he also has a ranch house, he has pretty much the same lot size, and he has a structure at the same location area.

Chairman Nestorowicz explained every property is different so she can't really compare what somebody else might of done without.

Dorana Gopchenko is having trouble understanding why he was allowed to do that and they are not. They pay the same taxes, live in the same city.

Chairman Nestorowicz repeated every property is different. Like how they address each property individually and look at each individual property. So, basically, because he did not hear support on here for the large size it sounds like a smaller size does have support here.

Dorana Gopchenko explained the smaller size wouldn't really achieve the goal they're trying to achieve.

Chairman Nestorowicz said well then they can take a look and see what kind of motion they get, but he just...

Secretary Jerzy said at this point, Mr. Chair, they've tried to negotiate and would just like to make a motion to deny.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to deny the petitioner to construct an oversized shed (24' x 24.5' = 588 square ft.) shed in addition to an existing 415 square ft. attached garage for a

total of 1,003 square ft. of accessory structure area.

Reasons being: Too oversized for the lot; Self-imposed; Believes it's also economic because they might possibly be running a business out of it.

Dorana Gopchenko said there is no business. What kind of business?

Secretary Jerzy said excuse him, he's making a motion, ma'am. Thank you. That's his motion he's putting on the floor.

Board Member Higgins supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion to deny by Mr. Jerzy, with support by Mr. Higgins. He'll take the roll call it's a yes to deny is the reply if voting to deny it.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7 – 0).

Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Higgins	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Anglin	Yes, to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 8. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Richard Esch |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Same as above. |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 7544 Continental |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-28-484-006 |
| ZONE: | R-1-C |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a 13' 3" x 7' (92.75 square ft.) covered front porch to no less than nineteen (19) feet of the front sidewalk and eighteen (18) feet of the property line as per the plans.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 7.05 – Front Yard: Each lot in R-1-C districts shall have a front yard of not less than twenty-five (25) feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked him to start with name and address, and then the request.

Richard Esch just wishes he could understand what he's saying. The acoustics in here are horrible. And he's not making it any better. But good evening to all of you and thank you for leading the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yeah, so if...

Richard Esch said he hasn't been included in that since his Fitzgerald days over half a century ago.

Chairman Nestorowicz said ok. If you can give the board his name and address.

Richard Esch, 7544 Continental.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked him to explain what it is he's wanting to do.

Richard Esch stated he would like to enclose the front porch. When he bought the house with mom and dad back in '78 it was just a wooden porch. Then there was foundation problems he encountered back in 2010. He approached the city to help him fix them. So, all of the stances the house was on have been replaced now with cinderblock all the way around. When they did that, they considered the front porch was a loss. So, that was eliminated and footings and new blocks were put down for a slab to replace the old wooden porch. He hopes the board understands his drawings and stuff.

Chairman Nestorowicz thinks so.

Richard Esch said now he's too the point now he wants to escape the bugs and stuff and would like to enclose it.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for that explanation. Is there anyone else in the audience wanting to speak on this item?

No response.

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

Board Member Higgins told the Chair that this is the one he's going to recuse himself from.

Chairman Nestorowicz said ok.

Board Member Higgins just wanted that to be clear. He knows the petitioner.

Chairman Nestorowicz understands. So, when recusing yourself you actually have to leave the stage.

Board Member Anglin said go away now.

Board Member Higgins explained this is the first time he's recused himself.

(Inaudible)

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made the motion to recuse Mr. Higgins from this vote, Supported by Board Member Perry.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (7 – 0).

Chairman Nestorowicz said Mr. Higgins has left the stage.

Board Member Anglin said he knows the neighborhood fairly well. Again, it's in the south side of Warren where the lots are smaller. The homes were originally built closer to the street. They've had some come up where the houses would actually have to move back to meet code. So, he understands the need and would like to have a porch on the front of his house and would like to have it closed in. He doesn't think it would be a detriment to the area, because there's a lot of houses on the south side of Warren and have that already done to it. It's part of the community there. So, he has no objections to it and he'll let his other board members speak. When they get done he'd like to be the one to make the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other comments from other board members on this.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz said then do they have a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to the petitioner to:
Retain a 13' 3" x 7' (92.75 square ft.) covered front porch to no less than nineteen (19) feet of the front sidewalk and eighteen (18) feet of the property line as per the plans.

