

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 14, 2025

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, May 14, 2025 at 7:30 p.m. at the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

David Sophiea, Chairman
Paul Jerzy, Secretary
Roman Nestorowicz, Vice-Chairman
Shaun Lindsey
Michael Assessor
Garry Watts
Jon Green

Members of the Board absent:

Charles Perry, Assistant Secretary
William Clift

Also present:

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

A roll call was taken and Board Member Perry and Board Member Clift were absent.

Motion:

Board Member Assessor made a motion to excuse the absent members; Supported by Board Member Watts.

Voice Vote:

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

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Jerzy asked if the applicant for item 16, 23170 Schoenherr was here.

No response.

Secretary Jerzy said not seeing any. They're going to move item 16 to the June 11th meeting and keep the rest of the agenda as written for reposting.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to adopt the agenda with previously mentioned change; Supported by Board Member Nestorowicz.

Voice Vote:

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

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of the Regular Meetings of March 12, 2025, April 9, 2025 and April 23, 2025.

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to approve the minutes of March 12, 2025; Supported by Board Member Assessor.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to approve the minutes of April 9, 2025; Supported by Board Member Green.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (5 – 0). (Abstained: Chairman Sophiea and Secretary Jerzy)

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to table the minutes of April 23, 2025; Supported by Board Member Assessor.

Voice Vote:

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

Chairman Sophiea stated before they go to item 6 tonight, he wanted to announce they do not have a full board tonight. They're down two (2) members. A normal variance requires five (5) yes votes to pass. A use variance requires six (6) yes votes to pass. So, that puts them at a slight disadvantage tonight. To anyone in the audience that has an item here tonight he wanted to give them the option now to reschedule to the next meeting when they have a full board. Would anyone like to reschedule please approach.

No response.

Chairman Sophiea said not seeing anyone, they'll move on to item 6.

6. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: The Home Depot -USE-**
(Reschedule from 3/12/2025)
REPRESENTATIVE: Kaleb Sondgerath
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 25879 Hoover
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-22-432-016
ZONE: MZ, C-2, C-1, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to -USE-

- 1) Allow 1,167 square ft. of permanent outdoor storage in a P district.
- 2) Allow 9,770 square ft. of permanent outdoor storage in a C-2 district.

For a total of 10,937 square ft. of permanent outdoor storage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 14.01 – Uses Permitted: Outdoor storage is not a permitted use in C-2 district.

Section 16.01 – Uses Permitted: Outdoor storage is not a permitted use in P district.

Steve Watripont does not see them here today. They have not submitted everything to Planning yet. He knows the board was waiting on that. They did tell them before it comes back, it should go to Planning first, but it was scheduled to this date certain. He doesn't know if they want to schedule it out and repost it, or reschedule it out.

Secretary Jerzy asked if they should go past June 11th to end of June.

Steve Watripont heard they were close. He talked to Planning today and said they have talked, but haven't received everything yet. He would probably a month and a half or two (2) months.

Secretary Jerzy said that puts them into July.

Chairman Sophiea said June 25th or July 9th.

Steve Watripont said June 25th might be a good date.

Board Member Green asked if there's a question as to whether or not this meets the site plan that was approved, will the site plan itself be looked over before Planning sends it back here for the variance.

Steve Watripont explained Planning will look at it. Usually, they won't get a copy of that approval until everything is done. So, if he wants to follow what Planning is doing, his suggestion is to follow it when it's on the meeting or call Planning and ask them what he's asking.

Board Member Green said potentially it could come to this board and not comply with the site plan and they're to vote on the variance. He asked if he understands where he's going.

Steve Watripont explained basically anything that comes before this board is not in compliance completely with the site plan, but there is recommendations from Planning Commission. If for some reason it doesn't go forward with Planning issues and it is detrimental to the variance requested, they will ask that it get tabled and go forward from there. It depends on the situation would be the

answer. In this case, they're waiting for the site plan and they knew they were waiting for the site plan before it came before the Zoning Board.

Board Member Green asked if they're operating on the existing site plan or will there be a new site plan for this particular item?

Steve Watriont informed they are not operating on either at this point in time from what he's seen.

Board Member Green said that answers his question. Thank you.

Steve Watriont included enforcement is happening.

Chairman Sophia asked if they have a motion.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to move item 6 to June 25, 2025; Supported by Board Member Nestorowicz.

Voice Vote:

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

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

7. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Paslin

(Revised from 4/23/2025)

REPRESENTATIVE:

Bryan Duquet / William Lince

COMMON DESCRIPTION:

25411 Ryan

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

13-19-478-013

ZONE:

MZ, R-1-P, M-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

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

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

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

Bryan Duquet, 36886 Harper, appeared before the board stating he's with Sign-O-Rama representing Paslin. Unfortunately, Richard had a knee replacement and was not able to join them this evening. As long as the board is comfortable going forward without him, he'll be happy to answer any questions he can.

Chairman Sophia said that's fine. Is there anything else he would like to add about the request.

Bryan Duquet thinks it's pretty straight forward. Obviously, it's a very large facility. Set back a long ways off the road and they're looking to do something to make it look more appealing than just the

big building set way back. This is the arch that would be going on the sign should it be permitted.

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

No response.

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

Board Member Nestorowicz stated the size of the sign is what concerns him. Its not just a sign that says this is the business that's here, it's like a billboard. He personally thinks that is overkill for a building if they're just looking for signage to help shipping and receiving and all that sort of stuff. That's his two cents worth.

Chairman Sophiea does have a question for the petitioner. Is this large kind of decorative wall sign, is it a banner or something more permanent that's going to be.

Bryan Duquet explained it's going to be a flex face sign. So, like the larger signs like Meijers and all that. This will be heavy material that's durable to last. Banners are typically not really made for long term. So, this is not going to be something they're going to put up and it's going to look worn and teared.

Chairman Sophiea asked if it's illuminated.

Bryan Duquet replied it's not illuminated. It is a full frame. It is tensioned like a flex face, but it is not illuminated.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. Are there any other comments from the board?

Board Member Green is not a big fan of signs, but that's not what he's here for. He thinks it's way too big, thinks it's a branding sign like an item they had before them a few weeks ago. Directional signs sometimes are effective, but a lot of stuff, studies, he sees say signage, especially the branding signs, don't necessarily increase business visibility. He's going to vote no because he just thinks these signs are too big and it looks like they're going to a circus. So, that's his comments.

Secretary Jerzy echoes the same sentiment as his colleagues, too. He has a problem granting 723 square feet of wall signage for that property. He fully believes that it's not an economic issue, but it is a detriment to the area and self-imposing because they basically want to put it up. There's no real rhyme or reason. The business has been established there for many years. So, he doesn't have a problem keeping the existing sign that's on the premises, the twenty-four (24) foot by twenty-four (24) foot at forty-eight (48) square feet, but he thinks the other sign is just way too big for the property.

Board Member Lindsey thinks he feels the same way as Mr. Jerzy here. He's definitely fine with the twenty-four (24) foot sign out in the front of the building. He thinks that's tastefully done. He agrees with everybody here on the board. The other sign, forty-five (45) feet, that's huge. That is a very large sign and it does seem to be more as free advertising for the company. He would much rather see them advertising the name of the company in a more tasteful way. He be in favor in

approving the twenty-four (24) foot sign, but he's not going to vote yes on the forty-five (45) foot sign tonight.

Bryan Duquet said based on the tone of the board it doesn't sound like this is something they wouldn't be able to approve tonight. Maybe they should table this and wait until Richard is able to attend this meeting. He doesn't want to speak in their behalf.

Chairman Sophiea asked the board to consider if there is a certain compromise they would make on that additional sign if they would allow some sign and table this item if they thought they wanted to allow something on that wall.

Board Member Watts asked if there's any way to downsize that. He knows he can't speak on their behalf.

Bryan Duquet said he can't, but he can obviously present it when they come back and have options available if that's the direction they think they should be going. He did some math on the facility. It's a 21,000 square foot facility; it's a big building. Something too small is not going to show up, it's going to be a stamp on an eight and a half by eleven envelope. This is not a little building, this is not fifty (50) foot setback. This is hundreds of feet setback so it would look big on paper, when looking at it from the road it's not very big. It's kind of represented by the size of the building, right? He did the quick math, it's almost 21,000 square foot facility. There's quite a large parking lot in front of it, so the viewing distance is substantial. That being said, he would like Paslin to represent themselves if this is not something they can easily agree to.

