

CITY OF WARREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on February 23rd, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.,

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, February 23rd, 2026, at 7:00 p.m., in the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Commissioner's Present:

Delwar Ansar
Michael Holowaty
Syed Hoque
Andrey Duzyj – Assistant Secretary
Mahmuda Mouri – Secretary
Merle Boniecki – Vice Chair
Warren Smith – Chair
Henry Newnan – Ex-Officio

Also present:

Ron Wuerth – Planning Director
Michelle Katopodes – Assistant Planning Director
David Crabtree – Assistant Planner
Amanda Mika – Assistant Planner
Melissa Maisano – Senior Administrator Secretary
Lisa Gibson – Office Assistant
Mary Michaels – Acting City Attorney
Patrick Conlin – Communications Department

1. CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Smith – Calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:
3. ROLL CALL:
All members present.
4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

MOTION:

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

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FEBRUARY 9th, 2026:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Secretary Mouri to approve, supported by Vice Chair Boniecki. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

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

- A. SITE PLAN FOR THE ADDITION OF A MINOR REPAIR FACILITY AND STORAGE OF INVENTORY AND SUPPLIES FOR AN EXISTING GAS STATION; located on the northwest corner of Hoover and Nine Mile Roads; 23011 Hoover Road; Section 27; Abbas Harajli/9 Mile & Hoover Property LLC; PSP250045. **Postponed from December 1, 2025 and January 26, 2026.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Abbas Harajli – Good evening, my project is a gas station, I would like to build a three-bay garage for servicing vehicles for service repair. I've been here before and met with Ron to go over some details, hopefully we agreed on everything and we are here to finalize it, we hope you see it's a good project.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site indicates no difficulty in development.

FIRE: In response to the traffic letter for site plan PSP250045, the Fire Department doesn't see any issues that may affect our operations.

AT&T: AT&T does not object to this proposal. We do have facilities in the vicinity. Please advise the petitioner to contact me if any conflicts are discovered.

COMCAST: In response to your utility request for the above project, please refer to the attached map for the location of Comcast CATV/FIBER facilities in that area. Aerial cables are highlighted in

orange for fiber and yellow for coax cable. Underground is highlighted in blue for fiber and green for coax cable. If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact us by email at cccutilityrequests@teamsigma.com.

DTE: DTE Electric Company has received and reviewed the site plan for addition of a minor repair facility and storage of inventory and supplies for existing gas station. DTE Electric Company objects to the site plan for the addition of a minor repair facility and storage of inventory and supplies for existing gas station; impacting 23011 Hoover Road; Section 27; per the site plan provided for the following reason: The proposed building will be within 3 feet of the existing transformers that currently feed the existing building. The proposed needs to be at least 7.5 feet away from energized equipment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978

MCPWO: The Macomb County Public Works Office (MCPWO) has reviewed the site plan for the project referenced above and has determined the proposed site disturbance is less than one acre and will not require a stormwater review from this office. If a no objection letter is required, please forward your request to Wesley.Jonik@macombgov.org.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Chair Smith – Public Hearing open for audience participation.

(Audience Portion)

Public Hearing portion closed.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Commissioner Holowaty – Good evening, sir. I live right around the corner from there so I'm familiar with your gas station. I noticed that you have propane storage tanks, are you still doing propane refills there?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – No, currently we're not doing it.

Commissioner Holowaty – I went to refill my barbecue tank and they said no, we are not doing it anymore. Is there something you can do to help your neighbor by eliminating that storage tank to help him with his easement.

Mr. Abbas Harajli – I don't think he's referring to that side of the property, it's the opposite side. The thing is, they agreed before it was vacant, like 30 years ago, they allowed me to use it.

Commissioner Holowaty – A new owner?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – No, it's the same owner.

Commissioner Holowaty – Of the restaurant.

Mr. Abbas Harajli – Same owner.

Commissioner Holowaty – That restaurant was closed for a long time.

Mr. Abbas Harajli – Maybe the people operating it is new, I think it's the son-in-law. The owner was the last person who spoke here. They allowed me to use it at the time, and actually I didn't need it, there was no ill intention on my part, I could make it work with it or without it. When they brought to my attention that they really don't want me to use it anymore I was fine, I redesigned it without using that piece of land. The main issue is I think they are trying to get a drive in there, that's separate from my petition. I hope you give them a driveway.

There's a misunderstanding with the telephone pole, it's actually in my property, there was a survey done. Anyway, the propane is on the opposite side.

Commissioner Holowaty – What type of repair are you going to be doing?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – It's going to be minor.

Commissioner Holowaty – When you say minor, oil changes only?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – Yes, oil change, brakes and tires.