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

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Perry to approve the petitioner's request. Roll call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (6 – 0).

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

Chairman Nestorowicz and Secretary Jerzy both told him to enjoy his new porch.

Richard Esch said now he has to get the building permit and find some way to get it done.

Chairman Nestorowicz said exactly.

Richard Esch said to have a good evening.

Secretary Jerzy said him, too.

Chairman Nestorowicz said have a good night.

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 9. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Richard and Mary Colette Powers |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Gregory Vargo |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 31850 Dimas |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-05-405-002 |
| ZONE: | R-1-C |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct a 12' x 14' 4" (172 square ft.) addition on the rear (east) of the home to no less than 31' from the rear lot 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.

Gregory Vargo appeared before the board stating he's representing the petitioner.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked him to give the address for the record.

Gregory Vargo asked his address or the address of the parcel.

Chairman Nestorowicz said either.

Gregory Vargo said his is 20210 Woodland Street. Per the application it asked to explain the nature of the hardship. What he wrote is their requesting is more of a practical difficulty. They're asking for a variance to build a master bedroom, which is already there, but they're going to add a barrier free bathroom for continuing care. Himself and his clients are all getting older and to get into a bathtub is sometimes difficult. There seems to be, he's been a builder for fifty (50) years, that to eliminate a bathtub in a house reduces the value to someone else maybe down the road. So, this bathroom that they're going to add, which is fully handicapped, barrier free, would be positioned right next to the existing bathroom. Which in and of itself makes it easier for the hookups, but because of that, now they have to gain the bedroom size. They have to encroach into the variance, into the rear yard. One of the reasons he cited was that it's a very shallow lot. They didn't buy this house. Matter of fact, it was her mothers house and she purchased it. The thing is, the lot sizes he doesn't think the average resident really takes into consideration how deep their lot is versus someone three (3) streets away. So, once they put this plan together and they did the plans and submitted them, they were obviously

turned down because of that encroachment. So, that's the primary goal is to build this bedroom with another bathroom barrier free that they can, as we all grow older, they all grow older, they will be able to stay home. That's the idea and not have to go to a home. So, they'll go from there.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for that explanation. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to speak? Please approach the podium. Also give name and address for the record.

Harry Cook, 5201 Chicago, appeared before the board stating he's in the same neighborhood. He just came here to speak in favor of this variance because he would like to... He doesn't think the encroachment, he forgets the exact term, he thinks it fits the very good goals of letting them stay in their house longer. Although it is a variance, he doesn't see it in any way a detriment to the neighborhood. He just came here to speak in favor of it.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him. Anybody else? If you could also approach the podium.

Richard Powers appeared before the board stating he is the one that is asking for the variance. He just wanted to say they both did a very good job telling the board the idea of what they want to do. Everything they looked at this is an improvement, not any type of detriment to anyone. He's talked to the neighbors and they all seem to agree. He just wanted to thank them.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there are any other comments from the audience.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for discussion. He just wanted to start. He thinks that plan they've come up with is a good one. He personally, anything that helps somebody stay in their home longer and enjoy their house, in his opinion, is a good plan here. That's just his comment.

Secretary Jerzy said he's actually kind of blown away by this. This is a very detailed, very tasteful build out of what he's trying to do. He commends him for doing that and wanting to stay in their house and not sell trying to find somewhere else. He also thinks it's going to add to the resale value of the property, too. It's going to be a little bit more specialized towards somebody's needs for that down the road. It's sad they don't see more of this coming through the board, projects like this to help out.

Gregory Vargo said if they would like to see some 3D of the inside.

Secretary Jerzy said no, this is good enough. This was really well put together and doesn't see it being a problem. Like he said, it's a shallow lot, it's out of view, it sticks with the building lines, and they would never even know it's there from the street. So it has his support. He yields the floor.

Board Member Anglin said it's nice to see people wanting to stay in Warren, it's great and it should be this way that they support people doing what's needed to their house to maintain their style of life. It's no objection to this. He wishes he could see more people who are willing to remodel and do things to stay in Warren, because the alternative to that is the house gets sold and its turned into a rental property. He wants to read a motion, if he has no objections from anybody else on the board.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there is any other discussion or questions. If not, make a motion Mr. Anglin.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to the petitioner to:
Construct a 12' x 14' 4" (172 square ft.) addition on the rear (east) of the home to no less than 31' from the rear lot line.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area; Size and shape of the lot; He likes to see the residents stay here in Warren.