Board Member Watts thanked him.

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to reschedule to June 11, 2025; Supported by Board Member Nestorowicz.

Bryan Duquet said June 11th should be fine. He asked for any recommendations he should take back with him.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a May 28th meeting. If he would prefer to have the meeting sooner.

Bryan Duquet thinks he's out of town that week.

Chairman Sophiea stated they'll keep it June 11th.

Bryan Duquet asked again for any board recommendations or just bring some options back.

Chairman Sophiea thinks it would be a good idea to come back with a couple different options.

Nicole Jones informed them they still have to vote on it.

Secretary Jerzy said they have to vote on it.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (6 – 1). Secretary Jerzy was the no vote.

The petitioner's request was **RESCHEDULED** to June 11, 2025.

8. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Joseph and Suzanne Gatt**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 30110 Blossom Lane
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-12-178-026
ZONE: R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a 12' x 10' shed outside of the side building lines of residence to within 3' of the south property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.20 – Detached Accessory Buildings: (a) ... Such buildings shall conform to, and shall not project beyond, the existing side building lines of the principal building on the lot...

Chairman Sophia asked the applicant's to both state their name and address.

Suzanne Gatt, 30110 Blossom Lane, appeared before the board.

Joseph Gatt, 30110 Blossom Lane, appeared before the board.

Chairman Sophia thanked them. Please tell the board about the request.

Joseph Gatt explained they lived in this location for almost thirty (30) years now. They had a shed put in twenty-seven (27) years ago, which they thought permits and everything were pulled for it. They found out that they weren't. Now, the shed is three (3) feet from the property line. It sits outside the house about two (2) feet. So, it can be seen between the two (2) houses. They thought everything was in compliance. They had no idea.

Suzanne Gatt said they got a letter in January.

Joseph Gatt said they got a letter in January saying that they were...

Suzanne Gatt said violating the ordinance.

Joseph Gatt has a picture of the shed if it helps them to show how much it stands out. They had the inspectors come out and check. There is a rat wall. From his understanding, it will pass code. It's just a matter of it's not in the ordinance because it's outside the building line.

Chairman Sophia thanked them. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item? Please approach. If the petitioner can please just step to the side. Name and address please.

Cindy Fultz, 30145 Blossom Lane, appeared before the board stating she has been neighbors with

Joe and Sue for thirty (30) years. She doesn't understand why this is an issue. There's so many other things in their neighborhood that should be addressed. They shovel their snow, they cut their grass, they take good care of their property. She doesn't understand why they're having to go through all this. For a shed they can see down the property line. That's all.

Chairman Sophia thanked her for her comments. Is there anyone else in the audience? Please approach.

Lisa Langford, 30066 Blossom Lane, appeared before the board stating she is directly to the south of them. There has not been a problem with that shed in thirty (30) years at least. She doesn't understand what the issue is now. It doesn't hinder anything. Weeds don't grow between the shed and fence. It's well maintained. She doesn't know what the issue is at this point.

Chairman Sophia thanked her for her comment. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to speak?

No response.

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

Board Member Lindsey wanted to say to the audience and anybody watching in the public. He personally really enjoys and appreciates hearing from the community and the neighbors when the board hears these items. It is so important for him to make a decision on how it's effecting people in the community. This particular request he sees no issues with. The ordinance is saying that it just can't be in line of sight, so that's why that two (2) feet is an issue. It's tastefully done. The yard is well kept. It's a beautiful shed. They said it had a rat wall, correct?

Joseph Gatt replied yes.

Board Member Lindsey said that's his number one concern if..

Joseph Gatt explained it was inspected by Paul Lize. The inspector came out and he checked it, it was all fine.

Board Member Lindsey stated the rat wall is the number one concern, but this is a beautiful property. They are maintaining it. He has no issue with this. He would support their request.

Joseph and Suzanne Gatt thanked him.

Secretary Jerzy explained typically in the past they always held a pretty solid standard to sheds in the line of sight. He thinks this is an extenuating circumstance where said petitioner didn't realize what was going on the property until they decided to do something on the property. They see this time and time again on the board where they to upgrade the property and find out other things. Permits weren't permitted when they said they were and now it red flags everything. This isn't a detriment to the neighborhood. He doesn't think it's self-imposing at all because most of it was there to begin with. It's a beautiful yard. It would be a shame to have them rip up the nice backyard that they have. That's just his opinion. For him, personally, this is one where they have a little bit of wiggle room. If they're talking a matter of three (3) feet. It's not the whole shed. There's plenty

of sheds in this town that are in the line of sight that probably need to be red flagged, too, but that's neither here nor there. He's in favor of granting these people the variance. He doesn't see anything wrong with this.

Board Member Watts said if this was somebody that popped the shed up last month or in the last few months, he would probably be a no vote for not following the code. After twenty-seven (27) years and nobody has complained. Obviously the neighbors love them. He lives two (2) blocks over. Drove by and took a look at it. Their property is very nice. He agrees with them about other things that need to be taken care of in the neighborhood. After twenty-seven (27) years of no complaints, he doesn't see where it's a problem. He'll definitely vote yes. Thank you.

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

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to retain a 12' x 10' shed outside of the side building lines of residence to within 3' of the south property line.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Lindsey supported the motion.

Chairman Sophia asked to hold on for a moment. Mr. Watripont?

(Inaudible)

Chairman Sophia said great.

Chairman Sophia said they have a motion by Secretary Jerzy, support by Mr. Lindsey to approve the request as presented.

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

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

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 9. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Patricia Brown |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Same as above. |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 24521 Columbus |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-25-253-041 |
| ZONE: | R-1-C |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct a 12' x 10' shed that extends 9' beyond the north building line of the principal building to within 6' 11" of the north property line.

Existing non-permitted shed to be removed.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.20 – Detached Accessory Buildings: (a) ... Such buildings shall conform to, and shall not project beyond, the existing side building lines of the principal building on the lot...

Chairman Sophia asked the petitioner to start with name and address please.

Patricia Brown, 24521 Columbus, appeared before the board. Unfortunately, a year ago he had to demolish her one (1) car garage, it was an attached garage, due to it being a hazard. Doing the right thing, she knew it had to be demolished, which she did do. That left her with a dilemma. Her home has no basement and she has no garage. Therefore, she has no where to be able to store her garden equipment like her power tools. She likes to build things. Yard stuff, trash cans. Those things that tend to be sightly and get in the way. Her idea is to put up a ten (10) by twelve (12) shed where the back part of the non-existent garage was. There is a rat wall already existing exactly in the spot where she can fit that ten (10) by twelve (12) foot shed. She does have a shed that's been existing on her property for the entire time that she's lived there. When the garage came down and they were mentioning that now it can be seen and it's rather unsightly. That is going to be demolished and taken down. Again, her dilemma is she has no way to store anything on her property. That's why she is requesting the variance.

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

No response.

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

Board Member Green asked that the garage she tore down, was the slab tore up at the same time?

Patricia Brown answered no. It's a very long driveway and the entire area where the garage was, the existing slab and rat wall are still there.

Board Member Green asked if it's her intention to put her shed on that.

Patricia Brown answered yes.

Board Member Green asked on the existing garage slab.

Patricia Brown answered yes. What was the pavement concrete slab that the garage was on. It had a rat wall around it. She does not have a... Her house isn't even on a slab. It's on a rat wall.

Board Member Green asked if this secondary shed is still up.

Patricia Brown explained the original one that has been there since she moved in twenty (20) years ago is there.

Board Member Green said it's not on a slab.

Patricia Brown said it's not on a slab, but because now it can be seen from the street and it's really old she's going to be taking that down.

Board Member Green asked that she left the garage slab there. How large is that garage slab? Where she tore the garage down. Is it twelve (12) by ten (10)? He asked if she sees where he's going. Is this shed going to be stuck on a garage slab?

Patricia Brown replied yes. She sees where he's going. Her driveway literally... It was a single car garage. It was fourteen (14) feet wide and then from the street to ten (10) feet behind the house is all concrete slab. So, the driveway goes right next to the house and then also ten (10) feet behind. That's where she would like to put the shed. The ten (10) feet by twelve (12) feet would literally fit in that area where the back part of the garage use to be.

Board Member Green said with four (4) feet left over. Somebody help him.