Commissioner Holowaty – Will you be keeping cars overnight there?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – No, that's not the plan, there's nothing major that requires overnight.

Commissioner Holowaty – No major brake jobs where they need to store their cars overnight?

Mr. Abbas Harajli – The plan is, and I think that's what the zoning is, we are shooting for same day, but no plans to have vehicles overnight. I didn't think about it but you could leave the vehicle inside the building.

Commissioner Holowaty – I yield the floor.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Your neighbor wants to put a driveway into that 20-foot area, I don't know how you're going to do that since you have your driveway onto Hoover. You have two driveways onto Hoover and then the other driveway that's to the north; I can't see how you're going to put a driveway into the 20-foot easement.

Mr. Abbas Harajli – That is his petition, if he's filing for a petition, I'm not sure, that's totally separate from my project.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I understand that, I'm bringing up to somebody's point, I don't think you can put a driveway in there off of Hoover because he's got a driveway. The guy north of you has a driveway and there's just not enough room there for another driveway. Ron, I know this isn't part of the site plan, but if they are planning on it, is it possible to put another driveway in there?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's 20 feet wide; you can have a 20-foot-wide maneuvering lane, but where the driveway enters Hoover, you're going to have to have at least a minimum 20-foot radius. You're going to have two radii agreements to get permission to put those radii in there, if they can get those, they can have one.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Do you think it will work, because I'm looking at it and I understand what you're saying about the radii.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's almost like the north driveway that exists and, let's just say, the new driveway looks like it would turn into a boulevard. Actually, it's a thought process, they've thought about doing this and until they speak to the Engineering Division about actually doing it no one will know. They are the ones who make the last decision, but the way I described it, I make it possible.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Fair enough, if it comes back to us and if all of this works, I don't know if we can pass it, we will see on the drawing. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair Smith – Good evening, sir. The reason this was brought back to us is because that piece of property that you are using or going to use belongs to the other petitioner, the other resident. So therefore, you went in and you had everything revised to where you eliminated that off your property and you're going to close it off with a fence or something like that so it will isolate that from your property, so you won't be able to park over there anyway. All you're trying to do is keep everything on your property where you're not bothering his property and you've revised the drawings to do that. As far as I can see, for now, I can understand if they want to put another driveway in, but like Ron said that's going to have to deal with other things other than just opening it up. As far as you're concerned it won't be a problem because your property's not going to be there anymore.

Mr. Abbas Harajli – Correct.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

B. SITE PLAN FOR A GAS STATION WITH CONVENIENCE STORE; located on the northeast corner of Mound and Thirteen Mile Roads; 31104 Mound Road; Section 4; Michael Weigand/Gazebo Real Estate (Josh Bratton/Agree Convenience No. 1, LLC); PSP250050. **Postponed from December 15, 2025, January 12, 2026, January 26, 2026, and February 9, 2026.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Josh Bratton – Agree Development, 30201 Woodward Ave., Royal Oak, Michigan. I appreciate you joining us here tonight we're hoping that this one will be the charm.

What I wanted to do is go over the updates and changes from the last public hearing that we had that were all outlined in the executive

summary that was circulated to the City. Afterwards, our Traffic Engineer can go over the updated traffic study results in more detail, and then Pat Lennon, our Attorney, would also like to add some comments.

If you go to the first slide, this site plan is an overlay of the old site plan what's shown in red is the changes. If you go to the next slide that's the revised site plan, so the main changes that we made on Thirteen Mile, we removed the left out, we moved that further north and we made it so you can only exit the site on Mound Road. The reason we did that was because GM brought up some concerns about the line of sight when people are pulling out on Thirteen Mile. So, we feel that resolved that issue.

Also, what was brought up in the hearing in December was that the fuel truck needed to oversteer to the lane to its left in order to make the turn into Mound Road. We were able to make adjustments to those curbs to allow for that fuel truck to enter without veering into the other road. Macomb County has approved the adjustment of those curbs; we are still waiting for Macomb County Department of Roads to respond to our last set of plans. We are expecting, if approved today, that will be conditioned upon approval from Macomb County Department of Roads.

We'll go over the traffic study in more detail but just a couple of important things to note. That traffic study did include updated counts that were taken on January 20th, 2026, we also added counts that were provided to us from GM from 2024 when their gate was open on Thirteen Mile because they had a concern that the gates are currently closed for construction and therefore they wanted to make sure the traffic report included and reflected those counts. So, we took those counts increased them by 1% and included those into the study. The result of the study still confirmed that the intersection will operate at a level service B, which currently operates now and doesn't have any queuing issues, which he will go over in more detail.