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

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

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7 – 0).

Board Member Anglin	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Higgins	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

Gregory Vargo thanked the board.

Secretary Jerzy and Chairman Nestorowicz both said you're welcome.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 10. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Amanda Ferrin |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Jason McFall |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 32508 Tecla |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-01-231-010 |
| ZONE: | R-1-C |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct a 14' x 19' 4" (270.66 square ft.) rear patio enclosure and to retain an 8' x 10' (80 square ft.) existing shed in addition to a 23.3' x 19' (442.70 square ft.) attached garage for a total of 793.36 square feet of accessory structure.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 5.01 – Paragraph (i): ... All garages and/or accessory buildings shall not contain more than seven hundred (700) square feet of the floor area.

Jason McFall appeared before the board stating he's from Wayne Craft, 13525 Wayne Road. They wish to construct a simple glass and screen sunroom. The back of the house there now is kind of like a little recess area, a collector for debris and dirt and other things. She just kinds of wants to make the most out of her yard. They initially thought about making it larger, but they kind of paired it back a little bit to something she felt it would be acceptable in size. The shed stays in place. They're moving some other stuff out of there. It will clean up the backyard quite nicely. Again, it will just be something for her to enjoy evenings, family and things like that. Make full use of her property and everything. She doesn't have any coverings back there now. Just kind of open. He doesn't recall any trees on her property. She just wants a very nice simple sunroom to help enjoy her property a little bit more as she gets older.

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

No response.

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

Board Member Anglin said again, it's nice to see somebody want to stay in their home. He's looking at the aerial view of this property, there is no shade. He can understand very much the need to have some type of shade on the property. He would rather see trees, but lacking the tree he thinks the enclosure is the perfect way of going with it. He has no objections to that.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other questions or discussion from other board members.

Board Member Anglin would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to give permission to the petitioner to:
Construct a 14' x 19' 4" (270.66 square ft.) rear patio enclosure and to retain an 8' x 10' (80 square ft.) existing shed in addition to a 23.3' x 19' (442.70 square ft.) attached garage for a total of 793.36 square feet of accessory structure.

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

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

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

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7 – 0).

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

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

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

11. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Domino's Pizza**
REPRESENTATIVE: Kal Mansour – Sign Emporium Inc
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 13734 Twelve Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-13-101-002
ZONE: MZ, C-1, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Erect a 2nd wall sign 18.06 square ft. in addition to a 40 square ft. wall sign that has previously been approved, for a total of 58.06 square ft. of total wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.37(C) – Shopping Centers: One (1) wall sign of a size not to exceed forty (40) square feet shall be allowed for each business located in the shopping center.

This item was rescheduled to August 28, 2024 during the adoption of the agenda.

12. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Allied Signs, Inc.**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 28740 Mound
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-16-101-018
ZONE: MZ, M-2, C-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Install three (3) wall signs as follows:

- 1) 4' x 13' (52 square ft.) on the south elevation.
- 2) 4' x 13' (52 square ft.) on the west elevation.
- 3) 12-1/16" x 13' 11" (13.98 square ft.) on the west elevation.

For a total of 118 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 no to exceed forty (40) square feet shall be allowed for each business in commercial business and industrial districts zoned C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Bob Berjarno, 33650 Giftos, appeared before the board stating that he's here on behalf of Clean Express Auto Wash located at 28740 Mound Road. They're requesting a variance for some additional wall signage and additional square footage allowed by the ordinance. The property is kind of unique where it sits on Mound Road. The north bound lanes are, right at the light there, the north bound lanes and then the right turn lane for east bound Twelve Mile is right at the approach for the entrance of the driveway for the car wash is going to be. As traveling north on Mound Road, the residential house there and all the trees block a lot of visibility to this property and the building. They would like to get additional signage to make it more clear for consumers and for traffic safety issues with people wanting to pull into the car wash, and that light is right there. So, they would like to get as much

visibility as possible for this location.