Secretary Jerzy asked if he could interject real quick. The way he's looking at this. First off, there's no real print to go off of. He's guessing this is what she submitted to go off of as far as a sketch or print. He thinks she is trying to get the twelve (12) foot by ten (10) foot shed put on the slab to avoid redoing the rat wall, by the sound of it.

Patricia Brown said no...

Secretary Jerzy said he hasn't posed a question yet. So, his thought is if the old one comes down, she probably wants to put the twelve (12) by ten (10) obviously on the current existing cement. Trying to save a couple dollars, he would imagine. The only other thing is, there is plenty of property where this doesn't even need to be. He's not against the shed. He's against the placement of it. So, she just heard what the last petitioner. They have a strict thing. A light bit line of sight is fine, but this whole thing is going to be visible just like the old one from the street. To him, there's plenty of room behind her property, correct him if he's wrong, to put a twelve (12) foot by ten (10) foot shed, right?

Patricia Brown explained her property floods in that back area. Any area in the back literally. When they had the winter storms they had, she had to go to Home Depot and get huge pumps to pump out her yard. Which she's also working on that this year. She literally has six (6) inches of standing water, three (3) to four (4) times a year in her backyard she has to pump out. There is no way she can construct a concrete slab behind the existing house with a rat wall. So, when her driveway is already where her garage used to be and it has an existing rat wall, it's not a matter of saving money, it's a matter of it's more convenient. She has no where. Again, no garage, no basement. She has a lot tools, yard equipment, stuff to keep her yard looking nice. She has no where to store it.

Secretary Jerzy said again, he's not against the shed. He just thinks...

Patricia Brown stated she did include a picture of the shed.

Secretary Jerzy said she has a picture of the shed, but usually they have some kind of sketch diagram to go off of. They're kind of going off of a Google map thing.

Chairman Sophiea interjected; he has to visualize this. When she pulls her car into the driveway, which side is the home on. The right side or left side?

Patricia Brown answered left side.

Chairman Sophiea said imagine she has her garage still. She pulls up the driveway, goes ten (10) or fifteen (15) feet from the road, and the house is on the left side. Correct?

Patricia Brown replied yeah.

Chairman Sophiea said ok, she keeps going another ten (10) feet and she had her one (1) car garage attached to the home.

Patricia Brown said it used to be.

Chairman Sophiea said ok, but the one (1) car garage was slightly back from the front line of the house.

Patricia Brown answered yes. In fact it was at the very back of the house.

Chairman Sophiea asked that she kept driving, go by the side door, go by the backyard and then it was all the way in the back. Correct?

Patricia Brown explained the garage, there was a back door and then five (5) foot wall behind that back door on the side of the house. It only went from the back door to the back of the door is only about five (5) feet. The garage was placed near the proximity of that back door and extended ten (10) feet. Well, actually, it was about a twenty (20) foot garage. So, there's one (1) foot.

Chairman Sophiea asked if she's proposing to put the shed as far back as she can on that slab.

Patricia Brown answered yes. As far back as she can, yes.

Chairman Sophiea said the problem with that is she's replacing her garage with a more temporary structure. The issue is not the shed, it's just the placement. He knows there's water problems in the backyard. It looks like she has a pretty large backyard. There is a shed back there now. Is that not on any type of slab?

Patricia Brown explained it's on a slab, but because the city ordinances and when the inspector came out after she had the garage demolished and approved everything, he said by the way that shed is now visible from the street. It is like twenty-one (21) or twenty-two (22) years old. It's getting dilapidated and she wants to remove it.

Chairman Sophiea asked if she had the new shed purchased yet.

Patricia Brown answered no. She's not going to do that.

Chairman Sophiea is not a fan at all of having a shed on the driveway slab whatsoever. He's not really a huge fan of having it completely visible from the street, but he would rather see her new shed on that old slab, because at least it's clear that it's in her backyard. Way back.

Patricia Brown stated according to the ordinance, it would still be visible.

Chairman Sophiea explained that's what he's going to discuss here with the board, some type of compromise. He's definitely not in favor of it replace where the one (1) car garage was. He's not a huge fan of it being visible from the road. He thinks a decent compromise would be let her put the shed where the old shed is on the slab.

Board Member Nestorowicz asked Mr. Watripont before when the garage was still existing, would that old shed qualified. It would've been behind the sight lines of the old garage, correct?

Steve Watripont doesn't know the distance it was. It has to be within three (3) feet of another accessory structure, which would've been the garage. So, if it was within three (3) feet of the garage, yes. He doesn't know if there was a permit on it. He knows it had a rat wall from what he's been told. He wasn't on this and not very familiar with this project. But yes, it would have been legal behind the garage on the property.

Board Member Nestorowicz said what makes that one being out of ordinance is because the garage is no longer there, therefore now it's visible.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes the property unique.

Board Member Nestorowicz likes the idea that someday that garage can be replaced and the pad is there for the garage. He would have no problems supporting the new shed being on the old slab.

Secretary Jerzy could get behind that.

Chairman Sophiea asked if that would have to be reposted.

Secretary Jerzy asked if they have measurements.

Steve Watripont explained the request is outside the building lines. That would still be outside the building lines, so he doesn't see why it would. The board can put a condition that it would be setback farther.

Secretary Jerzy asked setback where the old shed is.

Steve Watripont thinks that could be done. He doesn't know. He would want to verify that with the city attorney.

Jennifer Pierce doesn't believe it needs to be reposted, because the request would be the same.

Board Member Watts is looking at a Google street view of her house. He's looking at the driveway. He hopes he has the right house. He can see a white structure in the driveway.

Patricia Brown explained that would've been the old garage.

Board Member Watts said it looks like the garage is behind that.

Patricia Brown apologized and asked what he's looking at again.

Board Member Watts replied a front view of her driveway. It looks like there's a car in the driveway and then there's a white canvas tent type structure. It's probably old.

Patricia Brown explained she had a garage sale.
Board Member Watts asked if that's the garage behind it then.

Patricia Brown said that's the garage right behind it. That was a twenty (20) foot. It goes back quite a ways.

Board Member Watts said that makes good sense to him.

Chairman Sophiea said to the petitioner, she's heard the boards comment so far that they're not a fan of the shed in the spot she proposed. They think a good compromise is moving it back. She has to accept that she would be in agreement with that.

Patricia Brown asked that they're saying once she removes the old shed, just replace it with a new one.

Secretary Jerzy said yep.

Chairman Sophiea said she can put a new shed.

Patricia Brown continued saying on the existing slab in the backyard.

Board Member Watts asked if it has a rat wall on it.

Secretary Jerzy said yep. It would have to be inspected anyways.

Chairman Sophiea asked if someone would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to construct a 12' x 10' shed that extends 9' beyond the north building line of the principal building to within 6' 11" of the north property line. **New shed built on the current slab where the old shed is.** Existing non-permitted shed to be removed.

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

Board Member Nestorowicz supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Secretary Jerzy, support by Mr. Nestorowicz to approve the modified request as read.

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

The petitioner’s request was **APPROVED** as modified.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>10. PUBLIC HEARING:
 REPRESENTATIVE:
 COMMON DESCRIPTION:
 LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
 ZONE:</p> | <p>APPLICANT: Thomas and Kolleen Farrah
 Same as above.
 13728 Tefft
 13-01-107-002
 R-1-C</p> |
|--|---|

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Construct a 15’ x 15’ (225 square ft.) covered porch in the rear setback to within 17’ 3” of the rear property line.
- 2) Retain rear setback of residence at 30’ 3”.

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.

Kolleen Farrah, 13728 Tefft, appeared before the board.

Thomas Farrah, 13728 Tefft, appeared before the board.

Chairman Sophiea thanked them. He said their request is pretty self-explanatory, but if they could please tell them about it.

Kolleen Farrah explained their home, the backyard faces south. They would like to build a porch, covered porch, so they can utilize their backyard because the sun unbearable quite honestly during the day in their backyard.

Thomas Farrah included because the house is facing south, the sun is going east and west, so it’s all day long.

Chairman Sophiea thanked them for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Sophiea said they do have a short blurb from a neighbor.

Secretary Jerzy said short correspondence from Joanne Namel from 13705 Tefft. As a neighbor they're fine with it. They said they're good neighbors and keep up their property.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. At this time, he closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for discussion.

Board Member Green said on the drawing, they can clarify for him, they have an existing deck back there.

Kolleen Farrah answered no. The survey they have is from their original purchase in 1992. There was a huge deck. They currently have a small patio, or smaller patio.

