

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2026

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, January 14, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. at the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

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

Members of the Board absent:

David Sophiea

Also present:

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Nestorowicz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

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

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to excuse Mr. Sophiea; Supported by Board Member Assessor.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (8 – 0).

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Jerzy has a couple of changes to the agenda. He would like to make these two changes. He would like to move item 6 to item 15 and remove item 15 that's currently on the agenda and move that item to the February 11th meeting. So, item 6 will be the new item 15 and

item 15 on the agenda is going to be moved to February 11th.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to approve the previously mentioned changes; Supported by Board Member Clift.

Board Member Watts asked why they're moving 6 to the end.

Secretary Jerzy explained he's stuck in inclement weather. He's on the way, but stuck in inclement weather.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Chairman Nestorowicz explained if anybody in the audience is here for item 15, the previous item 15, that is in February 11th and this is the only notification for it. It's not going to be reposted for it. He just wanted to let anybody know that. Now, he does know there are a couple use variances on today's meeting. Actually, it's just 12. Since they are down one (1) member and item number 12 is a use variance. He did want to give that petitioner a chance, if they wanted to reschedule to have a full board, they have that opportunity. Or if they want to proceed when their item comes up tonight is good too. Is the petitioner here? Are they fine proceeding with them being down one (1) member on their item? Okay, thank you. That takes them to the approval of the minutes.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Regular Meetings of November 12, 2025 and December 10, 2025.

Motion:

Board Member Green made a motion to approve November 12, 2025 minutes; Supported by Board Member Watts.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion:

Board Member Green made a motion to approve December 10, 2025 minutes; Supported by Board Member Watts.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (8 – 0).

6. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Steven Savich
(Rescheduled from 12/10/2025)

REPRESENTATIVE:

Same as above.

COMMON DESCRIPTION:

26837 Ryan

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

13-19-228-009

ZONE:

MZ, C-1, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain 12' x 28' (336 square ft.) painted mural wall signage on the east elevation, in addition to the permitted 40 square ft. wall sign for a total of 376 square ft. of wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.11 – Specific Sign Definitions: For purpose of this ordinance, the following signs as listed shall be defined as follows:

24. Mural. A picture painted directly on a wall and shall be considered a painted wall sign for the purpose of this ordinance.

Section 4A.35 (c) – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): 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.

This item was moved to item 15 during the adoption of the agenda.

7. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Dennis Bostick
(Rescheduled from 12/10/2025)
Lisa Baker
32900 Dequindre Ste A
13-06-101-027
M-2

REPRESENTATIVE:

COMMON DESCRIPTION:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

ZONE:

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

1) Install a 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 4' x 8' (43% of the total permitted free standing sign area) to within 2' of the sidewalk along Dequindre Road.

2) Install a second 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 4' x 8' (43% of the total permitted free standing sign area) to within 2' of the property line along Fourteen Mile.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.11 – Specific Sign Definitions: For purpose of this ordinance, the following signs as listed shall be defined as follows:

22. Monument sign. A sign mounted directly to the ground with a maximum height not to exceed five (5) feet.

Section 4A.27 – Electronic Message Center: In addition to other applicable zoning requirements, a responsible party shall comply with all of the following electronic message center requirements:

(b) Except a property where a business has a valid State of Michigan Motor Fuels Retail Outlet License, the digital display area of an electronic message center does not exceed 25% of the total permitted free standing sign area.

Section 4A.35 – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): (b) One freestanding on-premise sign or advertising display of a size not to exceed one hundred and fifty (150) square feet shall be allowed in industrial districts zoned M-3 and M-4.

(c) Total wall signage of a size not to exceed one hundred and fifty (150) square feet shall be allowed for each building in industrial districts.

Chairman Nestorowicz stated to the petitioner to begin with name and address for the record

and then take the board through their proposal or what the changes were from last time.

Lisa Baker, 5439 North Groesbeck, appeared before the board representing Dennis Bostick. They have the two (2) different signs that are under variance. They do have a packet where they proposed the numbers they were given. They have also gone back with the owners and looked at some other options. She asked if she could confer with Steve on this for just one second. She didn't hear back from Steve today on the one. There's some information for the Fourteen Mile location that she believes he's not positive whether a permit had been pulled on the one sign previously. Is that correct?

Steve Watriont stated there has been no permit pulled on the sign that was there before for JR Spring. The monument was there. She was talking about making it a pole sign. If they move forward with the pole sign, it will have to be reposted again and go from there. If that's the decision.

Lisa Baker doesn't know if the board is able to separate those. Move forward with the monument, that's going to remain a monument. Then they can do some information seeking for the other one. What they're wanting to use the same...

Board Member Green said to excuse him for just one second. Can he get clarification from Steve real quick on this or no?

Chairman Nestorowicz said to wait till it's the... It's the petitioner's time right now.

Board Member Green said he gets it.

Chairman Nestorowicz said he'll just have to wait. Continue ma'am.

Lisa Baker asked if there was a question.

Chairman Nestorowicz explained they'll ask the question when it's the boards turn.

Lisa Baker looked at... Initially they asked for a four (4) by eight (8) reader board on both locations, which is higher than what the board expressed that that is a little bit too high in their opinion, some of the conversation from last time. So, they've reduced the one on Dequindre to a four (4) by six (6). Which is only six (6) square foot over the ordinance. Then the one on, that they're looking at for the Fourteen Mile Road, is the exact size what they're allowed. The eighteen (18) square foot, they've reduced that one to the three (3) by six (6). The only thing that is up in the air is they would like to use the existing pole. For the setback location they're unsure of whether that was a permitted sign or not. Otherwise, to move back to the Dequindre, she'll walk through that one completely. So, the setback is now four (4) foot compared to two (2) if they were to make that adjustment. The height is seven (7) foot, which is still less than what the existing sign there is. The reader board has been reduced to that four (4) by six (6), which is twenty-four (24) square foot.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if they have anything else to add on that.

Lisa Baker continued saying secondary, not sure whether they're going to be allowed to do this,

but she can walk the board through what they were proposing. On the Fourteen Mile location they've moved it to a pylon sign thinking that's going to add some visibility for drivers as well as the visibility for them to directionally get into that driveway that's not marked otherwise into that property. They've reduced that sign to a three (3) by six (6), which is right within ordinance. The setback of the existing pole that's there for the gymnastics is ten (10) foot. Which is a little bit, she thinks they're five (5) foot above that. So, it's only five (5) foot difference if they were to use that existing pole. So, that they can... She doesn't know if that has to go out to the community again to look at that particular sign, but size wise the reader board size everything was within ordinance. Other than that questionable setback on that one.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked her for that explanation. He turned it over for a public portion of the meeting. Is there anyone from the audience wanting to speak, provide input on this item.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for questions and discussion. Mr. Green can ask his question now.

Board Member Watts said first to the petitioner. Gymnastics sign, does that belong to the Bostick property?

Lisa Baker explained that's what they were trying to verify with Steve. She doesn't believe they were able to find that at this point.

Steve Watripont said in the research he's done since last month, he focused on this property and then started looking outward. There are multiple addresses at the other one. He has not found a sign permit. He definitely did not find a sign permit for the 32900. So, the JR Spring definitely did not. He did find that there was a face change on a sign, but he can't find what sign that was for. So, he's still digging on all the other addresses. They'll start enforcement once that research is done.

Board Member Watts asked as of tonight, he found no permits on the Fourteen Mile signs.

Steve Watripont replied nope.

Board Member Watts asked about the sign that is on Dequindre.

Steve Watripont answered there is a permit for the sign on Dequindre. Basically, it was the original sign was nine (9) feet, six (6) inches in height, he believes. It was not necessarily a monument sign, but it went up and had a short pole and it was like a flag sign that was still lower to the ground with a higher flower bed from the renderings he found.

Board Member Watts said they talked about branding when dealing with the building. He had numerous complaints about the building being painted. The building being painted, the color it is to go with their brand. Is that going to be considered advertising as well?

Steve Watripont has not made it over to that section. He hasn't been out of the office except for a couple inspections actually. With the holiday's and short staff and everything else. If it's a solid

color, ninety-nine (99) percent of the time, no. It's usually when there's a different fleck in the color showing something and going that way.

Board Member Watts thanked him. He'll save him time and send him a picture.

Steve Watripont said he'll still go look.

Secretary Jerzy thinks they discussed that last meeting, too. How the brightness of that building is probably more signage for them than any other signage that they could probably put on that building. He holds firm in the opinion that he doesn't believe either one of these signs are needed. He thinks what she has currently... He thinks if she uses the old JR Spring monument sign that's currently on the front lawn, put (inaudible) on that. With the current wall signage they approved last meeting, he thinks that's more than adequate enough. He is definitely not in favor of a one (1) story pole sign with an LED display on it. He told her last meeting and he'll say it again. He's not in favor of any LED's in this town until they can get some kind of handle on the ones they currently have. So, he's going to be a firm denial on this and he's going to be a firm denial on any LED's that come before this board going forward. Unless the petitioner... He means he can't put anything in writing saying that they'll have to keep it at a certain brightness. A lot of the problem is they'll have five (5) or six (6) different displays. Five (5) are fine and then one pops up and it's just blinding. So, until they get more enforcement from the city on this he can't get behind it. He's just going to help them police it from up here. He yields the floor.

Board Member Green said maybe it's him. Is the agenda item stuff they see in front of them matching, and he knows she's coming back, but it's not matching their backup and it's not matching, in his mind, what she said.

Lisa Baker said if he looks at the handouts for item 7. So, she did provide a picture. The front picture is what was originally proposed last month. The page behind that for each Fourteen Mile and Dequindre, shows them trying to compromise and come down on size. Make it closer to what is their current ordinances. The LED board current ordinance, they're allowed a three (3) by six (6) reader board. The monument sign they're allowed seventy-two (72) or seventy-six (76). Seventy-five (75) square foot is actually what they're allowed for a monument sign.

Board Member Green asked if there's still two (2) monument signs.

Lisa Baker explained they're requesting that. Ordinance reads that there's one (1). The issue that comes into play on this property is there's Fourteen Mile, the building is not visible. There's an entrance there, DOT is talking about not allowing a left hand turn there. That would cause anyone coming into this business would have to use the Fourteen Mile location. That entrance is not marked at all currently.

Board Member Green asked if she's reducing the monument sign to seven (7) feet, which is if he's getting this right, from nine (9) eleven (11). That's still two (2) feet over the ordinance and the percent of LED lights is still forty-three (43) percent?

Lisa Baker said it is not. They've reduced it from a four (4) by eight (8) reader board down to a four (4) by six (6).

Board Member Green explained he's talking about the percent of that sign that...