In addition to that we did have our Traffic Engineer respond in a letter to the letter that was provided by the neighbors Traffic Engineer dated January 22, 2026. It added clarification and addressed every one of their comments in this revised report, that was also circulated to the City with the executive summary.

We held multiple calls with GM regarding their concerns, per GM's suggestion. GM's Traffic Engineer Kimley Horn, GM's team, and our team jumped on a call that occurred on Friday, February 20, to

review the results of the updated traffic study. We did receive confirmation from GM in an email that was forwarded to the City that we sufficiently addressed GM and their Traffic Engineer's concerns that were specifically outlined in that email.

As a reminder, it's not shown on any of the slides, we are putting a substantial amount of investment into aesthetics including landscaping. We are increasing the green space by 134%, increasing the tree count by 57%, and adding nearly 200 shrubs as well as a shaded walkway/bench garden area to the intersection. We've already far exceeded the landscaping requirements in the City ordinance, and we are more than happy to discuss anything that the City would like to see beyond what we have designed.

Lastly, we feel that we sufficiently satisfied all the requirements of the ordinance for approval. We feel that the revised traffic study and site addressed any safety concerns that were voiced to us by the City or GM. I'll now have Robert Matko go over the traffic study in a little more detail.

Mr. Robert Matko – Good evening, Robert Matko, 13060 South US 27, DeWitt, Michigan. I believe you'll hear later during public comment, I'm sure the adjacent parcel owner and potentially their Traffic Engineer may be here this evening. I won't get into the specific details of what we didn't report other than to just address some key items that were brought up. One was my registration, so I included in the response letter to show that I am an active professional Engineer in the State of Michigan. I think also there were some comments about the IT 11th addition versus the 12th addition. When the traffic impact study was initially done, the 12th addition was not out yet, but we went ahead and updated the revised traffic impact study to include the 12th addition.

I think also the updated study does take into account not only GM's concerns but also potential queuing concerns on Thirteen Mile Road by removing the right turn out. Not only does it push access further east providing adequate stopping distance, it also provides additional queuing space on Thirteen Mile Road. I think the updated site plan certainly accomplishes many things. Again, I'm not going to go through every key point, if the adjacent parcel owners have additional comments or questions on the traffic study, I can certainly address those. Or if their Traffic Engineer has concerns again, I'm here to address those comments. I don't want to go through each comment other than to say we feel that we've satisfied again concerns and we've tried to address everything that was out there in

terms of initial concerns from the previous meeting over a month ago. Thank you for your time, and again I'm here to answer any questions you have.

Mr. Pat Lennon – Good evening, my name is Pat Lennon, I'm an Attorney with Honigman Firm, I represent the applicant, I'm here to speak to some of the legal issues.

They are pretty simple and clear here. We discussed them, I believe, the first meeting was on December 15th. We discussed them in detail on January 12th, we've supplemented the application with legal filings explaining how the project satisfies all of the legal requirements and is what's called a by right project. Which means if we meet the standards, it's legal and entitled to approval. In fact, Section 5015 of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act that says a site plan shall be approved if it contains the information required by the Zoning Ordinance. It's not just us that has presented that to you; it's also the Planning Staff and the team here. We think the story gets better because you may recall from the January 12th meeting, I think there was some confusion about what and why we were even being tabled, there were some requests that came from that and to the credit of the applicant they've done everything in their power to address them.

There was some concern involving General Motors because they are a large neighbor with potentially a lot of traffic, well they've certainly done that. Second there were requests regarding additional information in the traffic study, well not only did they supplement that, they did a whole new count on January 20th. They also incorporated information provided to them by GM, so they've gone above and beyond in this regard. Based on what they learned they made adjustments to their site plan. They've eliminated the left turn out onto Thirteen Mile and shrunk that down to a right turn out and shift how Mound Road operates. They have pivoted to be sure we address concerns about truck traffic and deliveries. So, we met the ordinance before, but now we are even beyond that and I hope you take that into consideration as you deliberate tonight.

And as you do, and as you consider the fact that the Planning Staff has now recommended this for approval, I believe, for the third time, I hope that you remember that the real standard is, is there material and competent evidence that's been provided that shows that we don't meet a standard. We are convinced that there isn't and that there can't be because this applicant and their team have gone to such a level that we know that the standards have been met.

As we've stated before, and is the case here, we meet the standards and we would respectfully request that you approve this applicant.

Secretary Mouri reads the following recommendations:

TAXES: Current.