Board Member Green said good enough. Thank you.

Chairman Sophiea has no problems with this. He thinks it's going to be a nice addition.

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

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to give permission to:

- 1) Construct a 15' x 15' (225 square ft.) covered porch in the rear setback to within 17' 3" of the rear property line.
- 2) Retain rear setback of residence at 30' 3".

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

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Secretary Jerzy, support by Mr. Assessor to approve the request as presented.

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

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

11. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Patrick Rosenick**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 22370 Curie
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-32-205-014
ZONE: R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a horseshoe driveway that is:

- 1) In the front yard.
- 2) Non-hard surfaced (gravel). Main drive to remain hard surfaced.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.06 – Yard Use: No part of any required yard, except a rear or side yard shall be used for any detached garage or any accessory building other than a garage or use, or for the storage of vehicles. Any portion of a lot in front of the front building line shall be used for ornamental purposes only and nothing shall be placed thereon except trees, shrubs, or items of similar nature.

Section 4.32 – Off-street Parking Requirements: (k) All off-street parking areas shall be provided with adequate ingress and egress, shall be hard surfaced with concrete or plant-mixed bituminous material (base may be stabilized gravel or equivalent...)

Chairman Sophia asked them to start with name and address please.

Patrick Rosenick, 22370 Curie, appeared before the board explaining he's trying to retain his current horseshoe drive that has been there for about fifty (50) years. He has pictures of it from the Macomb County website that its been there for all those years. All he did was put crushed concrete over it and made it look presentable. That's basically what he did.

Chairman Sophia thanked him for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this item? Please approach. Name and address please.

Henry Berden, 22466 Curie, appeared before the board stating since he moved in the house is immaculate. He keeps an immaculate yard. People there before were not. Like previous people have said, they have more issues with more properties on their block. There's one young lady it's like a junk yard. He's been there since '91 and that drive has been there. Since he's moved in, he's made it more presentable. He doesn't let the weeds get in it. He takes very good care of his property. They're glad to have him, because there are some properties they need to address.

Chairman Sophia thanked him for those comments. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to speak on this item?

No response.

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

Board Member Green did drive by the property. It is the nicest house on the street. He has no problem

with this variance.

Chairman Sophiea asked for any other comments from the board. Or motions?

Board Member Watts said if nobody else has a comment he'll make a motion.

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to retain a horseshoe driveway that is:

- 1) In the front yard.
- 2) Non-hard surfaced (gravel). Main drive to remain hard surfaced.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

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

Roll Call:

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

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

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

12. PUBLIC HEARING:	APPLICANT: Ron Her
REPRESENTATIVE:	Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION:	30301 Gloede
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	13-12-252-021
ZONE:	R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Allow the expansion of a non-conforming church by constructing an accessory structure with the following conditions:

- 1) 30' x 50' (1,500 square ft.)
- 2) 14' in height at the eaves accessory structure.
- 3) Outside of the side building lines of the principal building.

Also to:

- 4) Continue non-conforming use of a church not on a major thoroughfare.
- 5) Continue non-conforming use of a church with wall or greenbelt screening where site abuts residential districts or uses.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.20 – Detached Accessory Buildings: (a) ... Such buildings shall conform to, and

shall not project beyond, the existing side building lines of the principal building on the lot...

(5) That all accessory structures, excluding garages, will not exceed a total of 120 square feet.

Section 5.11 – Churches, Schools, Libraries and Civic Clubs: Churches, synagogues, mosques, public schools, public libraries, private educational institutions, funeral homes, community buildings, country clubs, fraternal lodges or similar civic or social clubs shall be permitted with permission of the Planning Commission pursuant to the standard set forth in Section 22.14(b)(1) and upon compliance with the following minimum requirements:

(1) That these uses shall be located on a major thoroughfare as identified by the City of Warren Master Thoroughfare Plan.

(5) That a six (6) foot wall or eight (8) foot greenbelt pursuant to Section 2.26 of this ordinance, be provided where the site abuts a residential district or residential use or is adjacent to an alley which abuts a residential district or residential use.

Chairman Sophiea asked the petitioner to start with name and address.

Ron Her, 30301 Gloede, appeared before the board.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. Anyone else that would like to speak, state name and address. Isaac Schill, 30301 Gloede, appeared before the board.

Chao Hang, 30301 Gloede, appeared before the board.

Chairman Sophiea thanked them. Please tell the board about the request.

Ron Her explained this is their second time here. This is essentially their church wanting to add a storage shed. Based on the size almost a pole barn kind of structure to store their lawn equipment and just supplies they use for church maintenance and things like that. So, essentially, they are trying to get this shed built up since late last year. Essentially, that's the request.

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

No response.

Chairman Sophiea closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for discussion. First he'll have Secretary Jerzy read the impact statement into the record. Or summarize it at least.

Secretary Jerzy thanked the Chair. Per the Planning Department:

- “• On January 13, 2025, the Petitioner attained conditional approval of a minor amendment to the site plan for Warren Hmong Alliance Church. The approved minor amendment is for the addition of a 30 ft. x 50 ft. shed. After reviewing the request, no issues were found to impact the abutting, local or general public in relation to the addition of this structure. Attached you will find the Planning Department's findings and recommendation for approval, as well as the Planning Commission's approval letter to the petitioner.

- Regarding the variance request to waive the requirement for a wall or greenbelt screening where it abuts residential districts or uses, the Planning Department makes the following recommendation:
Per Section 4D.46 of the Zoning Ordinance, modifications to non-residential requirements for landscape screens or natural buffers, Subsection 3, states:
The public benefit intended by the landscape screen or buffer requirements could be better achieved with an alternative design. Planning Staff has provided an alternative design as follows:
 - 1) Provide the eight (8) foot wide greenbelt along the south property line beginning at the existing fence up to the west edge of the parking lot, a distance of approximately 380 ft. There are some trees and arborvitaes existing in this area. Indicate the existing plantings, and include the additional trees and shrubs to be planted within this area per the Zoning Ordinance. Indicate the greenbelt on the site plan.
 - 2) Along the remaining south, west, and north property lines, Planning Staff would like to see clusters of plantings that can include trees, shrubs, and flowers that would provide screening between the existing use and the adjacent residential dwellings. At present, there is not any screening except for a small section along the south property line. Some examples are as follows: Eastern White Pine, American Sycamore, Arborvitaes, Eastern Hemlock, Serviceberry, Eastern Redbud, Sweetbay Magnolia, and Arrowwood Viburnum. This is not an exhaustive list. Indicate the locations of the new planting clusters and species on the site plan.”

Secretary Jerzy continued to say that looks to be it. It just has the Planning Department's recommendations and all that, which is three (3) or four (4) pages.

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

Board Member Green asked where they store their lawn equipment right now.

Ron Her explained they have a small portion of the building right now that's enclosed that just fits two (2) lawnmowers in there. So, they need this shed to essentially alleviate that.

Board Member Green asked this pole barn side shed.

Ron Her said yeah, it's about that size.

Board Member Green stated just for clarification, it's noted in the backup there's to be no outside storage around the shed, which is common. A lot of times people will start outside storage, so just be clear with that. The other question he would have is, it was noted by Planning that he has an existing trash dumpster right now.

Ron Her replied there is a dumpster on site right now that they've been asked to relocate and build a wall around it, yes.

Board Member Green asked if they're willing to do that.

Ron Her answered yes, they're willing to do that.

Board Member Green realizes a property that big walls are pretty expensive. Would they be willing to try to do some of this greenbelt on some of the spots that are open.

Ron Her replied definitely.

Board Member Green thinks that would be neighborly if they did that. Those are his questions. Thank you.

Board Member Watts stated they have a pretty good size building. He understands they have a spot where they're keeping some stuff now. There's no way they can modify to keep that stuff in the building without putting up a...?

Ron Her explained the building is very old school that the founding members purchased in the early 90's. To do that, they would have to tear down strong foundations to excavate and too much demolition.

Board Member Watts happens to live in the area. He has talked to a few of the neighbors about this. This is a pretty good size building that he wants to put up, a pole barn in a residential area. Quite frankly, he kind of has a problem with that. To him it doesn't fit the neighborhood. In his mind, have they looked at any other options?

Ron Her replied this is the best option. He doesn't know what other options they can do. Again, it's an old school buildings. It has classrooms they use for Sunday school for ministry work, which was is attached to their church building. If they had to remodel the building it's a lot more work than building a shed next to it.