Lisa Baker thinks it's thirty (30) percent. They're allowed twenty-five (25) and that moves it up to just below thirty (30) percent she believes. So, it's six (6) square feet over what ordinance allows.

Board Member Green said when they make the motion, because there's three (3) different numbers here. Thank you.

Board Member Lindsey wanted to make a comment to the board. When he's looking at this, he thinks he's in agreement with Mr. Jerzy that the signage that's already allowed on this property is certainly sufficient to brand the building, to allow people to know the business is there. This is overkill in his opinion. It's too much signage. He's in agreement, too, on the LED's. He's not comfortable with that. He's going to be a no vote on these.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Lindsey.

Board Member Watts said going back to his original comments. He wasn't quite done. He'll add where he stands on this. One, he's in agreement with Mr. Jerzy with the LED's. They're a problem. This is a lot of signage. He's gone by that building a lot over the years and actually have done business with John R Spring. He doesn't know that he's ever seen anybody come in from the Fourteen Mile location. So, he's not quite sure the need even for that. He guess since there's no permit they're not even going to be able to approve that part tonight. He thinks about the Fourteen Mile, about how much signage and the LED and then the color of the building. That's just a detriment to the neighborhood. He has had a lot of phone calls about this. He's going to have a problem with this moving forward until some kind of resolution is done, because it's just too much. It's too much. If they had a sign that didn't have the bright LED's or they had an ordinance that could limit it, that would be one thing. Then to paint the building like this. It's totally out from what the neighborhood looks like. He can't get behind this at all until some changes are made.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Watts. He wanted to reiterate. He agrees with his colleagues up here because he's actually fine with the monument sign and such, but the LED portion. The ordinance allows no more than twenty-five (25) percent. Personally, it's like if there's going to be an LED portion, he'd like to say they should keep it under the twenty-five (25) percent, which is what they're allowed. He would have a hard time voting for a larger LED portion. He has no problem with monument signs and can give the additional square feet on that, but those are his comments. Any other questions? Discussion?

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

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to deny the petitioner's request to:

- 1) Install a 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 4' x 8' (43% of the total permitted free standing sign area) to within 2' of the sidewalk along Dequindre Road.
- 2) Install a second 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 4' x 8' (43% of the total permitted free standing sign area) to within 2' of the property line along Fourteen Mile.

Reasons being: Detriment to the area; Property is not unique to require it; Self-imposing; Not necessary; Creates an unreasonable impact and burden on the adjacent public with the LED component on the sign.

Board Member Lindsey supported the motion.

Jennifer Pierce stated point of order. Correct her if she's wrong, but she believes the request tonight was for a three (3) by six (6) LED on Fourteen Mile Road and then on Dequindre a four (4) by six (6) LED message board. Instead of what was on the original.

Board Member Green asked if it was also seven (7) foot on the monument signs.

Jennifer Pierce asked Ms. Baker to correct her if she's wrong, but on Dequindre the request that she's looking at was for three (3) by six (6).

Secretary Jerzy rescinded his motion. Go ahead, Ms. Pierce.

Jennifer Pierce asked if she's correct on Dequindre it's three (3) by six (6).

Lisa Baker explained they had proposed a four (4) by six (6), which is twenty-four (24) square foot versus the allowed eighteen (18). She thinks the client would be open to an eighteen (18) square foot, which is allowed in the ordinance. With that being said, the only thing that would come into play would be the setback. So, there's currently, with the existing sign that's there, what would be installed is smaller than what JR Springs has there.

Jennifer Pierce explained what she's trying to ascertain is her request tonight. The new information that they were provided tonight. She said the first page was last meetings proposal. She has changed it to the second page.

Lisa Baker said correct.

Jennifer Pierce explained what she is looking at is for 32900 Fourteen Mile Road. To install a free standing sign with a three (3) by six (6) LED message on the existing pole. That's on Fourteen Mile. Then on Dequindre is four (4) by six (6).

Lisa Baker said that is correct.

Jennifer Pierce wanted to make sure she is looking at the right information.

Lisa Baker continued stating as she said the client would be willing to bring that down, she believes, if this is declined. Then they would be allowed a three (3) by six (6) reader board or an LED on that position. The only thing that would come into play on that variance would be the setback. Currently, it's only at two (2) foot, which was approved on previous variance. She doesn't know if the client would be allowed to remain at that two (2) foot or whether they would have to adhere to current ordinance on that. Or whether that could get granted she guesses.

Jennifer Pierce explained if it's already approved to waive the setback requirements and do the

two (2) feet, that runs with the land. So, she wouldn't need to seek a variance. As long as the sign complied with all the other requirements of the ordinance.

Lisa Baker thanked her.

Secretary Jerzy said real quick with the percentage then with the scale down of the four (4) by six (6). That changes the percentage from forty-three (43) percent to what was the percentage?

Lisa Baker believes it's twenty-nine (29). She had worked that out. Actually, thirty (30) percent. At four (4) by six (6) it would be thirty (30) percent. At the three (3) by six (6) it is the twenty-five (25) that is allowed.

Board Member Watts said to clarify, the two (2) foot setback is on the Fourteen Mile sign.

Lisa Baker said that is on the Dequindre. Again, without back finding, they're not positive on what variances or what signs have been granted in the past on Fourteen Mile. There are signs there. They have not been able to find that at the city, so they're not positive on that one yet.

Board Member Watts said he's good. Thank you.

Board Member Cliff said July 6, 1966 to erect a sign within two (2) feet of the front property line sign to be ten (10) foot by three (3) foot six (6) inches by nine (9) foot six (6) inches in height.

Board Member Watts said for Dequindre, yeah.

Board Member Cliff said that variance exists and runs with the land.

Lisa Baker said thank you.

Board Member Green said this is his original point of what he brought up. Does the seven (7) foot have to be in there, too? She switched from nine (9) feet to seven (7) feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz said as long as it's less it's fine.

Board Member Green thanked him.

Secretary Jerzy is trying to get his ducks in a row. Bear with him people. He would like to remake the motion for denial for the variance requested.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to deny the petitioner's request to:

- 1) Install a 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 4' x 6' (30% of the total permitted free standing sign area) to within 2' of the sidewalk along Dequindre Road.
- 2) Install a second 61.5 square ft. monument sign that is 9' 11" high, contains an electronic message center that is 3' x 6' to within 2' of the property line along Fourteen Mile.

Reasons being: Detriment to the area; It is not necessary; Not economic; Property is not unique enough to require additional signage.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Jerzy, support by Mr. Assessor to deny the request for reasons stated in the motion. Basically, it will be a yes to deny is the vote.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Secretary Jerzy	Yes to deny.
Board Member Assessor	Yes to deny.
Board Member Clift	Yes to deny.
Board Member Green	Yes to deny.
Board Member Watts	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Lindsey	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes to deny.

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

Chairman Nestorowicz informed she can talk with Steve for next steps.

Lisa Baker said she’ll reach out to him tomorrow if that’s ok with him. It sounds like they can just keep the sign the same size and everything that’s approved and then the reader board is three (3) by six (6). Correct?

(Inaudible)

Lisa Baker said perfect. Thanks a lot guys.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 8. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Image 360 – Robert Dempster |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Robert Dempster |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 26225 Sherwood |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-21-151-038 |
| ZONE: | C-3 |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Install a 40” x 144” (40 square ft.) wall sign on the north elevation in addition to a previously approved 40 square ft. wall sign on the east elevation for a total of 80 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 Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz doesn't see the petitioner present for this. Do they want to proceed on this item without the petitioner? Do they want to reschedule it? Nicole, have we heard anything from this petitioner?

(Inaudible)

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to move this to the end of the meeting to see if the petitioner shows up with the inclement weather, make it item 16; Supported by Board Member Green.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (6 – 2). (Board Member Clift and Board Member Lindsey voted no.)

9. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Mary Jane's Friends & Co.**
REPRESENTATIVE: Krys Wdowiak
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 13647 Ten Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-24-352-044
ZONE: MZ, M-1, R-1-P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Retain a 12' x 4' (48 square ft.) wall sign.
- 2) Retain verbiage on wall sign that advertises a marihuana business.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.14 – Prohibited Signs: The following types of signs are prohibited in all districts, unless it is a public art work commissioned by the City of Warren as part of its Placemaking with Art Initiative: (p) A sign, visible from a public right-of-way, advertising Caregiver operations or marihuana business, except retail establishments and provisioning center facilities.

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 Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz said second petitioner not present. Since they moved the other one to the end...

Steve Watripont stated he's just been informed that there were a couple calls into the council offices that people believe that this building was closed today and that all activity was closed. So, if that helps the board with their decision. He's just letting them know that and that might be why

some people aren't here. He told the board the ones he knew weren't going to be here.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Steve for sharing that.

Steve Watriont stated the petitioner for item 6 is here now, too.

Motion:

Board Member Green made a motion to move this item to 17; Supported by Board Member Watts.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (6 – 2). (Board Member Cliff and Board Member Lindsey voted no.)

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 10. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Global Sign and Awning |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Ayad Sitto |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 13625 Twelve Mile |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-12-353-020 |
| ZONE: | MZ, C-1, P |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a ground sign with an overall height of 17.4', a 9.39' under clearance; overall sign area of 96" x 96" (64 square ft.) which includes a 3' x 8' (24 square ft.) electronic message center setback 6' from the sidewalk in place of previous variance for ground signage dated 8/22/2012.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.17 – Setbacks: The following setback regulations shall apply to signs located in all zoning districts: (b) All freestanding or ground signs shall be set back from the right-of-way line a minimum distance equal to the height of the sign.

Section 4A.19 – Clearance: All freestanding, projecting, and marquee signs shall have a clearance of ten (10) feet beneath the sign structure, excluding monument signs.

Section 4A.27 – Electronic Message Center: In addition to other applicable zoning requirements, a responsible party shall comply with all of the following electronic message center requirements: (b) Except a property where a business has a valid State of Michigan Motor Fuels Retail Outlet License, the digital display area of an electronic message center does not exceed 25% of the total permitted free standing sign area.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present.

No response.

Secretary Jerzy asked if they should cancel the whole meeting at this point. They'll move this... This is going to be a quick meeting if they don't show up. There's going to be a lot of unhappy people he feels.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to move this item to 18; Supported by Board Member Green.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (5 – 3). (Board Member Clift, Board Member Lindsey, and Board Member Watts voted no.)

Board Member Clift said this is relative to Mr. Watriont's statement. He keeps a pretty firm grasp on what's going on in town. He has received no prompts, no texts, no alerts of any kind about this facility or it's activities today being closed. Bear witness to his case, the parking lot was full of people doing exercises out here when he walked in this afternoon. Hence, no call no show no repeat.