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

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz turned it over to the board for discussion. He's going to start with a question. He understands the need for signage, but there is a sign that's... is that a monument sign?

Bob Berjarno replied it is a monument sign.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a monument sign that's along Mound, that will give visibility for people traveling north and south.

Bob Berjarno explained the issue with the monument sign. It's only an overall height of five (5) feet. Some SUV vehicles are higher than five (5) feet. So, even the SUV vehicles or a lot of semi traffic on Mound Road can easily block the monument sign being stopped at the light there before Twelve Mile. So, the monument sign is only forty (40) square feet and only five (5) foot overall height. So, that being said, SUV's and semi's can actually block that monument sign at times when traffic is stopped at the light where the light is located with the approach of the car wash is. Plus, there is also a utility box right there south of the property that is an obstruction of view. The sign for the east bound Twelve Mile, north bound Mound traffic sign is also there. There's a lot of obstructions to that monument sign.

Chairman Nestorowicz understands. He just sees there's a lot of signage. The monument sign says free vacuums. Does it need to say free vacuums over the door on the west elevation? You know, it's just his comments. He doesn't know what other comments other board members will have.

Bob Berjarno explained with the free vacuums years ago there use to be gas stations on every corner. Then it banks on every corner, then drug stores, now there's car washes on every corner. Competition is pretty tough for car washes and gives the consumer the information they do offer, free vacuums. Which is good marketing point.

Chairman Nestorowicz understands. He still thinks that, personally, there's a lot of signage there.

Secretary Jerzy said his thought on this is a couple different things. He saw a couple of the Clean Express Auto's around town. There's a couple of them. He thinks there is one (1) in Roseville and there might be one (1) in Sterling Heights, but to the defense of the sign company. The way the vacuums and the way these things are built. First off they got a hundred and fifty-eight (158) foot building that's going to be sitting at a traffic light. So, at the end of the driveway they have a traffic light, they got people sitting in traffic, they're actually in a pretty good marketing area because they're right at the traffic light. So, he guesses the nuts and bolts of his point is people see these things from a mile away. The way the vacuums are built with the hoses. To him, anytime he passes one of these new car washes it automatically just snaps his neck just the way it's built and the design of it. So, with that being said, he doesn't feel the need for any additional signage. Especially with them being right at the end of the driveway with the traffic light right there. Like his colleague said, they have the monument sign and the building is a hundred and fifty-eight (158) feet long, almost a hundred and

fifty-nine (159) feet long. That thing is going to stick out, people are going to see it. He understands what he said with the trees with the property there, too, but he really feels like this is actually going to have a better success than the other one going in down the street with the way it's laid out.

Bob Berjarno would like to comment that a lot of the car washes they do see the vacuum equipment in the wide open and stuff. They're usually on a major corner. There's not the trees that are at this location. This building is setback a little bit from the AT&T building. So, all that vacuum equipment is not going to be up noticeable from traffic. It's going to be more setback along the length of the property.

Secretary Jerzy asked if the vacuums are going to be on the north side of the property.

Bob Berjarno believes they're going to be on the south side, but it's still setback and the AT&T building blocks a lot of that. So, they're not going to see a lot of the vacuum equipment like they do see at other car washes on corner lots. Like Fourteen and Gratiot or ones that are out there that do not have this unique landscaping blocking it. The building is setback from the building next door to it.

Secretary Jerzy yields the floor.

Bob Berjarno started to say he did take a video.

Board Member Anglin said what he would like to see done here is reduce the clean express auto washes that are on the south and west side down to forty (40) square feet. It's not a big reduction, but it is twelve (12) square feet. That gives them some elevation of a sign up to accommodate for the trucks and traffic on the road. Now, they do have on the monument it says free vacuums. If they're thinking that's not enough recognition, he might want to put that in a bolder print or something to make it stand out a little more. Now, where that free vacuums is at in the back of the building looking at this print, he doesn't see where that's going to be a big benefit because the building next door is covering it.

Bob Berjarno thinks he's looking at the wrong elevation. The free vacuums is actually on the front of the building, the west elevation. So, people from Mound can see it. That's not the south elevation.

Board Member Anglin said ok, then he is looking at this wrong.

Bob Berjarno explained where the free vacuums is actually on the front of building where it's parallel with Mound Road. South elevation is the one...