Board Member Watts understands that. He knows they have a big piece of property, but like he said they're centered in the middle of a residential neighborhood. To put a pole barn up there just doesn't fit. Years ago the college put one up on Bunert south of Twelve and it doesn't fit the area there either. So, he has his concerns. He doesn't know how the rest of his colleagues feel, but he's going to be a no vote on this.

Chairman Sophia has a couple comments to make. His first comment is they're on a huge piece of property. He doesn't necessarily disagree with putting some type of auxiliary garage or shed or some type of structure for additional storage. What concerns him is the height. He wanted to ask him why it has to be so tall. Is it going to be a two (2) story?

Ron Her explained it's one (1) story. It's going to be mostly for lawn equipment, tables, chairs, things like that. Right now they got snow blowers in a room. They have to move these things out so they can utilize the room for other purposes.

Chairman Sophia understands that. How far is the structure going to be from the closest wall of the building?

Ron Her explained it's not very far. He would say about ten (10) or fifteen (15) feet at most.

Chairman Sophia said that was his other question, because it doesn't make sense to put

something way out in the field.

Ron Her said it's not way out in the middle of nowhere, no.

Chairman Sophiea has a concern with the height of the structure. He thinks fourteen (14) feet is kind of high for an auxiliary building in the back. He would also like to see the arborvitaes on the south property line shielding the neighbors. What other comments from the board?

Board Member Nestorowicz still has a concern. Fifteen hundred square feet is huge for an accessory building. It's as big as his house. That's a lot of lawn equipment, snow equipment and other kind of equipment they could store in there. He has no problems with placement and all this kind of stuff. He would love to see something smaller. Not fifteen hundred square feet.

Secretary Jerzy agrees with Mr. Nestorowicz. That was the first thing that stood out was fifteen hundred square feet is a lot of room for just a few lawn mowers, snow blowers, tables and chairs. It's bigger than half the houses on the south side. So, the square footage kind of throws him for a loop. Everything else seems to be ok. He's just questioning the size of it.

Chairman Sophiea asked how big the church building is.

Ron Her doesn't have the approximate size.

Board Member Watts informed it was a former elementary school he believes.

Jennifer Pierce said twenty-three thousand.

Chairman Sophiea said twenty-three thousand, ok. That's a huge building. How about parking on Sunday? Do they have any cars parking on the lawn at all. Do they have plenty of parking?

Ron Her explained they recently expanded their parking lot the last couple years. They don't have any issues with parking.

Chairman Sophiea said they might have an old birds eye view because the lot doesn't look very large.

Secretary Jerzy asked if he could ask the petitioner a question real quick. What made them land on the fifteen hundred number of square footage? How did they calculate their needs based off of...

Ron Her stated they have two (2) riding lawn mowers, commercial lawn mowers. Snow plow truck.

Secretary Jerzy asked a vehicle, too.

Ron Her answered yeah.

Secretary Jerzy said that's starting to make a little bit of sense. That fills the space pretty quickly with things like that. At least he has a better understanding. Thank you for clarifying.

Chairman Sophiea said in the spirit of fairness, they approve sheds that are 200 square feet on fifteen hundred square foot homes. If they're going by percentages here, fifteen hundred is pretty reasonable. He understands the concerns some members have. Are there any other comments from the board? Mr. Lindsey do you have something to add?

Board Member Lindsey is hearing what everybody is saying about the size. He thinks about it, and maybe they don't have it here in Warren, but if driving north of here and start seeing some of these really large churches you'll see this type of thing on their property. He doesn't think this is uncommon. They have a very large building, so it seems to make sense they might need that space. They might even grow into that space. He's definitely driven by churches, large churches, that have these types of things. So, he would support this with the trees and landscaping.

Chairman Sophiea said his only other concern is obviously there's going to be electricity. Is that going to be a heated or cooled structure? Is there going to be plumbing out there?

Ron Her said no plumbing at the moment. They do plan electricity and maybe later down the road.

Chairman Sophiea personally doesn't have a problem as presented as long as those greenbelt items are taken into consideration and added into the plan. He doesn't want to see that become a residence though. He wants to see that building used for the purposes that they're presenting it as. Any other comments from the board?

Board Member Green has one more. This is probably a good time to bring it up. When he was driving around, and this is in regards to the dumpster and dumpster enclosure. When he was driving around this week he counted seventeen (17) dumpster enclosures and only six (6) of them had dumpsters in them. So, he would urge them to use their dumpster enclosure. It's a problem. He just used that to bring it up this time, sorry. Go ahead. He's good.

Chairman Sophiea thanked him. Any other comments about this or motions?

Board Member Lindsey said he would make a motion but is not sure how to word it with the greenbelt. Is it just how it's written?

Secretary Jerzy he can put with it the recommendations from Planning for the greenbelt as recommended by Planning.

Board Member Lindsey asked to not read off bullet point five, but replace it with the recommendations from Planning.

Chairman Sophiea said correct.

Board Member Lindsey said to give him one second and he'll make the motion.

Secretary Jerzy said no problem.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to:
Allow the expansion of a non-conforming church by constructing an accessory structure

with the following conditions:

- 1) 30' x 50' (1,500 square ft.)
- 2) 14' in height at the eaves accessory structure.
- 3) Outside of the side building lines of the principal building.

Also to:

- 4) Continue non-conforming use of a church not on a major thoroughfare.
- 5) Continue non-conforming use of a church with wall or greenbelt screening where site abuts residential districts or uses.

Take the Planning Department's recommendation to add greenbelt screening.

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

Chairman Sophia asked if they had a comment.

Jennifer Pierce believes he also has to read number 5 in.

Secretary Jerzy said number 5 was the recommendation from Planning.

Chairman Sophia said they replaced number 5 with implementing the greenbelt.

Jennifer Pierce believes they still need to read number 5 because it's a church in a residential area.

Secretary Jerzy said the first part of it, yes.

Board Member Lindsey said to add onto the motion, continue non-conforming use of a church with wall or greenbelt screening where site abuts residential districts or uses **while taking the Planning Departments recommendation adding greenbelt screening.**

Chairman Sophia said there we go.

Secretary Jerzy said perfect.

Chairman Sophia asked for a support.

Secretary Jerzy supported the motion.

Chairman Sophia said they have a motion by Mr. Lindsey, support by Secretary Jerzy to approve the request as read.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (5 – 2).

Board Member Lindsey	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	No, detriment.
Board Member Green	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	No, detriment to the neighborhood.

Board Member Nestorowicz
Chairman Sophiea

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

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

13. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Jonathon Sulaka**
REPRESENTATIVE: Same as above.
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 24800 Hoover
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-26-101-026
ZONE: M-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Conduct a temporary outdoor retail sales operation without a permanent building.
- 2) Conduct a temporary outdoor sales operation in a 30' x 30' (900 square ft.) tent in an area designated for parking from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. June 21, 2025 through July 6, 2025.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.48 – Temporary Outdoor Retail Sales in Commercial and Industrial Districts:

Temporary outdoor retail sales may be permitted in conjunction with a permanent building in C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Section 4.52 (d) – Standards for Temporary Outdoor Retail Sales Approval: No sales activity or display of merchandise shall be permitted in the area designated for required off-street parking for the existing or temporary use.

Caren Burdi, 28225 Mound, appeared before the board on behalf of Jonathon Sulaka. Mr. Sulaka is here to her left asked him to confirm to the board that he's asked her to represent him tonight.

Jonathan Sulaka said yes, he asked Caren Burdi to represent her tonight.

Caren Burdi had him do that because it's not on the affidavit that was submitted. She asked if she may proceed.

Chairman Sophiea said please.

Caren Burdi explained this was a site that was often done by Pat Sulaka. It was a site for fireworks in the exact same fashion that was being presented today that Pat Sulaka had submitted twenty (20) plus years that he did fireworks at this site in the exact same way. Unfortunately, Pat Sulaka passed away last August and this is his nephew Jonathan Sulaka. He has been doing fireworks with his uncle Pat Sulaka for the last fifteen (15) years. Basically his right hand man. Now, Jonathan has taken over to do the fireworks to support the Sulaka family. His aunt and the granddaughter. This is at Value Fresh Market. Her client proposes to have a thirty (30) by thirty (30) tent from June 21st through July 6th for legal fireworks from 9:00 AM to 9:00 PM. The June 21st is to allow for setup time. His inspection date will be June 25th. Sales won't start until probably the 26th at that location. It will be sales from the 26th to the 4th, and then he'll be cleaning up that site. The record of Pat Sulaka and Jonathan Sulaka when they did fireworks with the state is excellent. They do not have a record of violations or noncompliance and they're available for any questions they might have.