Board Member Watts said he would agree.

Chairman Nestorowicz understands. They'll address those items at the end of the meeting. Item 11.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 11. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Cavaliere Companies |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Lorenzo Cavaliere |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 30300 Hoover |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-11-160-001 and 13-11-160-002 |
| ZONE: | MZ, O, P |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to
Retain parking to within 20' of front property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 13A.07 (a) – Front Yards: In O Districts, every building shall have a front yard of not less than thirty (30) feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present. Start with name and address for the record. Take the board through their request.

Lorenzo Cavaliere, 30078 Schoenherr, appeared before the board. The request before the board this evening is a parking lot setback, which the ordinance requires thirty (30) feet. The parking for building and parking lot. Back in 1999 they did get an approval for a building setback of twenty (20) feet instead of thirty (30) feet. At that time, the plan showed the building setback twenty (20) feet and the parking lot setback twenty (20) feet. Recently, a tenant had requested a variance to install a generator, which was approved. At that time, he was notified... He built the building back in 1999 and still own it today. He was notified that although there was a variance for the building to be setback twenty (20), there was not a variance for the parking to be setback twenty (20) feet. So, the issue came up and he met with zoning officials at the city. They said he needed to submit an application and here is. The building has been up for going on twenty-seven (27) years. He never had an issues, no complaints. The building is maintained fairly well. They pretty much have the same tenant in there that they had back in 2000 when they finished the building. Without this variance, they would have to rip out parts of the parking lot that's been there for almost twenty-seven (27) years. That's the story of why he's here tonight.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him very much for that explanation. This is a public hearing. Are there any members of the audience here to speak on this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion and there is a...

Secretary Jerzy said they have an impact statement from Planning.

Board Member Green said there is audience.

Chairman Nestorowicz reopened the audience portion. Please state name and address before the comments.

John Wilcox, 11630 Robinwood, appeared before the board. He is here because he has had a lot of problems with this company over the years. He wanted to talk to someone to see where he goes from here to have these problems fixed. Nothing is being done from these people. He doesn't know if he can talk to him or...

Chairman Nestorowicz asked what kind of issues they're having.

John Wilcox said with the dumpsters. The first wall fell over and crushed his fence. They said they were going to fix it and give him a new one, they never did. They had two (2) people come over for estimates and never talked to any of them people. They left and never heard from these people again. It's an ongoing situation with all this. When they first did this, they're supposed to landscape and everything else. What they did with their so called landscaping, they had two (2) guys in a pickup truck throwing dirt over that wall and he got into an argument with the guy. He said he's just doing his job. He was told to go six (6) inches from the wall and two (2) inches deep. That was it. When he told him that's no good, he had to clean all the concrete and everything else. Had to redo the whole thing. When they put the wall up, the second wall. They sprayed it with some kind of chemical that killed part of his grass and his plants and everything else. He had to redo everything. Put all new dirt in, grass seed, everything. It took time and a couple years to finally get it going. He has to look at his notes for the rest of the stuff. He has to talk to somebody because the leaves are already left up, people drop off for treatments and everything else. Even the people that drive the vans and all that, they have a tendency to go by that dumpster and urinate. The gates across that dumpster are never closed. So, anybody can walk in and do whatever they want. That's more issues. He has all kinds of gross masks, everything blowing over the wall. They have no facilities to throw things away when people are leaving the building. They throw it all over the ground.

Chairman Nestorowicz understands that sir. He would say that those kind of concerns should be probably brought up with the Building Department. If there are any violations out there or if they didn't follow through with the site plan or so, or if there's any violations, enforcement would happen through them. Unfortunately, the board doesn't have the power to discuss those items here. They're here to discuss their parking. Even when they take their vote it's regarding the parking situation that variance, not...

John Wilcox explained his neighbor had to call down there. He believes she talked to Steve and so that's why he came down here to talk to him also.

Chairman Nestorowicz said that's the direction he would point him in is to talk to Steve and his department over there. They can get any enforcement out. Actually, if you wanted to speak to the

owner today, the owner is behind him. Maybe after this item they can have a discussion with him and the owner can listen and hear what concerns he has and try to address that. With that, he closed the public portion of the meeting. Did he read the impact statement?

Secretary Jerzy said from Ron Wuerth in the Planning Department, "After review of the request no issues were found to impact the abutting, local, or general public. Petitioner received Planning Commission approval for a minor amendment for a generator variance installation at a medical building on August 25, 2025."

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Jerzy. He closed the public portion and turned it over to the board for questions and discussion. He would ask the petitioner, he hears there are some concerns from one of the neighbors, not relating to the parking, but maybe its something he can address and discuss with him and try to resolve those issues.

Lorenzo Cavaliere has no issues with discussing anything anyone. He's not aware of what he's talking about.

Chairman Nestorowicz said that's why if they could have that discussion offline.

Lorenzo Cavaliere said yes, he has no problem with that.

Secretary Jerzy has a question for the petitioner. If this isn't granted and he has to rip out parking, hypothetically. Does he still have enough parking for his facility with doing so? Based off the size of the building and stuff?

Lorenzo Cavaliere said that would be a big issue for them, yes.

Secretary Jerzy doesn't understand why the city didn't catch this first when they went through this process. It seems like somebody dropped the ball somewhere. In his opinion from being on this board in the past, that's something that shouldn't be punished by them because of somebody else's malfeasance of information or just not doing their job. Or not giving him proper information. He's willing to bet he'll adjust his site plan based off of that knowledge he didn't have. He can kind of get behind this just because of that aspect he just explained. He'll yield the floor.

Board Member Watts didn't actually drive over there and look at it. He Google mapped it. He doesn't see the deal with the parking. He doesn't see how this got missed. He doesn't see where it's a problem either. He has no problem with that. Kind of knowing their developments, he would assume they can trust him and Steve and these fine people will get together and try to resolve some of those issues. Would that be correct?

Lorenzo Cavaliere can assure that any issues with any neighbors they will address.

Board Member Watts figured that. Perfect. He has no problem with this. Thank you.

Board Member Lindsey is in favor of this. He thinks it's tastefully done. The property is well maintained, at least from the image that he can see. He thinks it would be unreasonable for the board to deny and ask this gentleman to tear up his property. If they don't have any other comments, he will make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to retain parking to within 20’ of front property line.

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

Secretary Jerzy supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Jerzy to approve the request for the reasons stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

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

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

12. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Alina Koshelovska -USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Assad Sobh
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 32480 Mound Ste 3
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-04-103-007
ZONE: PB

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to -USE-

Perform the C-2 use of permanent makeup in a PB zoning district.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 12.01 – Use Regulations: Tattooing is not a permitted use in a PB zoning district. Refer to Section 14.01(e).

Section 14.01 – Uses Permitted: In all C-2 Districts no building or land, except as otherwise provided in this ordinance, shall be erected or used except for one (1) or more of the following specified uses: (e) ... tattoo parlors.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked them to start with name and address of anybody that is speaking tonight. Then take the board through their proposal.

Assad Sobh, 32480 Mound, appeared before the board stating he’s the owner. Alina is potential tenant that signed a lease. They’re hoping to get her a business license. When they went to apply, they said the building was zoned as office C-1 and the type of use she’s applying for would require a C-2. There is some kind of miscommunication between them and the Building Department where

they classify as a tattoo. She does absolutely no tattooing. Permanent makeup is becoming very popular in the last five (5) years for various reasons. People don't want to do makeup every day. That type of use is anywhere from two (2) months to four (4) months. They would have to come back for a treatment to redo it if they chose it or they can just let it fade out. She also does fresh makeup for weddings, photography, any type of occasion. It's a one person use. The building is located right on Mound, just south of Fourteen. It's an odd building where there is no frontage on Mound. It sits to the back.

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

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion. They do have an impact statement that needs to be read in for those.

Secretary Jerzy read per Ron Wuerth of the Planning Department, "After review of the request no issues were found to impact that abutting, local, or general public. The petitioner indicated to the Planning staff that the three (3) parallel parking spaces that exist along the south side of the property shall be removed to allow for a wider maneuvering lane that will accommodate two-way traffic."

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Jerzy. With that, he closed the public portion and turned it over to the board for questions and discussions.

Board Member Cliff said in response to the comment from the petitioner during his statement, he looked up four (4) different resources and they term permanent makeup, also known as cosmetic tattooing or micro pigmentation, is a cosmetic procedure that uses tattooing techniques to apply permanent color to the skin. It can last one (1) to five (5) years. That's why the definition is the way it is. He just wanted to clarify that for the petitioner.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him.

Board Member Lindsey has a question to the petitioner. Hearing that definition is very helpful, but he would like to ask the petitioner as well. How is the tenant, how do they actually apply the permanent makeup. He's not familiar with that.

Chairman Nestorowicz said if the tenant can give name and address for the record.

The tenants husband stated his name and address of building. He's speaking for his wife because she doesn't speak English. They're Ukrainians. She's been doing this for six (6) years. He doesn't know why it's listed for one (1) to five (5) years, it's not lasting. It's three (3) or four (4) months. Then they need to come in and reapply. If the client comes in and reapplies all the time, it might (inaudible). It's mostly for the older people because younger ones...

Board Member Lindsey said his question isn't around the timeline, it's the actual applications. Are they using the needle to apply the makeup?

The tenants husband explained on the top layer, then it's face paints away. It's not like they do anything close like tattooing. It doesn't stay. He wishes she would be able to talk.

Board Member Lindsey said that answers his question.

The tenants husband explained she does lips, eyebrows. Doing a tattoo on those parts of the body, it would be really painful. Top layer and then it eventually fades away. They need to come in and apply all the time.

Board Member Lindsey thanked him for that. That answers his question. It sounds like tattooing to him. The other thing he wants to consider, and lets just for the sake of it say it isn't tattoos they're familiar with. If they grant this variance, the next tenant can come in and be granted that allows tattooing. So, he thinks at least from where he's standing, it sounds like tattooing to him. Even if it wasn't, if they grant this variance, the next tenant that comes in can tattoo there. He would not be in favor of that. This will be a no vote for him.

Secretary Jerzy said to echo his same sentiment, Mr. Lindsey. They're creating a C-2 zone. So, it could be a tattoo parlor, it could be a number of different things going forward. He wouldn't be so possibly against this, but it's backed up to a residential. With the C-2 running with the land, and he noticed in the backup material, the reasoning for being in front of the board one of them is that building was for health use from a previous owner. It wasn't disclosed so it sounds like she was sold a property that she could use without knowing. They're not in the business of bailing out people in bad investments and granting variances because they didn't do their homework on the property and things of that nature. Just to him, he does feel the hardship. He's all for entrepreneurship, new business owners and things of that nature, but just to put a C-2 zoning restriction on that building going forward is where he has a sticking point and problem with. He yields the floor.