Board Member Anglin said he can figure it out in a minute. He'll withdraw for right now.

Chairman Nestorowicz said as Mr. Anglin is figuring that stuff out he would actually be fine with forty (40) square feet for two (2) wall signs at forty (40) square feet instead of the fifty-two (52).
(Inaudible)

Board Member Anglin said the front of the building is going to have clean express auto wash on one side, and he wants to put free vacuums on the other side of the front of the building.

Bob Berjarno said that's correct.

Board Member Anglin said ok. Now, the other two (2) signs, the other sign, that says clean auto is going to be on the...

Chairman Nestorowicz said south. So driving north on Mound they would see it.

Board Member Anglin said it would be on the south side of the building.

Bob Berjarno said correct.

Board Member Anglin said ok, that would be the one he would like to see eliminated. They have a sign out in the front, they have a sign that's elevated in the front. He thinks the free vacuums is border line. He wouldn't vote against this project if it would eliminate those signs. The one on the south side which would be the north side.

Bob Berjarno said it would be the south elevation.

Board Member Anglin said ok, the south elevation sign.

Bob Berjarno explained traveling north on Mound they would see it, traveling north.

Board Member Anglin said if they're traveling north on Mound, they would see it, but that's also the side of the road they'll be on when they see the monument sign.

Bob Berjarno said yes.

Board Member Anglin wants to make sure this is Mound, monument sign is right here, this is going north.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yes.

Board Member Anglin said they'll see that because there can't be too much in front of them to be able to see that. So, eliminate the sign on the south side of the building. He understands the need or the want for a sign on the north side so they can get that south bound traffic, which is on the other side of the medium.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he means on the west side is what he said.

Board Member Anglin said west elevation.

Chairman Nestorowicz agrees.

Board Member Higgins said he would support that.

Board Member Anglin said it has him kind of backwards here. He apologized for siphoning through this.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he would support that.

Board Member Anglin said if he has no objections to this, he would make a motion right now that they eliminate the south side elevation sign and give permission for the west side sign that's four (4) feet by thirteen (13) and the west side that's twelve (12) feet 1/16th by thirteen (13) eleven (11) on the west side.

Bob Berjano replied yes. He asked if the board would consider with the south elevation, instead of the fifty-two (52) square foot sign. Would the board grant forty (40) square foot of sign on the south elevation, just because of the concerns of the monument sign being blocked by traffic, vehicles and semi's? For visibility of the approach coming up. Traveling north. He took a video traveling here today up north Mound Road and the tree lines are an obstacle.

Board Member Anglin said he'll go back to his original thought on this. He's trying to keep them from getting carried away on this. Every business wanting more and more. He's sure he sat here and said this one has this one and this one has this one, why not him? Lets put the south elevation and west elevation at forty (40) square feet and maintain the size of the sign for free vacuums.

Bob Berjano is willing to go with his original idea of the west elevation and eliminating the south elevation signage all together then.

Board Member Anglin asked if they'd rather do it that way then, at fifty-two (52) square feet. West elevation. So, if that's ok with him and nobody on the board has any objections he would like to make a motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Anglin made a motion to grant permission to:
Install ~~three (3)~~ **two (2)** wall signs as follows:

- 1) ~~4' x 13' (52 square ft.) on the south elevation. **Removed.**~~
- 2) 4' x 13' (52 square ft.) on the west elevation.
- 3) 12-1/16" x 13' 11" (13.98 square ft.) on the west elevation.

For a total of 448 ~~66~~ square ft. of wall signage.

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

Secretary Jerzy supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Anglin, support by Mr. Jerzy to approve the signs on the west elevation for the petitioner. Roll call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7 – 0).

Board Member Anglin

Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Higgins	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Sieracki	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

13. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if anybody had any new business for today.

Board Member Higgins stated he's going to be absent for the next meeting that's on the 28th. That's the same night as their Harper Charity Cruise held in St. Clair Shores. They'll probably go until ten (10) or eleven o'clock, after their done. He has to host it though, so he has to be there. They are welcome to join in the merriment if they have steam left in their sails afterwards.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for letting them know. Not hearing any other new business, motion to adjourn.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

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

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (7 – 0).

The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Paul Jerzy
Secretary of the Board