Chairman Sophiea thanked her for those comments. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in

the audience who wishes to speak on this item?

No response.

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

Board Member Lindsey stated he works probably a quarter mile from here. Is there any issues for him to be a part of this discussion?

Chairman Sophia said not if that's the only... He doesn't work for the owner of the facility?

Board Member Lindsey said no, just location.

Chairman Sophia said it's no problem.

Board Member Lindsey just wanted to clarify and thanked him.

Chairman Sophia is not a huge fan of tents in general. He usually grants them for the temporary fireworks just because it's only up for two (2) weeks. In his mind, it's a little less detrimental to the neighborhood because it's not up for four (4) or five (5) months. It's just up for two (2) weeks, it's quick. They have a good record at that location.

Secretary Jerzy stated he has to go onto the record stating again his disapproval for fireworks tents in town. He also believes it takes away from the businesses in town that are trying to do the right thing having their own brick and mortar. He thinks it undercuts businesses there actually paying insurance and property taxes on said business. He's sure Mr. Sulaka is a fine young gentleman, but this has been his line in the sand since he's been on the board. The reason there's probably such great compliance is because there is no inspection during that time. These things pop up, everybody is going on their holiday weekend. Short of the first initial inspection, there's no follow up. His passed displeasure with the way tents are anchored in this town and trying to get some kind of tent ordinance established so they can try to avoid this every year would be nice. He's always going to be against these as far as he's concerned, any time they come up.

Board Member Lindsey feels the same way. He's generally not in favor of fireworks displays outside for the same reasons. He lives in the city and sees these things go up. They're usually not in compliance from what is voted on and approved. He does personally think they're a detriment to the area. He will vote no.

Chairman Sophia asked if there are other comments from the board. He asked the petitioner if they had something to add.

Caren Burdi is concerned that the board thinks there are no inspections. That is not what occurs. In fact, the state fire marshal office is in charge of them.

Secretary Jerzy doesn't think he said that, because he did not say that. He said short of the first inspection he doesn't believe they are there every day, every week. Sorry, he just doesn't.

Caren Burdi said if she could explain. She represents many fireworks vendors and have for probably the last fifteen (15) or so years. At one point, she owned a fireworks company. She has since sold that. She has have happened to open fireworks tents throughout Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb County for about ten (10) years in a row. The way that it is setup is there is an initial inspection and done by Lansing, the fire marshal from Lansing. They set up a date when they're going to come and they go through the entire three (3) pages of what's required to be able to have that fireworks tent set up. In addition to that, the city is always, because it is a tent within their city, are welcome to come and inspect. They're open to that. In addition to that, not only do they do that, but they come back around several times. They have actually tried to have minors buy fireworks and test the system. They've actually checked the fireworks themselves. When they first check the fireworks at the first inspection, it is not uncommon that they come back again and check the fireworks. This is the protocol that goes on. She has had fire works vendors get tickets for blocking exists when they wanted to control the pathway through their tent for violating closing exits. She knows they're out there doing enforcement because she ends up representing them on their violation tickets. The good news is, the Sulaka's have never had those violation tickets. They run a very clean operation following all the rules. The other thing he heard about was insurance. The state law mandates a million dollar insurance policy.

Secretary Jerzy had nothing to state about insurance. He was talking about brick and mortar shops that pay their taxes, pay insurance on their property year in and year out, month after month. Only to be undercut by these tents that pop up and undercut their business. Same thing with the flower peddlers that come in and undercut their business. He has no comments about insurance about his tent or nothing, so don't twist his words Ms. Burdi, please.

Caren Burdi stated she was just trying to show positive...

Secretary Jerzy said they don't need it. He doesn't need anymore information.

Caren Burdi wasn't trying to be disrespectful and saying he said there wasn't insurance.

Secretary Jerzy said she's just twisting her words. He doesn't appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairman Sophia asked if there are other comments from the board tonight.

Board Member Green said his question is for Mr. Watripont. This is kind of a round and round thing. They have an existing piece of property on Thirteen Mile and Mound where their tent is actually... that's a good point, he doesn't even know if there's a height requirement where their particular point is higher than the business signage behind it. When they brought that up he thought about that. His more specific question to this item is, they spoke about this before, does the ability to advertise with a sign that's not on the structure itself but what he calls circus signs. At one point he said sometimes those go along with these items.

Steve Watripont said they're not required to have a C of C. If the property owner requests a temporary sign can be put in place. There is a fee and a permit required.

Board Member Green asked if he meant the petitioner. So it doesn't automatically come with this.

Steve Watripont said signs do not come automatically. Signs don't come automatically with site plans or building plans or anything. Signs stand on their own.

Board Member Green said where he sees signs, that means somewhere along this process someone approve the sign.

Steve Watripont said or they put it up illegally.

Board Member Green thanked him.

Chairman Sophiea said while he's there he has another question. Sometimes they see the flower stands go through Planning to get a one time approval where they can do the tent annually. Is he familiar with that?

Steve Watripont explained outdoor sales areas require site plan approval. Fireworks has gone through site plan, well it's been there for a while, but it had gone through site plan approval at some point in time.

Chairman Sophiea said ok, so there's no way to just go through Planning at one time to get a yearly, two (2) week temporary license.

Steve Watripont said there would be if they went for permanent outdoor sales if that's the question he believes he's asking.

Chairman Sophiea said but that's not something through the Planning Department that would go back to zoning for a permanent.

Steve Watripont said Planning has the authority to do permanent outdoor sales on an established brick and mortar there. This is temporary where it doesn't meet those conditions.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes sense.

Board Member Green asked to piggy back off that if he may. They talked about this earlier. This is not specific to this item, but while they're talking about it. They talked about this earlier. A lot of these particular items they've discussed are obviously site plan violations. So, in the process they have Planning and that's where the site plans are approved. Outside of that, Planning has no enforcement tool. They don't have any people to do enforcement. When they talked about property maintenance. Property maintenance, even though it's supposed to be more residential, it seems to lean more towards businesses. Once these site plans get approved it just seems like there's no... People just run wild with what they're doing. That's a general problem.

Steve Watripont explained the process with the site plan is they go through it. They do send an inspector out. If the inspector finds anything issues a letter to the Building Department, which zoning takes over and would follow up with enforcement of non-compliance with the site plan within the zoning ordinance. Property must comply with the site plan. So, they do have that authority. Zoning doesn't go out and look to see if anyone is complying with site plans on a daily basis. They don't have the manpower or time to do that.

Board Member Green said this is a discussion for another day. Obviously this is not a priority of theirs in the administration.

Steve Watripont said he cannot speak on that behalf.

Board Member Green said he knows, but he can. It's not a priority. Planning should have enforcement, a tool. Property maintenance should have more people and zoning should have more people. Or what happens is what people on this board have been complaining about since he's been here. Wagons are falling off the damn wheel and nobody is doing anything about it. This is not them they're talking about, its general speaking.

Steve Watripont understands.

Board Member Green said the first thing he's learned is this is not a priority for the administration. That answers his questions. Thank you.

Steve Watirpont said you're welcome.

Caren Burdi is a little concerned they're talking about things that aren't this item.

Board Member Green said they are.

Caren Burdi asked if she can say something. They're not asking for temporary signage. That's not a situation that they're going to be doing. With regard to site plans, she ends up representing clients consistently who get letters from the Building Department that they're not in compliance with their site plan and often work to bring them back to the process to get them in compliance through Planning and sometimes zoning. Or clean up the situation to have them fully understand what their site plan is. So, where as they've been through site plan before, the site plan that they're seeing is exactly what they intend to comply with. Exactly as it's on here. So, if they went out there it should look exactly like that.

Chairman Sophia wants to summarize. This has been here for twenty (20) years. Obviously there's been no violations they see. The people in the brick and mortar store fronts aren't complaining because if they didn't like the guy they would complain to the landlord, because the landlord is in control of the property. This to him is just the same request that's been there and asked for at least fifteen (15) years. Are there other comments from the board? Ms. Burdi is there anything else she would like to add?