Board Member Cliff has to echo the same sentiment. Just by sheer definition of the process it falls under the category the Building Department has to use in order to ensure certain things. He is absolutely not in favor of changing a use variance on a piece of property with this kind of proximity to homes and neighborhood for the use as outlined. It's nothing against these folks directly. Understand, they're responsible to look into the future as well. As his colleagues stated, when they decide to leave or go to a different area or business, this rating stays with that property. The next thing you know they have a full blown piercing, tattoo parlor in the midst of a neighborhood. It's just not a good fit.

Assad Sobh is not asking for them to make it permanent. If they vacate...

Chairman Nestorowicz explained it stays with the property. It's not something that...

Board Member Cliff said they don't have the ability to read in to that particular motion that it would disappear if they decide to vacate. This is a use change. This is a use variance. This is a very... A use variance is one of the most important variances that a board can consider. They have to consider it carefully. He understands their train of thought and if they could they probably would but they can't. They can't grant that kind of... They don't have the latitude to grant that type of decree to say that once their tenant leaves or moves or quits doing that type of business there, that that goes away. It stays with the property in perpetuity. He yields the floor.

Steve Watripont explained working in the zoning department and his sentiments are very similar to theirs. As writing up this variance, he did not write it up, but Brian did and consulted him. He believes, he will ask the attorney, the way it was written up was to allow this in Suite 3 only and it was limited to permanent makeup. It would not allow for a tattoo parlor because its very specific in that use in that suite on that property. It's not rezoning the whole property, that would have to go to Planning and all that. It's allowing a specific use on that property. He's going to defer to the attorney on that, but again, he does not disagree with what was said there. That's why it was written up very specific though. Just so the board knows that.

Jennifer Pierce is reviewing the request real quick.

Board Member Green stated when he looks at these use variances...

Chairman Nestorowicz said to give Ms. Pierce a moment to look at this. Mr. Green go ahead.

Board Member Green repeated when he looks at these use variances the first thing he looks at is can it be used as zoned right now. It can be. That's one of the criteria that he used when looking at these variances. If it helps anybody, but...

Board Member Cliff said just to add onto that. He does see the address with the Suite 3, 48092. Directly below it is the entire parcel number for the property. 13-04-103-007. He yields the floor.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked Ms. Pierce if she has any input.

Jennifer Pierce agrees with what Steve said. Case law supports if the use changes a variance can be revoked. It could be a permanent makeup application only in that suite.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked not be for that property for the entire parcel. It would just be suite 3?

Jennifer Pierce said correct.

Steve Watripont wants to make a suggestion. If it goes forward that way. The maker of the motion includes it only to limit to that suite because the variance does go on the parcel as a whole, but it wasn't written specifically as that suite. Again, he didn't write it, but he knows they talked about that and that was the intent of it.

Board Member Watts did look it up and read what Mr. Cliff put out there. It is a form of tattooing. He thinks that they're going... He thinks they need to be very careful. It goes with the property and to be sure. What's the chances of it getting revoked? They know what happens there. They need to be careful. He knows that these fine people are just going to lease the spot, so it's not a problem, in his eyes, they could lease another spot. They're not going to be a permanent tenant to him. Although he hopes they would be.

Assad Sobh is hoping they will be. The place has been vacant for years.

Board Member Watts thinks they just need to be very careful. He's probably going to be a no vote because it is a form of tattooing.

The husband of the tenant doesn't believe they're going to be able to move in. They're already financially invested in this right now at the moment. It's such a simple. It's 800 square feet unit. That's all what those units are.

Board Member Watts gets it, but when dealing with problems in the city.

Assad Sobh said there is a tattoo parlor two doors north of that.

Board Member Watts said it's zoned properly. When dealing with zoning issues, they have to be very careful with this.

Assad Sobh respects that. They're classified it as a tattoo, there is no ink in there whatsoever. It's a makeup and its limited to eyebrows, the lips and fresh makeup. There is no ink in there whatsoever. That's one of the things he had a hard time understanding that classification of it. There is no ink whatsoever. It's a one person kind of operation. He's fine with limiting it to just this tenant. If that tenant vacates, that variance dies out.

Board Member Watts asked if they have already moved in and started the business.

Assad Sobh replied no, no. They signed a lease, they went to apply. They do two (2) different types of procedure. Fresh makeup and the permanent makeup. The city authorized them to do fresh makeup, but to do the permanent makeup they would need to come in front of the board.

Board Member Watts said he's telling him they're open for business.

Assad Sobh replied to do fresh makeup. They haven't really done anything because they don't want to advertise and they don't want to get a sign. They didn't want to invest the money into. They do two (2) different types, fresh makeup and the permanent makeup. In order for them to get a sign on all that, they want to do it all at once. If this is denied, they move elsewhere. If it's approved, they move forward with it. He thinks it would compliment the area. It really would. It's a unique building. It's very hard to lease it and it's been vacant for years. He bought that building and really cleaned it up. All four of the suites. There was a fire there and it was abandoned by Mr. Earl for a while. It all got cleaned up, all permits were pulled. Very unique. They have a travel agency in the front unit, trying to get them in, they have a property management company possibly taking a suite. They need to literally understand the permanent makeup and not clarify it. It's a female type of procedure. You won't see any men in there.

Board Member Watts understands. He's one vote. Thank you.

Board Member Cliff said in the course of these applications, is the skin broken? Is the skin pierced? He said first layer of skin.

The tenant's husband replied no blood, just the top layer of the skin.

Board Member Cliff said the top layer of the skin is pierced. He asked if there is a license to do this type of work. According to what he's reading in the State of Michigan LARA requires a license.

The tenant's husband said just to apply. She doesn't require any licensing or teaching to get, it's just to apply. No school, just apply to pay the fee and that's it.

Board Member Clift said his train of point here is that he can stand there and deny that they're not tattooing all day long, but the state regulations state that they are. They have to follow that same regulations in order to perform this business.

The tenant's husband said that is just how the State of Michigan, half of the United States doesn't treat this as a tattoo.

Board Member Clift isn't worried about the other half of the United States, he's talking about...

The tenant's husband understands but it's just the point of them. It's Michigan.

Board Member Clift understands them all the way around. However, in four (4) years he doesn't want to see a full blown tattoo parlor in Suite 3 in that building. If they vote yes on this, that has the potential to absolutely happen.

Assad Sobh could block that and he wouldn't agree to it.

Board Member Clift yields the floor.

Assad Sobh explained the culture and religion he comes from, he's against tattooing.

Board Member Lindsey doesn't know if the board has any other comments. He would like to open it to them if they do, but if not he's prepared to make a motion.

Secretary Jerzy said before he reads in his motion, he did miss a correspondence that he needs to read into the record. This is his apologies for not reading this to the board during audience, but it's from John Gulich who resides at 32455 Halmich.

"I'm a homeowner whose property is right next to this location. I'm opposed to a tattoo parlor or permanent makeup business being granted on the property for the following reasons: biohazard waste, medical waste such as needles, blood, blood soaked bandages, linens, ink, existing rapid tenant littering, neglect at 32480 Mound has already resulted in a fire that damaged the building, units, roof and parking lot summer of 2025. Poor upkeep of property results in litter garbage constantly being thrown by tenants of said property and the wind into neighboring yards and residential property beside and behind location. There's already an existing tattoo business located on 32750 Mound Road a block away from the proposed location. No need for two tattoo businesses in such close proximity. This area is zoned for professional office space by the City of Warren and is surrounded by private residences and apartment living on all sides. I've spoken to my neighbors who own property and live in the vicinity of this location and they agree that an additional tattoo permanent makeup business is not welcome in our neighborhood. Especially since the owner, landlord, Alina does not enforce cleanup and upkeep of 32480 Mound Road allowing the property to be littered with trash which blows into the neighboring living areas and also resulted in a

dangerous fire that not only changed her building but trees on neighboring properties. The proposed location is surrounded by residential living, private homes and apartments. Thank you for taking the time to consider my feelings of the residences.”

Assad Sobh said that’s really insulting to him because he runs a very tight business in the City of Warren. Mr. Steve will vogue to that. That property had no tenants in there. What kind of litter? There are apartments on both sides, south of that and north of that. That literally sit in the parking lot and drink beer, broken bottles everywhere. They have a dumpster, a crew of...

Secretary Jerzy wanted to stop him. He didn’t aske a question. He’s just reading a citizens statement. This isn’t him personally attacking him, this is just a citizen in the neighborhood 300 feet from the business.

Assad Sobh understands.

Secretary Jerzy said he’s been by the business. He concurs. It seems it’s pretty impeccable. The times he’s driven by it. He’s just saying...

Assad Sobh appreciates that.

Secretary Jerzy said he had to read that into the record.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked Mr. Lindsey if he had a motion he wanted to make.

Board Member Lindsey thinks the board has pretty much expressed their thoughts on this. He would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to deny permission to perform the C-2 use of permanent makeup in a PB zoning district.

Reasons being: Property can be used as zoned; Seems to be self-imposed; Property is not unique; Detriment to the area.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion to deny by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Assessor for the reasons stated. It would be a yes vote to deny.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Board Member Lindsey	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes to deny the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Unfortunately, yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

Board Member Watts	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Reluctantly, yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

13. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Mirsad Zecevic**
REPRESENTATIVE: Hisham Turk
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 27643 Schoenherr
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-14-430-032
ZONE: PB

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Construct two minarets (religious symbolic towers) in the front setback that are 4' x 4' at the base, 30' in height and to within 26' of the front property line along Schoenherr.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

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 within permission of the Planning Commission pursuant to the standards set forth in Section 22.14(b)(1) and upon compliance with the following minimum requirements: (8) Every building shall have a front yard of not less than thirty (30) feet. If a circular drive is proposed in the front yard, a distance equal to the width of the drive shall be added to the front yard setback.

Section 12.06 – Front Yards: In PB Districts, every building, for use other than residential, shall have a front yard not less than twenty-five (25) feet.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is here for this item.

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz said this petitioner is not present.

Board Member Lindsey said he would like to move forward. It's after eight (8) o'clock.

Chairman Nestorowicz said that's fine. Are there any audience members who would like to speak on this item? If so, please approach the podium. State your name and address for the record.