Caren Burdi said yes, please. In addition to doing the tie down straps, her client does the water weights. He does four (4) of them at each corner. These water weights weigh 458 pounds each one of those water weights and it's attached to the corners. In addition to the tie down ropes that go into the ground. He has been in compliance with recommendations by this board in the past. They're willing to comply with that. It's her understanding that the concrete is only 400 pounds. So, this is fifty-eight (58) pounds more as stated. The location that they're at is one (1) brick and mortar building. They don't do fireworks. They're pleased to have Mr. Sulaka do the fireworks and there are no other entities there. It is the market fresh, Value Fresh Market. As stated, they're the only ones in that location.

Chairman Sophiea thanked her.

Board Member Nestorowicz said if there's no other discussion, he would like to make a motion.

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Nestorowicz made a motion to approve the petitioners request to:

- 1) Conduct a temporary outdoor retail sales operation without a permanent building.
- 2) Conduct a temporary outdoor sales operation in a 30' x 30' (900 square ft.) tent in an area designated for parking from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. June 21, 2025 through July 6, 2025.

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

Board Member Green supported the motion.

Chairman Sophiea said they have a motion by Mr. Nestorowicz, support by Mr. Green to approve the request as read.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (5 – 2).

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

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>14. PUBLIC HEARING:
REPRESENTATIVE:
COMMON DESCRIPTION:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ZONE:</p> | <p>APPLICANT: Mohamad Abualrub
Same as above.
15150 Fourteen Mile
13-01-228-024
C-1</p> |
|---|--|

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Install a 18" x 7' (10.5 square ft.) wall sign in addition to existing 20.56 square ft. and 19 square ft. wall signs.
- 2) Install 864 square ft. of design element to gas canopy.
- 3) Install 103.90 square ft. of signage to (5) gas pumps. Sides of pump valances to remain white.

For a total of 1,017.96 square ft. of wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.35 – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-

2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): (c) Total wall signage of a size not to exceed forty (40) square feet shall be allowed for each business in commercial business and industrial districts zoned C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Chairman Sophia asked the applicant to please state their name and address for the record.

Mohamad Abualrub appeared before the board and stated his address.

Chairman Sophia thanked him.

Tom Tamou, 3102 Farmdale Drive, appeared before the board.

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

Tom Tamou explained they built a new gas station there in the corner. The business has been approved for liquor license and also for gasoline sales and retail store. So, these businesses need signs as everyone knows. They had to wait so long, although the business is open now already. They're operating with a temporary sign on the street until the official one comes in. They have a beautiful sign coming in. That was approved already. They're just waiting for the faces because they're special made for this company called S&G. They own quite a few gas stations. Eighty-two (82) gas stations. They just purchased four (4) more. One of them was theirs. They just purchased seven (7) more after that purchase. They're quite coming to town and they would like to welcome them and show them that... It's a beautiful building. So, please help them provide beautiful signs for it.

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

No response.

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

Board Member Watts said the temporary sign that's up on the hill on the corner out there, that's just temporary and coming back down?

Tom Tamou replied correct.

Board Member Watts said very nice job on the development. It looks a lot better than those two (2) abandoned structures that were there. He came by there tonight and he has a real problem.

Tom Tamou said he bets it's about the grass.

Board Member Watts said it looks horrible. The sod looks good up on the hill, but all the way around he lost his mind.

Tom Tamou laughed and said he did too. He wants to explain that. So, that's brand new sod. They cannot cut it, they won't allow them to cut it until it seals between the grass and the top

soil. It looks like...

Board Member Watts said yeah.

Tom Tamou suggested they see his other properties. They are all cut. He has vacant property for twenty-six (26) years now and been looking for a tenant somewhere on Ten Mile Road. He cuts it even though it's been vacant, but he understands. He doesn't like that either. Of course grass cannot be high for any type of business. They cannot cut it right now, they have to wait until it seals. Otherwise, they won't guarantee it.

Board Member Watts said the sod looks good on the side of the sidewalk to the building, but outside between the walk and the curb, it looks horrible. Then down by the wall to the west side of the property. As long as that's not going to be a pattern he doesn't have a problem with it.

Tom Tamou said oh no. Nobody builds buildings like this and leaves (inaudible).

Board Member Watts said it's very nice.

Secretary Jerzy said they have come along way on this project haven't we sir.

Tom Tamou replied yes they have.

Secretary Jerzy stated the one question he has is they're asking for two (2) liquor signs.

Tom Tamou explained it's two (2) sides of the building. One on the east and one on Fourteen Mile.

Secretary Jerzy personally, beautiful building, he thinks the one on Hayes is just a little bit extra. People are going to know they're selling liquor, they got the bigger one on the front. People are going to be drawn into the new building just by matter of fact. He can't see how they're not. That's the only thing he sees in this. He thinks everything else is fine, but just to have that nice face of that side of the building on Hayes. Have that liquor sign on up there, to him is kind of... He doesn't know, but that's just him personally.

Chairman Sophiea would echo that. It's a beautiful building. He thinks the signage for the gas pumps and awning is all routine gas station stuff. He has no problem with that. He has a little bit of a problem with the liquor signage. It's such a beautiful building. It's a shame to put... It makes it look cheap to add liquor so prominent on the building. If that's what they want to do, he guesses he can support it. He just doesn't want to see Budweiser and other beer and liquor advertisements in the window. That's what a lot of places do.

Tom Tamou understands what they're saying. These places they have to advertise their stuff in order to, you know, that's what they all do.

Chairman Sophiea stated sometimes they do it a little more tastefully. Food, snacks, liquor, beer, it's not just liquor. You know what he means? That was his only comment.

Secretary Jerzy agrees. He thinks they're going to end up having window elements in there. At

some point they're advertising for a special sale that's coming along, but people probably know that they're selling alcohol in there. Just him personally, you know, to remove the eighteen (18) by seven (7) he would like to see. If they're against that, then they're against it.

Tom Tamou said they're not done, because there's Saroki's Chicken and Pizza. They're also coming there. They will like to have some type of sign also. That's coming in the future. They're working with Steve on that he's sure. He asked Steve if he is correct.

Steve Watripont did talk to a rep from either Saroki's or the sign company. It sounds like they're going to come in within the ordinance so they won't be before the board. They're looking to put two (2) twenty (20) square foot signs. They'll have their C of C. They're allowed forty (40) square footage and they already have the spot that will be on the ground sign that was already approved by the board.

Secretary Jerzy remembers. Yes, correct. Thank you.

Board Member Watts has a question for Mr. Watripont. Window signage. Since it came up. Is there anything in the ordinance that says yes or no on that?

Steve Watripont replied yes. They are allowed, if it's illuminated they're allowed twenty-five (25) percent of the window be illuminated. If it's non-illuminated they're allowed fifty (50) percent. A permit is required for, well one (1) permit can obtain all the windows on the property. It's twenty-five (25) dollars per window. If they have ten (10) windows it's fifty (50) percent of each window pain, they would approve that and it would cost them \$250 and go from there.

Board Member Watts said since it came up. Thank you.

Steve Watripont said no problem. He tries to answer the questions quick and as honestly as he can.

Secretary Jerzy said they have to keep him sharp Steve.

Chairman Sophiea stated they know what they're doing. It's not his favorite thing having the liquor on the side, but they do a good job. He trusts that they'll keep the windows tasteful. Any other comments from the board?

Board Member Lindsey would like to make a motion if there are no other comments.

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to grant permission to:

- 1) Install a 18" x 7' (10.5 square ft.) wall sign in addition to existing 20.56 square ft. and 19 square ft. wall signs.
- 2) Install 864 square ft. of design element to gas canopy.
- 3) Install 103.90 square ft. of signage to (5) gas pumps. Sides of pump valances to remain white.

For a total of 1,017.96 square ft. of wall signage.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Assesor supported the motion.

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

Roll Call:

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

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

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

15. PUBLIC HEARING:

**APPLICANT: MC Development Holdings LLC –
Derick Riba**

REPRESENTATIVE:	James Dworman
COMMON DESCRIPTION:	2003 and 2005 Twelve Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	13-07-351-021
ZONE:	MZ, C-1, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to
Erect an 8’ high, 16’ x 35’ dumpster screen walls.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4D.40 – Refuse, Recycling Container Screening: Containers for refuse and recycling uses shall be screened from view from any adjacent residential use or public right-of-way, excluding alleys, screening may consist of a six (6) foot high opaque wall constructed of masonry material which matches the primary masonry of the principal structure on the site, standard concrete blocks are prohibited. Poured or precise concrete walls are permitted provided that they are installed on a continuous concrete footing and are eight (8) inches thick. Live landscape material located so it does not interfere with the function of the refuse container is encouraged in addition to the opaque screen.

Ryan Scholtes appeared before the board stating he’s the development director for a Sheetz development partner in southeast Michigan. He also has with him tonight Nancy Standish, she is their engineer. They are before the board seeking a variance from the ordinance for the height of their trash enclosure. The typical Sheetz trash enclosure is eight (8) feet in height. The current ordinance limits that height to six (6) feet. They primarily do this to make sure that all trash containers are completely 100% screened, nonvisible to the public. They are here tonight before the board to ask for that dimensional variance to allow them to build an eight (8) foot high trash enclosure at this location.

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

No response.

Chairman Sophiea turned it over to the board for discussion. They're going to read, at least summarize the Planning impact statement.

Secretary Jerzy thanked the Chair. From the Planning Department it says:

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

Secretary Jerzy said the lawyer submitted a letter summarizing the applicants variance request regarding the walls, all the dimensions. It's pretty lengthy. Regarding local authorities, applicant, explanation of the applicants request, so on and so forth. There's nothing really detrimental he's seeing in this report.

Chairman Sophiea said everyone has a copy.

Secretary Jerzy said that's all he has.

Board Member Nestorowicz was a little surprised because he didn't realize they were building that one until he got the package. That's walking distance from his house. He's familiar with the Sheetz locations in other states and stuff. The enclosure being eight (8) foot high instead of six (6) foot actually does screens it all a lot better. He personally thinks it's a good thing on the property.

Chairman Sophiea said they're familiar with the other Sheetz location they approved their eight (8) foot dumpster enclosure. The lawyers wrote a super brief. He doesn't know how many hours in that but they did a great job.

Ryan Scholtes said they do pay those bills and that is a rather lengthy letter.

Chairman Sophiea laughed and said he bets. He has no objections. Is there a motion?

Board Member Watts said this was on Planning then Monday night and it was postponed. It was not approved. So, his question is should they be voting on this tonight and approving it, because as he understands the variance goes with the property. Lets just say something happens and they didn't build, now they have this variance sitting there.

Chairman Sophiea said that's true.

Secretary Jerzy said that's a true statement.

Board Member Watts is concerned about... He's sure it's probably going to happen, but he doesn't want to do the wrong thing.

Chairman Sophiea asked Mr. Watripont if he had any clarity.

Steve Watripont stated he was coming up to clarify that he discussed it with people above about whether it should move forward or not, and they see no reason. As he came up here he thought about it a little bit, the board has the permission and ability to put a condition on that if it is approved by the site plan by the Planning Commission. The board can put that condition on there so it would be contingent today, but once approved.

Secretary Jerzy said Planning Commission approval.

Chairman Sophiea said that makes sense. If this was something more complex maybe he would be more inept to do that.

Steve Watripont informed usually they would probably say they want it removed if it was more complex.

Chairman Sophiea can't think of any use for that property where he would not want an eight (8) foot tall dumpster enclosure. It's a win, win either way.

Steve Watripont asked Mr. Watts if that answered his question.

Board Member Watts replied yes and thanked him. If there's no other questions he's prepared to make a motion.

Chairman Sophiea said please do.

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to grant permission to erect an 8' high, 16' x 35' dumpster screen walls. **Contingent on the project getting approved and moving forward.**

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

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

Roll Call:

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

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

The petitioner's request was **APPROVED** with the contingency.

Board Members Watts asked if they could get one of those opened soon.

Ryan Scholtes said they're doing everything they can. Demo starts on Pampa Lanes site in a couple weeks.

Chairman Sophia didn't have a chance to look very closely to the site plan. Is that car lot in the front still going to be there.

Ryan Scholtes explained those conversations are ongoing. He knows everyone likes to bring...

Chairman Sophia asked about the carpet in the bowling alley.

Ryan Scholtes said the carpet is gone. Bowling alley is remaining. They are in negotiations or have made the attempt to negotiate with the car lot owner. They are rekindling some of those conversations because of price going up and up. Its inevitable. So, they're doing everything they can to try to rectify that situation.

Chairman Sophia thanked them and said good luck.

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

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

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

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

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

This item was rescheduled to June 11, 2025 during the adoption of the agenda.

17. NEW BUSINESS

Board Member Watts said for Mr. Watripont. Mr. Green brought up some stuff earlier. He'll use a couple of good examples. He brought this up when he was ex-officio from council to the Planning Commission about new projects. The site plan has things that are included. Irrigation, shrubbery, grass, so on and so forth. They make those people fit in there and he thinks it's reasonable to expect them to use that stuff. To take care of their property. Now, here's a great example of who is not doing that. The Circle K on Van Dyke north of Eleven Mile. The place looks horrible. Their shrubs are dead, the grass is out of control half the time. Then there is a new place at Ten Mile and Schoenherr, north east corner, an oil change. Beautiful job, put all the shrubs in, the irrigation and everything. Shrubs are all dead. The grass is a foot high. How do they get a handle on this?

Steve Watripont stated if it's something required by the site plan it's Planning that would have to go out there. They do inspections afterwards. If it's dead shrubs or something that was on that site plan, then it is required that it be replaced. He actually did enforcement on the Tim Horton's at Twelve and Van Dyke because they chopped down all their trees. He doesn't know if they replaced it 100% but they did replace some of that and Planning hasn't said anything, but it did come from Planning first before zoning got involved. It's actually Planning and their assistant planners and stuff like that will go out and look at it to see if it complies with the approved site plan.

Board Member Watts said that answers the question. He's concerned about things were let go for so long in the city. Now, with the new administration and Mr. Muzzarelli he knows everybody is really upbeat about trying to get things done. It's just disappointing driving around seeing this mess.

Steve Watripont explained if it's related to open storage, that is one thing they will look to see if complies with the site plan. Most other things that aren't specific to the zoning ordinance they don't look for.

Board Member Watts appreciates that.

Board Member Green said they talked about this previous. The problem really is the amount of people they have. So, Planning doesn't have enforcement people.

Steve Watripont said they have the zoning department.

Board Member Green said they only have seven (7).

Steve Watripont replied correct.

Board Member Green said property maintenance is a different animal, but he thinks that's more in line with what he's talking about. The problem, again, is in over for anything to get done there has to be more employees. That's going to have to be an administrative decision as to what they think is important. Going to events or making sure the city doesn't look like a rat hole. So, he feels for him.

Steve Watripont thanked him. He was waiting for a question he was hoping he didn't have to answer.

Secretary Jerzy said to Mr. Green's comment. Since he's been involved with the city and on this board, paying attention to the budget. Every year he tells them they need to increase, at least double it. Double every department. For a city this size to think seven (7) people are going to catch everything. Mr. Watripont is doing a great job. Everybody in his department does a great job, but they're overwhelmed. It comes to a point that the overwhelming becomes how much are they really making a difference. It grinds you down. This man has never been ground down. He cares about the city and there's a lot of people in his department and property maintenance that do. Its just, like he said, they need more manpower. There is nobody doing follow up. They grant variances. One of the first things he granted was a screen enclosure on Shady Lane. The guy

with the wall. That thing is still sitting to this day same as is. They granted the variance for him years ago. There's nobody to do... he's overwhelmed. There is only so many people, so many hours in the day. He's putting out whatever fires he's got during the day, but they need two (2) or three (3) people just doing consistent follow up. He's been trying to champion that from anybody who is going to hear. Every department needs two (2) or three (3) people. It's going to pay for itself. It really will. Just have to keep trying.

Chairman Sophiea said in any event, they're lucky to have Mr. Watripont.

Steve Watripont thanked them all. They're all so kind. For the most part.

(Laughter)

Chairman Sophiea said two (2) quick things before they adjourn that he wants to bring to the boards attention. The special meeting they called for June 4th at 7:30 PM. It's a special meeting that should go relatively quick. There is going to be nineteen (19) items but they're all the same basically. Right, Nicole? The other thing is on Monday. They probably got the invitation already for the Council of Commissions dinner. Unfortunately, he's going to be out of town that night, but he hopes those that go have a nice time. Other than that he's ready to adjourn.

18. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

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

Voice Vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Paul Jerzy
Secretary of the Board