Rex Ochadleus, 13632 Joyce, appeared before the board stating he's within the 300 feet of this mosque. His issue is it doesn't fit the character of the neighborhood. That place is surrounded by residents. It's a single story dwelling and they want to put a two story in the middle of their... they all see it from their backyards. It just doesn't fit the character. The traffic at this place is horrendous. It's obvious they can't accommodate the amount of people that they have there. Their parking on their side streets. Every Friday they're coming into six (6) houses deep from Schoenherr coming into the east and that's up and down. He has a sister that's three (3) blocks over and she experiences the same thing. She did not show up because she's not within the 300 feet. They're concerned about the noise of calling to prayer. The traffic is not only the car traffic. They have

people flooding the streets, standing in the medium waiting for traffic to go back and forth is the reason he opposes it. He doesn't oppose it because it's Islam thing. He would oppose a Catholic something thirty (30) feet tall in a residential neighborhood. Thank you.

Robert Libstaff, 13458 De Mott, appeared before the board stating he lives behind in the cul-de-sac. He does concur with a lot of what he said. He thinks it would be an eye sore for the neighborhood. Yes, there is a lot of congestion around there. He's pretty sure there has to be some kind of ordinance with the capacity of people there, with the parking lot size that they do not have, and kind of just impeding on the neighborhood. It's just a quite neighborhood that he moved into in '06 and would kind of like to maintain it in that manner without having any of that. He would like to have it not happen. That's all he has to say.

Board Member Watts asked him to repeat his address.

Robert Libstaff repeated his address.

Secretary Jerzy informed him that the board got his correspondence, too, through email.

Robert Libstaff didn't know how this worked. This is his first time.

Secretary Jerzy thanked him and said he just wanted to let him know.

Terry Smith, 13671 Joyce, appeared before the board stating he's not within the 300 feet. He's five (5) houses off of Schoenherr. It's going to be an eyesore for the neighborhood. The traffic up and down the streets is ridiculous. They park where they want to park, whether they're on the edge of somebody's driveway, they don't care. They just park. Like they were saying, when they come across Schoenherr there will be fifteen (15) or twenty (20) of them standing in the turn lane waiting to get the rest of the way across. It's just a dangerous thing and it would not be a good thing for their neighborhood.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those comments and asked for any other audience members wishing to speak on this item.

Terry Smith asked if he could say one more thing. Also, when they do park they not only park in the pulled in spots. After those people are parked then they go through and fill up the complete center of the parking. If there was every a fire or somebody gets hurt, a fire truck cannot even get onto the property. They would have to park on Schoenherr to try to help anybody. Besides filling up all the side streets. He doesn't know if anybody has ever been there on prayer days to count the amount of people coming in, but he's pretty sure they're over the limit of what that building would allow through the Fire Department.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for those additional comments. There were a couple letters they wanted to include.

Secretary Jerzy explained he has a few. There are three (3) here and then the impact statement from Ron Wuerth, the Planning Department.

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

general public. The petitioner received site plan approval for the addition of minarets to an existing mosque on September 8, 2025.”

Secretary Jerzy continued reading an email from Ruth Sihler from 13446 De Mott:

“I want to begin by saying that I fully respect freedom of religion and the right of every community to practice their faith. My concern is not about the religious nature of the project, but about the impact of constructing towers of this size in a small, quiet residential neighborhood.

This building was originally designed and used as a dentist’s office, which generated minimal traffic and fit the scale of the surrounding homes. Since the change in use, traffic has already become a significant issue during their services. At times it is extremely difficult to drive down the street because of the number of cars parked along the surrounding streets. Adding towers and expanding activity at this location would only intensify these problems.

This is a residential area, and the proposed structures are not consistent with the scale or character of the neighborhood. Towers of this height and visibility would alter the landscape and increase noise and congestion in an area that was never intended to support this level of activity.

For these reasons, I am requesting that the project be rejected. Thank you for taking my concerns seriously.”

Next letter is from Cheryle Shaffer who resides at 13705 Villa Pointe:

“I am 100% opposed to this concept. It will make this neighborhood look gaudy. They don’t need to show by these ugly things that it’s a mosque. They have tons & tons of people who show up there. I believe they cram more people in there that is allowed. If anyone wants to verify this someone needs to go on Fridays at about 1:00 in the afternoon. I live in condos directly across the street & there’s so many people trying to get on the side streets next to them & surrounding parking lots it causes traffic issues. Was the request for a minaret to be put on top of the building approved? This is a very small building & not much property. If the minaret was approved for the top of the building so be it. That’s not put up yet. Leave it at that. Big No here”

The next one is from Tonya Pearrie who resides at 13732 Villa Pointe:

“I am writing to vote against Constructing the Minarets this would not for good for our neighborhood. My neighbor is also voting against this her name is Elizabeth Davis 13610 Villa Pointe Dr. Warren MI 48088. My neighbor Elizbeth is handicapped and was going to ride with me but due to the weather we won’t be able to attend. Also they’re still trying to park in our Cond’s which is private property.”

That’s all he has Mr. Chair.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Jerzy. With that, he closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for questions and discussion. He just wanted to offer point of clarification. He did want the audience members to understand that the variance they're here for is constructing the two (2) minarets on the front of the building. It's not in relation of the use to what they're doing at the building. He just wanted that to be clear as they discuss this item.

Board Member Watts said it does. It does have everything to do with what's going on over there. He's been there twice and if he could ask Patrick to put some pictures up on the screen for the board,, he'll show them what's going on over there. This is an office building, this is not for this many people. It's supposed to be a doctor's office. Now, if they look at... Patrick move one more. Now look at this. They're parked all the way to Schoenherr. If a fire truck came or an ambulance came with this situation, there was a truck in front of him and then him, there was no place for them to go and the ambulance or fire truck couldn't have gotten in there. Obviously, this is a police situation, but this is the second time he sat over there and watched this. He's been by there numerous times at call to prayer time. Next one please. Look at the street. You couldn't get a ladder truck from the fire department if there is a house fire down that street. It is that tight. Next one please. That's very bad. He believes at the last meeting.. Thank you, Patrick. He believes at the last meeting it was stated they were allowed capacity was 270. Himself and Andre Dujac from the Planning Commission went over there on call to prayer day. It was tough to count, but they counted about 350 people and actually lost count. They talked to the residents directly across the street in the condos and they were extremely happy they were there because their complaints have fallen on deaf ears. Across the street they're overrunning the condo complex. They want to cross the street to the condo complex that's between the two buildings that they own and those people were just beside themselves. This time when he went over there last Friday the people are having to pull their cars out of the garages in the condo complex and parking in their driveway so that these people don't park in their driveways in the condo complex. He didn't show the picture, but the one building where the mosque is at, the parking lot is full like the gentleman said. There are cars parked down the road. They're over their parking limit for the property. It's the same way for the second building that they own down the street. They're parking on both side streets. They're walking across peoples lawns. When you read their thing, they're talking about how they want to show it as a mosque so they can attract more people. They can't handle what they got. They're already violating city ordinances, violating fire code and the site plan. How can they approve this? It's ridiculous. There is no excuse for this. Then they changed the thing by a couple of feet and do that, then they don't show up tonight and then he reads this impact statement from the Planning Commission. He's going to be honest with them, they're a full time paid Planning Commission, they haven't been out there and seen this mess. All the complaints are here. How hard is this to deal with? This should have never of been sent to them in the first time, should have never of been sent to the second time. This is a detriment to the area. They've had four (4) variances approved and they've had one (1) denial. He's starting to notice a trend on some of this stuff. It's one (1) variance at a time until they over run the area. Enough is enough. He doesn't care what anybody's religion is. Catholic church, Church of Christ, he doesn't care. But they have ordinances and they have to live by those. This is overtaking. They have these people that come out tonight. They made it here with no problem. Where are they at? So, his vote will be a no vote or he'll make a motion to deny.

Board Member Lindsey has kind of been through this one before. He understands they made a

couple small changes. He does want to remind the board that their instruction in order to approve a variance, it says no variation from the provisions or requirements of this article shall be authorized by the board unless the board finds that the applicant has demonstrated all of the following to establish there's a practical difficulty in complying with the article requirement. The articles the board is given to establish if there's a practical difficulty, is number one, the property has to have an unreasonable impact or burden. Meaning that the strict compliance with the area would prevent an unnecessarily burdensome event. When he looks at this property he doesn't see that they can't use it as zoned. They already are operating as a mosque. He doesn't see any unreasonable impact or burden here. The property can't be self-imposed. This is self-imposed. Again, they're operating the mosque already. The building was purchased in the location that it is. To add these minarets is a self-imposed thing. The property must be unique. There is nothing unique about this property. In his opinion, it's being used outside of what it's really designed to do. It can't cause a detriment to the area. The board has heard from the audience, heard from the public, he thinks they heard those comments. He's always very vocal about the gratitude he has when the public shares their opinion about what's going on. It's incredibly important to the board to know how this is actually impacting. They saw the pictures. This is a clear detriment to the area. It can't be personal or economic. They heard from the petitioner the last time they were here, the whole reason, and what they have in their packet tonight, the whole reason that they want to build these minarets is to draw more community members. He would assume that there is a financial gain from that in some way. So, it is economic. It's not necessary. These are purely architectural structures, they don't change how they're operating out of this building. So, they don't meet that requirement either. Again, he'll remind that board that the petitioner must demonstrate all of these items in order to receive a variance. He hopes that he had made an argument compelling enough to show that they haven't met a single one of those. To the board, he doesn't see any basis that they have to approve this variance. He would be a no vote. He is well prepared to make a motion on this if there is no other comments.

Board Member Green has a comment. So, note that in the backup they're asking for a canopy also this time. Just to note that. He agrees with Mr. Lindsey that the petitioner hasn't established that there's a practice difficulty complying with this specific ordinance. So, just based on that he thinks this is a no vote for him.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Green. Is there any other questions or motions.

Board Member Lindsey would like to make a motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said yes, please.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to deny permission to construct two minarets (religious symbolic towers) in the front setback that are 4' x 4' at the base, 30' in height and to within 26' of the front property line along Schoenherr.

Reasons being: No unreasonable impact or burden; Strict compliance could be met; Seems to self-imposed; The property is not unique; Detriment to the area; Personal or economic situation; Unnecessary.

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion to deny by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Perry.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Board Member Lindsey	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes to deny.
Board Member Clift	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

- 14. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: My Granite Company LLC Kelly Jones**
- REPRESENTATIVE: Tim Storey
- COMMON DESCRIPTION: 14230 Eleven Mile
- LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-24-126-039
- ZONE: M-3

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a 33.04’ front setback on an existing building located in an M-3 zoning district.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 17.02(A) – Industrial Standards: Each lot in M-3 districts shall have a front yard of not less than 150’.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if the petitioner is present for this item?

No response.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there is anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item seeing that the petitioner is not here.

No response.

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

Board Member Clift states that it’s an existing building. Talking about retaining a 33.04 feet in the front setback back where it’s supposed to be 150. It appears that building has been there for quite some time under those type of conditions. He’s just kind of inclined to say this as a relative no brainer. Someone is just trying to clean up something to put it where it needs to be. He guesses there is a new tenant moving in there or new company taking possession.

Secretary Jerzy has a quick question for Steve if Mr. Clift is done.

Board Member Clift doesn't believe that's a new construction. There might be some upgrades out front, but this doesn't look like a very hard thing to deal with. With that he'll yield the floor.

Secretary Jerzy asked Steve if this property has a COC.

Steve Watripont replied yes it does. What they were out there for, or it's in the process, and what the enforcement started was because they had outdoor storage. With it being an M-3 they were going through site plan approval. This property was subdivided many years ago and did not take into account all of that. So, Mr. Clift is right, that this has been there. It's not a new tenant. They have been there but going through the process and because of the outdoor storage is why it got brought here.

Secretary Jerzy thanked Steve. On top of it as always. Appreciates it.

Board Member Clift asked Mr. Watripont to clear it up just a little bit for him. The enforcement is open on the outdoor storage and they're working on revising or submitting a revised site plan in order to...

Steve Watripont doesn't know if they have an impact statement on this one, but he believes they've already gone through the site plan process.

Secretary Jerzy said they do.

Steve Watripont believes it was approved for the outdoor storage being an M-3. There is no restrictions like a lot of others that come before the board. It's just the setback issue is the only thing left.

Board Member Clift has zero issue with it. It's an industrial area abutting the freeway it looks like. He yields the floor.

Secretary Jerzy said following up on Steve's comment. They do have an impact statement from the Planning Department, "After review of the request no issues were found to impact the abutting, local, or general public. The petitioner received site plan approval with conditions for outdoor storage of miscellaneous construction materials on December 1, 2025."

Board Member Lindsey said if there's no other comments, he'll make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to grant the petitioner permission to retain a 33.04' front setback on an existing building located in an M-3 zoning district.

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

Secretary Jerzy supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Jerzy to approve the petitioner’s request for the reasons stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

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

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

15. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: National Construction Rentals Inc-USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Mark Royer
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 22586 Ryan
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-32-101-013
ZONE: MZ, M-1, R-1-P, R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to -USE-

- 1) Install a temporary 12’ high wire fence with windscreen, inside of the concrete wall along the east property line to provide visual relief until green space matures for a period of 1 year from the time of planting.
- 2) Exceed the allowed 445 square ft. of open storage to a property that has a 890 square ft. primary structure by 15,072 square ft. for a total of 15,517 square ft. of open storage with 14,658 square ft. of it to be stored on a non-hard surface.
- 3) Allow open storage in the east 125’ of the property which is zoned R-1-P and R-1-C on a non-hard surface. **USE**
- 4) Retain a 24’ x 315’ gravel maneuvering lane on the east side of the property.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4D.32 – Specifications for Residential Areas: All fences in residential areas shall be of an ornamental type. Fences in residential areas shall not exceed four (4) feet in height and may be constructed of either metal, iron, chain link, wire, ornamental aluminum, vinyl or solid material construction such as wood, brick or masonry, except privacy fences allowed as provided in Section 4D.33 may not exceed six (6) feet in height.

Section 17.02(S) – Industrial Standards, Open Storage Other Than Junk: ... the designated area shall always be hard surfaced... the designated area may not exceed fifty (50) percent of the gross floor area of the primary structure...

Section 7.01 – Uses Permitted: Open storage is not a permitted use in R-1-C zoning districts.

Section 8.01 – Uses Permitted: Open storage is not a permitted use in R-1-P zoning districts.

Section 4.32(K) – Off-Street Parking Requirements: ... shall be hard surfaced with concrete or plant-mixed bituminous material (base may be stabilized gravel or equivalent) ...

This item was rescheduled to February 11, 2026 during the adoption of the agenda.

15. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Steven Savich
(Rescheduled from 12/10/2025)
Same as above.
26837 Ryan
13-19-228-009
MZ, C-1, P

REPRESENTATIVE:
COMMON DESCRIPTION:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ZONE:

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain 12' x 28' (336 square ft.) painted mural wall signage on the east elevation, in addition to the permitted 40 square ft. wall sign for a total of 376 square ft. of wall signage.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.11 – Specific Sign Definitions: For purpose of this ordinance, the following signs as listed shall be defined as follows:

24. Mural. A picture painted directly on a wall and shall be considered a painted wall sign for the purpose of this ordinance.

Section 4A.35 (c) – Signs Permitted in Commercial Business and Industrial Districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2): 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.

Steve Savich apologized for being late tonight. It took him about two (2) hours to get here from Novi. It was rough.

Secretary Jerzy said at least he showed up today.

Steve Savich, 26837 Ryan Road, appeared before the board stating this is for Mr. Miguel's. This mural was put up a couple years ago. He doesn't know if the board has the pictures. It sets back. It's on the back wall of their patio, so there is a dozen tables in front of it. They did get a ticket for that sign. He's here to ask for a variance because he's in the process of putting a covering on that patio. That will further hide that wall. It does not, he doesn't believe it effects, it's not a standard situation. It sits back. From the dining room to the restaurant, if they've been in the restaurant, that wall is all you see even inside the restaurant because it sits back so far. It provides ambiance for the guests on the patio but also in the restaurant. It's not distracting, you can barely see it from the street. He doesn't know if the board has any other questions, but he thinks the pictures speak for themselves.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked him for that explanation. This is a public hearing. He doesn't see any audience members, but he does have an impact statement to read in.

Secretary Jerzy said per Ron Wuerth of the Planning Department:

“After review of the request no issues were found to impact the abutting, local, or general public. After review of the request, no issues were found to impact the abutting, local or general public. However, unrelated to this variance request it should be noted: The petitioner received site plan approval with conditions for an outdoor dining area for the existing restaurant on June 10, 2024. As a condition of

site plan approval, the following variances were recommended by the Planning staff to be attained from

the ZBA prior to release of the site plan to the Building Division:

- a) To retain the existing maneuvering lanes and parking space lengths that do not meet the requirements of 4.32 (i). The plan indicates parking spaces at 17.5 ft., 18.1 ft., 18.6 ft., and 19.3 ft. in length. The minimum length shall be 20 ft. for internal parking spaces, and 22 ft. along a property line.
- b) To retain the 19.9 ft. wide maneuvering lane and the 19.3 ft. in length parking spaces located between the south elevation of the building and the south property line.

It appears that these variances have not yet been applied for. The petitioner should be made aware that approval of these variances is required prior to the Planning staff approving their revised site plan and forwarding it to the Building Division.”

Secretary Jerzy wanted him to be aware of that. Maybe he can talk to Steve a little bit more about what was just read. But he should have a copy of this impact as well.

Steve Savich stated he will talk to him about that. He does want to state that he is a tenant of that property for ten (10) years. The building owner unfortunately passed away a couple months ago. He is in the process of purchasing the building. He will fix what’s needed. Again, he inherited what’s there.

Secretary Jerzy said understood.

Steve Savich said these types of things, he’s not sure what he’s speaking too. If it comes under his power he would take care of it all.

Secretary Jerzy fully believes him, sir.

Chairman Nestorowicz closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for question and discussion. He just wanted to reiterate, he remembers when that building was built the Starlight. There were no changes to the physical building when it became Mr. Miguel’s in that aspect. Those parking spaces he would assume must’ve been around from those days.

Steve Savich said correct. That he definitely never touched. He’s done some parking lot repairs to fix pot holes, but he does have plans for that building that the board will see once he owns it. To make significant investments on a building that’s not his, nor did he know the future of that building, his hands were tied on a lot of things.

Chairman Nestorowicz said understood. Any other questions or discussion from the board?

Secretary Jerzy thinks he’s stated in the past that he’s kind of in favor of murals in this town. It’s a nice touch when done tastefully. He thinks this is one of those situations it is done tastefully and like the gentleman said, it’s set back off the road pretty well. If you’re coming something going north, you probably won’t even see it unless you really turn your head complete ninety

(90) degrees. So, it will have some graffiti art inside the building as well. If you had a meal or two (2) in there. It all kind of blends together very nicely. It makes sense about the maneuvering lanes. Every time he goes in there to try and park and its always kind of jammed up. Not busy, but just tight trying to get out of there if you have big vehicles and stuff. This is something he can get behind. Again, he thinks it's tastefully done. Also needs the permit for the forty (40) square foot wall sign, too. He personally doesn't see a problem with this variance request. He yields the floor.

Chairman Nestorowicz wants to concur with his colleague. The mural is nicely done. It does match the feeling of how the inside kind of looks and such. He thinks it's actually a good touch to the building.

Secretary Jerzy said if nobody else has anything other comments.

Board Member Clift mentioned the applicant stated the owner recently passed away. He asked what the owners name was.

Steve Savich replied Sima Birach.

Board Member Clift said the affidavit was dated 30 October of 2025. That's just a legal question. Is that still going to fly with him being deceased at this point in time.

Steve Savich explained his son is also named Sima Birach. It was Sima Birach Senior and Sima Birach Junior. He did get power of attorney and came in with him to fill out the paperwork.

Board Member Clift said that probably should've been included in their backup, but he'll yield the floor.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked if there's no other questions is there a motion.

Motion:

Secretary Jerzy made a motion to grant permission to retain 12' x 28' (336 square ft.) painted mural wall signage on the east elevation, in addition to the permitted 40 square ft. wall sign for a total of 376 square ft. of wall signage.

Reasons being: Not a detriment to the area.

Board Member Assessor supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Jerzy, support by Mr. Assessor to approve the request for the reasons stated in the motion.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7 – 1).

Secretary Jerzy	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	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 Clift	He's a fan of murals, too, but he's not a fan of murals being included in the sign ordinance and this is 296 square feet in excess of the 40 square feet allowed by ordinance. He is compelled to vote no.
Board Member Perry	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

Chairman Nestorowicz stated this brings them to the items that were rescheduled to end of the meeting and he sees no petitioner's present.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 16. PUBLIC HEARING: | APPLICANT: Image 360 – Robert Dempster |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Robert Dempster |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 26225 Sherwood |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-21-151-038 |
| ZONE: | C-3 |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Install a 40" x 144" (40 square ft.) wall sign on the north elevation in addition to a previously approved 40 square ft. wall sign on the east elevation for a total of 80 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.

Secretary Jerzy said if nobody else wants to add anything or say anything, he would make a motion to deny, but he'll yield the floor.

Board Member Clift is just curious. When was this initial forty (40) square foot sign approved? Forgive him, his eyes are tired and he's a little over extended. He doesn't believe he's seen it in the backup.

Chairman Nestorowicz said the first forty (40) square foot sign they wouldn't need their approval.

Board Member Watts said 11/26/2025 it was applied for.

Board Member Clift said to step up there for a hot second to clear something up for him. He appreciates him.

Steve Watripont said he'll try.

Board Member Clift asked if that's a new tenant in there.

Steve Watripont is not sure on this one.

Board Member Clift said then its pointless to ask if there was a permit for the initial forty (40) square foot sign or when it went up.

Steve Watripont would not know that either at this time.

Board Member Clift thanked him and yields the floor.

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

Board Member Lindsey said he knows Mr. Jerzy is prepared to make a motion. He doesn't see a problem with it. He would be in favor of this, but that's just where he stands.

Board Member Watts would agree. This building is on Sherwood. It's a large building and for the size of the signs, it's not going to make a dent in the area really. If they had an updated sign ordinance it would probably fit right in without a problem. He's disappointed that they didn't show up, but who knows what the problem was tonight.

Secretary Jerzy said he withdraws his motion at the time.

Chairman Nestorowicz thanked Mr. Jerzy and concurred with his colleagues where, you know, they have an existing wall sign of forty (40) square feet, which is within their limits. They want to add another forty (40) square foot. For the size of that building, industrial building on Sherwood, eighty (80) square foot of wall signage. There are so many others that are so much larger out there. That's his opinion.

Board Member Watts said if there is nothing else he'll make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Watts made a motion to grant permission to install a 40" x 144" (40 square ft.) wall sign on the north elevation in addition to a previously approved 40 square ft. wall sign on the east elevation for a total of 80 square ft. of wall signage.

Reasons being: Well within making it look good; Fits into the area.

Board Member Perry supported the motion.

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

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (6 – 2).

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

Board Member Clift
Secretary Jerzy

No, it's double what's allowed by ordinance.
No, detriment to the area and he'd like to implore that anybody that petitioners out there for zoning to attend meetings because that is one thing that is driving a no vote for this.

Chairman Nestorowicz

Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

17. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Mary Jane's Friends & Co.**
REPRESENTATIVE: Krys Wdowiak
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 13647 Ten Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-24-352-044
ZONE: MZ, M-1, R-1-P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

- 1) Retain a 12' x 4' (48 square ft.) wall sign.
- 2) Retain verbiage on wall sign that advertises a marihuana business.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.14 – Prohibited Signs: The following types of signs are prohibited in all districts, unless it is a public art work commissioned by the City of Warren as part of its Placemaking with Art Initiative: (p) A sign, visible from a public right-of-way, advertising Caregiver operations or marihuana business, except retail establishments and provisioning center facilities.

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 Nestorowicz did not see anyone and closed any public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for discussion.

Board Member Clift said they're asking for eight (8) square feet over what the ordinance is.. He doesn't see what the problem is dropping that sign size to fit the ordinance, so they don't even have to come and see the board about that. He's not a fan of signs going against the ordinance dealing with advertising marihuana businesses. He yields the floor.

Secretary Jerzy has a quick question for Steve.

Steve Watripont said that's why he stayed there.

Secretary Jerzy asked if that is just a grow operation.

Steve Watripont explained they are a subcontract company. They go and actually do like a Kelly service. They actually have weed cutters. People that go cut marihuana and stuff like that for processing.

Secretary Jerzy asked if they're selling or growing any product out of that building.

Steve Watripont said to answer another question that might not have been asked. There was no sign permit for the original sign on this one.

Secretary Jerzy thanked him very much.

Board Member Lindsey would like to make a comment that he agrees with Mr. Clift here. There is no reason for the shape of this building that they couldn't just have a sign within the ordinance. He would probably vote no.

Chairman Nestorowicz concurs with Mr. Lindsey because it's a shame that the standard printing has a sign that was too large but didn't have a variance to permit that. With the size of that building, there is no reason why a forty (40) square foot sign cannot suffice.

Board Member Clift said just to echo on that. There's no foot traffic. The only people going to be looking for this place are people that were interviewing or working there. Again, he thinks it's just unnecessary to put anything larger than what's allowed by ordinance. Again, a marihuana business is a marihuana business. He doesn't care if they're growing it or what they're doing or being Kelly services to farm out workers for it. Those people are going to know where it's at and they're going to know what it's about and what it's for. He doesn't think this is necessary at all. He yields the floor.

Board Member Lindsey said if there's no other comments he'll make a motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said to go ahead Mr. Lindsey.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to deny permission to:

- 1) Retain a 12' x 4' (48 square ft.) wall sign.
- 2) Retain verbiage on wall sign that advertises a marihuana business.

Reasons being: Economic; Size and shape of the lot; The building can be used as it is; Not necessary.

Board Member Clift supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Clift to deny the petitioner's request for the reasons stated. It will be a yes vote to deny.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Board Member Lindsey	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Assessor	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz

Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

18. PUBLIC HEARING: **APPLICANT: Global Sign and Awning**
REPRESENTATIVE: Ayad Sitto
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 13625 Twelve Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-12-353-020
ZONE: MZ, C-1, P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to

Retain a ground sign with an overall height of 17.4', a 9.39' under clearance; overall sign area of 96" x 96" (64 square ft.) which includes a 3' x 8' (24 square ft.) electronic message center setback 6' from the sidewalk in place of previous variance for ground signage dated 8/22/2012.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.17 – Setbacks: The following setback regulations shall apply to signs located in all zoning districts: (b) All freestanding or ground signs shall be set back from the right-of-way line a minimum distance equal to the height of the sign.

Section 4A.19 – Clearance: All freestanding, projecting, and marquee signs shall have a clearance of ten (10) feet beneath the sign structure, excluding monument signs.

Section 4A.27 – Electronic Message Center: In addition to other applicable zoning requirements, a responsible party shall comply with all of the following electronic message center requirements: (b) Except a property where a business has a valid State of Michigan Motor Fuels Retail Outlet License, the digital display area of an electronic message center does not exceed 25% of the total permitted free standing sign area.

Chairman Nestorowicz doesn't see anyone in the audience so he closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the board for question and discussion.

Board Member Watts said to Mr. Watriont. They had some discussion earlier. This sign has been there for some time, correct?

Steve Watriont said they went back and it was that size most recently looking at Google pictures. Before he was involved as zoning inspector a sign variance was granted at 16.2 for the LED message center. He does not recall when it had changed. It must have changed and not been noticed by any inspectors.

Board Member Watts is disappointed they didn't show up. It's not a place he goes into, but they have been there for a long time and they do a pretty good job on the property. His theory would be... He turned in a complaint recently, so every body knows, they put giant spotlights on top of the sign. Pointed in their parking lot and can see them already down to Bunert and they were blinding. He's sure that this is why this got their attention and they immediately took down the spot lights.

Steve Watriont can guarantee that's how it happened.

Board Member Watts is not afraid to admit it. He turns in a lot of stuff, but he almost feels like he would recommend postponing just to give this place an opportunity to come in and state their

case. That's the only thing he's got. He doesn't have any problem which way they go.

Secretary Jerzy said obviously LED he has a big problem with. It's been noted earlier in this meeting and documented in other meetings. This guy, if he has the same operation in Roseville. He thinks there is a Finesse liquor store in Roseville. He knows it doesn't apply to Roseville, but anytime they drive by that its like it's daylight out all day everyday. He thinks if he didn't address those lights, it would just expand. It still might expand. He doesn't believe... Is that the same owner for the last few years. He thinks it may have changed ownership, potentially. He might not have that information.

Steve Watrion said he does not have that information. He would have that back in the office.

Secretary Jerzy said if it's the same owner, same business, because that's a Finesse too over there. This is Finesse one or original Finesse but it's the same title, same kind of brand. It looks like a store that's open twenty-four (24) hours a day, there's light pollution galore. They can see it from a half mile down the road. Just with the LED light component, he doesn't need to hear anything else regarding this or wanting to hear his case regarding anything with this. Today, tomorrow, next month, he'll be a denial vote. He'll yield the floor.

Chairman Nestorowicz wanted to add one point. The existing sign before and the LED was twenty-five (25) percent, which is within the ordinance and he didn't need any approval for it. The new sign goes up to thirty-seven point five percent, which is over what's allowed, and why heeds this variance. Personally, it's like, he doesn't agree with the larger LED portion. If he kept that to twenty-five (25) percent, he wouldn't need to come to the board. He would actually not be in favor of granting this, personally.

Secretary Jerzy said personally he doesn't know the guy, but he just thinks it's going to be another LED that's out of compliance. That size being a beaming light on Twelve Mile is just his opinion.

Board Member Lindsey agrees. He's not in favor of this. The LED is overkill, it's not needed. He's advertising his business as it is. He doesn't see a need for an LED. It is a detriment. As far as the petitioner being here. He completely understands they had inclement weather. He would be more in favor if this was a resident of the city who can't make it. They're talking about peoples businesses, so if it's not important enough to be here. He has all the information he needs to make a decision. So, the petitioner in his opinion doesn't need to be here. He doesn't really think they would be able to sway his opinion on this anyway. So, he's a no vote on this. It's just too much, not necessary, detriment to the area, and certainly self-imposed. If there are no other comments he'll make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Lindsey made a motion to deny permission to retain a ground sign with an overall height of 17.4', a 9.39' under clearance; overall sign area of 96" x 96" (64 square ft.) which includes a 3' x 8' (24 square ft.) electronic message center setback 6' from the sidewalk in place of previous variance for ground signage dated 8/22/2012.

Reasons being: Detriment; Self-imposed; Property is not unique; Economic; Not necessary.

Board Member Clift supported the motion.

Chairman Nestorowicz said they have a motion by Mr. Lindsey, support by Mr. Clift to deny the petitioner's request for the reasons stated in the motion. So, it's a yes vote to deny.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion. The motion carried (8 – 0).

Board Member Lindsey	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Clift	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Green	Yes to deny.
Board Member Assessor	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Perry	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Watts	Yes for the reasons stated in the motion.
Secretary Jerzy	Yes for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Nestorowicz	Yes to deny for the reasons stated in the motion.

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

19. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Nestorowicz wanted to remind everybody about the joint meeting that's coming up next week between Planning and Zoning.

Board Member Lindsey asked if they have an agenda for that yet.

Secretary Jerzy said he does. He hasn't reviewed it yet. He will review it tomorrow and get it approved so it will be shared with the board.

Board Member Clift asked if the members of the board have any input on what's on that particular agenda.

Secretary Jerzy said it's just between the secretaries and Planning. That's it. They can either approve it or deny it once it comes through.

Jennifer Pierce said if anyone has any specific issues that they would like to discuss, email her and she will do her best to get the agenda updated.

Board Member Lindsey asked if the meeting is at 7 or 7:30.

Board Member Greens said 6.

Secretary Jerzy asked if they said 6 or 7.

Chairman Nestorowicz said the special meeting.

(Inaudible)

Secretary Jerzy said 6 o'clock on the 22nd. On the 28th it's 7:30.

Board Member Watts said to expand on asking about the agenda. It seems to be top secret because everybody that he talks to, he's gotten five different reasons of what the meeting is for. So, why is he going to submit something if it's not going to be handled or talked about. This is the problem he has. He thinks they all need to know what the meeting is about so they know what to submit. If he's going to submit something, and that's not what the meeting is about, then he's wasting his time. Here's what he's hearing. Ordinance updates and he hears it's about zoning overlay for some new project coming into town. That's what he's hearing what it's about.

Secretary Jerzy said again, he will review it tomorrow. He didn't get a chance to review it today. He'll get it approved to Nicole so they can get it shared ASAP tomorrow with the board. It will get sent out so all board members can see what's on there. That's his fault for not doing his due diligence today when it came through. He'll take one in the chin for that.

Board Member Green thinks he's asked this before. What is the process to get an ordinance developed. To get an ordinance going. For example, he's looking at these food trucks. He'll make it quick. And there's a lot of them. Some are parked for storage, some are still serving food. They have no guidelines and now he saw two on the way here. One has Christmas lights all over it. So, he doesn't know if its something... A lot of people... Is it something they should look into.

Steve Watripont explained the process for a zoning ordinance amendment, and he'll let the attorney either agree with him or disagree with him when he's done, is that the process goes to the Planning Department. It's formerly written, reviewed by the attorney's either prior to or after, then after approval by the Planning Commission it goes to the City Council for approval. That is the formal process for an amendment to the zoning ordinance. Is he correct?

Board Member Green asked who generates that?

Jennifer Pierce said that is correct or if you're her and do an ordinance and doesn't realize there's no zoning, they can get the regulatory ordinance passed. It's very difficult to enforce that when it doesn't say where those businesses can be located in the city. She thinks with the food trucks there's going to need to be. That is what he said, right? There is going to need to be two counterparts. Where they're allowed.

Steve Watripont said there would have to be something within the zoning ordinance as well as the regulatory.

Jennifer Pierce said correct.

Board Member Green asked that process gets started...

Jennifer Pierce said someone in the city needs to express a need for them. She's sure all the different departments in the city are going to have to get together and make sure all the stakeholders agree on what the ordinance says.

Board Member Green said when he brings it up, he's not opposed to food trucks.

Jennifer Pierce said no, trust her, it's something they've been discussing for quite some time now. It's not off the radar.

Steve Watripont is not opposed to food trucks. He's opposed to not having an ordinance for them is what he's opposed to.

Chairman Nestorowicz would actually hope this joint meeting they're going to have with Planning can bring up something like this. They need an ordinance for food trucks. Where they're allowed, what are the limitations and stuff like that. You know, amongst other ordinances that would need out there.

Board Member Green said they heard the board, right.

Secretary Jerzy doesn't think this is going to be a meeting that's going to be rebuilding Rome in a day. It's going to be... he really thinks this is just going to be a process. He thinks it's going to be a multitude of these meetings. That's his hope that they can get some stuff done. Not just have a one off meeting. Say they did it and then everybody goes their merry way doing what they're doing. That's not the goal of all of this.

Board Member Green said Twelve Mile and Schoenherr since August there has been a pile of cement. It's a large portion.

Board Member Watts said he has the pictures but he hasn't sent them over.

Steve Watripont talked about that within the Building Division...

Board Member Green asked whose project is it.

Steve Watripont replied is the property owners. They were on enforcement, he'll give some back history. They have been on enforcement for that back alley, which was in dire need of repair. The problem was because of all the sewer drainage and everything, storm drain and everything else, he had problems with the piping underground. He wanted to take care of it all at one time. They gave him time to do that on enforcement. They extended him twice. He talked to Engineer, went through the process. Finally, everything set in late October it started to dig it up and fix it and ran into a couple of other issues and then the asphalt companies are done November 15th or something like that. He wasn't able to move forward with everything. He has a patch that's still bad in the back, but the goal is to get everything done in the spring.

Board Member Green said it's bad in the back. There's a two foot drop offs from the doors that go out. He twisted his ankle going to AAA walking on that, that's when he noticed it. So, he can't...

Steve Watripont asked in the front.

Board Member Green said yeah.

Steve Watripont thought the front was halfway decent.

Board Member Green said no. He must've trenched out something.

Steve Watripont said they were on him for that. He's going to do the whole lot though in the spring is what he's been told.

Board Member Green asked about the debris. He can't pick that up now?

Steve Watripont hasn't talked to him this week. It was brought up by someone complaining through channels and the Assistant Building Director was on it and made a phone call directly to the owner. He was asked today by another Building Inspector if he could call him and that is on his list to do tomorrow because at 4:45 with him having five more phone calls to make he wasn't going to reach out to someone he didn't have on his agenda. He did call him back.

Board Member Watts said they talked about the impact statements they're getting from Planning. He doesn't know what's going on with his email, but he hasn't looked back, but he was told they were sent out yesterday. There is no reason why these impact statements shouldn't be with their packet when they get their packet. It's inexcusable. They need to make sure Planning gets the message because going forward, if they're not with his packet, and there is an impact statement, he's going to make a motion to deny. There is no excuse for this. Tonight, to read that statement about Schoenherr property that there's no problems yet look at the list of complaints from the neighbors. That impacts the neighborhood. Like he said, he's spent numerous Friday's over there. There's other violations on that property that haven't been corrected either. They're not doing their job and they're sending this stuff to them. He doesn't know, maybe wanting the board to be the bad guys. He doesn't have a problem being the bad guy, but they need to do their job and need to get their stuff to the board on time so they have time to review it properly. Paul, maybe he can put that on the agenda if it fits into what the agenda is about.

Secretary Jerzy said they can bring it up. They definitely can bring it up that day.

Board Member Watts is just tired of it. They've been getting too much stuff that shouldn't even be coming to the board if they were doing their job. Thank you.

Secretary Jerzy said he has just one other item and he'll let everybody go. He wants to remind petitioner's out there and anybody who wants to come before this board, this board acts as a quasi-judicial board. They are required to be here if they have a variance request. Whether illness, whatever, it happens, but they have to contact the office to make sure the meeting is still a go. Do their due diligence or else they might not get the favorable response that they think is coming to them. So, he thinks it's very disrespectful to everybody on this board that people don't show up. People on this board also have jobs. They take time out of their own lives to be here to hear these arguments and try to make the best decisions possible for the city. They can't do that if petitioner's aren't here. It will just be up to the board to try to handle business as usual and they will handle it like they did today, with or without you, going forward. So, he implores everybody to be here. That's all he'll say.

Board Member Clift said that prompts him to ask a question and this is to the secretary down

there. Do they have a mechanism in place for people who are supposed to be here that might not be able to be here to contact her in a timely fashion. Say they're on their way here, get into a car crash, have a flat tire, whatever. Is there a mechanism in place to be able to contact somebody.

(Inaudible)

Board Member Clift asked if that's a city issued device that she communicates on.

(Inaudible)

Board Member Clift said ok, maybe she should have a city issued device with a telephone number for an emergency contact. That number can be included in the packet in the event that somebody has to get ahold of her on the way here and have an issue.

(Inaudible)

Board Member Clift said it rings through to that device. That's fair enough. That mechanism is in place so there is no excuse to not pick up a phone and call to let someone know they're not going to be here.

Secretary Jerzy said there is a notice on the meetings.

Board Member Clift said up till lately he's been kind of giving the benefit of a doubt on that, but they have business to conduct and they can't keep going over and over and over. If they hadn't done what they did tonight, how many of these would be pushed back to the next meeting and then they're here till ten o'clock or whatever. Anyway, that's all.

Chairman Nestorowicz said any petitioner, he means, tell you the truth, as he was driving he came straight from his other work straight here. With the weather, he knew he might be late. He was actually ready to text somebody if he thinks he's going to be late, but it looked like he was able to make it in time. There is no reason a petitioner should not be able to say...

Board Member Clift is with Mr. Jerzy on that. Things need to tighten up just a little bit when it comes to certain things. He wants to express some concerns about this joint meeting too. He doesn't like being left in the dark, walking into something he doesn't know what he's walking into. He was very vocal about that and he's been vocal about it for several weeks. What's it about? Whose going to do what? Whatever. So, not to rat anybody out and he's not going to do it, but he's had some conversation over on that side and he's got a multitude of different excuses as to what's going on too. So, he just thinks its unprofessional to expect people to walk into a meeting and they're about week out and they don't know what they're going for. Some of them might have some homework they need to do, some might want to device something to talk about on certain topics. This thing is going to drop four or five days in advance. They work, he works three jobs and finished school finally, by the way. Anyway, he likes serving and he likes taking care of business, but he just doesn't think that sometimes, you know, what they have going on is taken into consideration. It's important. They got packets under control and he thanks you very much on that, Nicole. Packets are coming earlier, but he's with him, give him the back up. Give him the impact statements. They should be in the packet. Enforcements open on that property.

Give them everything they need to make their decisions. He also wanted to chime in on some of the lax enforcement that goes on in this town. A lot of stuff that goes on, the pictures he displayed tonight are disturbing. They all know what goes on. He thinks a lot of that, and he's said it before, he thinks a lot of that stems from the actions this board took five, ten, fifteen years ago by doing things the way they did them. Its up to the board to train... if the city is not going to offer them training opportunities to hone their skills and understand the rules and laws and regulations of what it is they're supposed to be doing when they're up there, they have an obligation if they're going to stay in these seats to learn what they need to do if they have to do it from an outside source. So, you know, he's holding five certificates from MSU and a couple other places dealing with regulatory, zoning and he tries to understand what it is that's going on out there. He can't say that about a lot of their predecessors, because now they're having to look at things this far down the road that are impacting neighbors. They had a lot of neighbors here tonight about a certain issue that really wasn't within their purview and he doesn't know who is hearing these people or whose not hearing them, but he thinks it's very disturbing. To jump on top of that, it really disturbs him a few meetings ago when he heard somebody made a phone call to somebody and stopped enforcement actions. Now, he doubts the whole process. He doubts the whole process, because somebody gave him cause to quantify what he thought was going on all the way. Who else is it going on with? With that he's off his soap box.

Chairman Nestorowicz asked for any other items for new business. Or motion for adjournment?

20. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

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

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken. The motion carried (8 – 0).

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Paul Jerzy
Secretary of the Board