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

1. Macomb County Department of Roads approval and permit are required for work in the Mound Road right of way.
2. On Mound Road right of way, Macomb County Department of Roads allows the maximum 30 feet back of curb to back of curb width for the proposed drive approach at the property line. Similarly, the City of Warren allows the maximum 30 feet back of curb to back of curb width on 13 Mile Road right of way.
3. All the existing & proposed utilities within the vicinity of the project limits along with the material a size should be shown.

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

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

1. MCDR allows only 30 feet (back of curb (BC) to back of curb) wide entrance approach in MCDR's road right-of-way (ROW). Verify and revise the Mound Road entrance. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the phone number above 586-463-8671.

Secretary Mouri – With that I have four resident's letters that are attached that I'll go ahead and read.

On January 23rd, 2026, the Planning Department received written correspondence from Jordan B. Segal, Attorney at Maddin, Hauser, Roth & Heller, P.C., an outside law firm not associated with the

subject property or proposed site plan. This correspondence includes a review of the petitioner's Traffic Impact Analysis conducted by Fleis & Vandenberg (F&V) at the request of Maddin, Hauser, Roth & Heller, P.C.

Also included in the correspondence is the attorney's interpretation of F&V's review of the Traffic Impact Analysis, with Maddin, Hauser, Roth & Heller, P.C. maintaining that the proposed Speedway gas station is unsafe and that the original traffic study does not meet professional standards.

The full correspondence from Maddin, Hauser, Roth & Heller, P.C. has been submitted to the Planning Commission.

Secretary Mouri – Another letter was sent on January 26, 2026.

Hello,

I also noticed the debate over a proposed gas station over at The Gazebo Banquet Center, 13 Mile Road and Mound Road Intersection, northeast corner. Like most residents, I also oppose it.

I understand and agree that we shouldn't penalize the property owner who wants to sell. A better solution to preserve lot value so he could sell at a good price, to a better use for the City (that would also bring more tax revenue to the administration, and utilize the land to a better "value per acre" could be to change the zoning for that lot for the seller, to allow a multi-family or mixed-use development or mixed on the lot.

A developer like the one behind Icon Park nearby in Serling Heights on 14 Mile and Mound would fit better near the Old Village Downtown near Beebe Road (the triangle between Mound, Chicago Road, and 13 Mile Road), make those properties nearby more valuable and the area more walkable. The owner could find another buyer for the same or better price, and the City residents should have more housing options, and more housing supply when it is so expensive.

I am wondering, could the City alternatively:

- initiate the rezoning of the parcel.
- or add an overlay district in the area that restricts gas pumps.
- adopt a form-based code for the form and design for potential buildings on the parcel (instead of the building use) that can encourage walkable ground floor activity.

Mary Clark CER-6819
February 23rd, 2026

- allow greater building height.
- expedited permitting in return of a better building for the City, residents, and neighborhoods.

I welcome the proposed temporary City moratorium on new gas stations, but that is not a long-term solution. Allowing landowners to build gently more density along main corridors (mile roads, Ryan, Van Dyke, Mound etc.) would bring different kind of developments, apart from a strip mall with a vast empty impermeable parking lot, or a gas station and car wash. And those kinds of developments would bring more tax revenue and income for the City.

Best Regards,
Paul Butuc

Secretary Mouri – We have another letter.

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Committee:

The Kemp family has developed numerous properties in Warren over the last 40 years. We currently own a property located at 6123 E. Thirteen Mile Road, which could be adversely affected by this development. Please vote no on this gas station and store. The site plan is unsafe because of traffic and access conflicts, it does not meet City ordinance, and it doesn't fit the look and feel of our block.

From a traffic perspective, the layout bakes in conflicts at the curb cuts and along the frontage. Short, quick turns and queuing will push vehicles into travel lanes and create avoidable crash exposure. That is a design problem that cannot be remedied with additional paperwork.

Safety will get worse, not better. Gas station traffic patterns add conflict points, queues, and crash risk that our block should not be asked to absorb.

Beyond safety, there is no economic need for another fueling station here. The corridor is already saturated; a new station would simply cannibalize existing sales, depress margins for long-standing operators, and add churn without creating net value or jobs. Approving redundant supply undermines corridor stability and does not advance the City's economic goals.

There is also the redevelopment cost the City inherits if a station later closes. Once USTs and fuel infrastructure are installed, sites

can carry contamination, vapor intrusion risks, and long-tail liabilities. Converting those properties back to productive use demands costly remediation and public incentives. Approving this use now risks turning a flexible corner into a future brownfield burden.

Given the traffic hazards inherent in this layout and its conflict with City ordinances and neighborhood character, the only appropriate outcome is to deny the application.

We support projects that make this corridor safer and better. This one does not. Please deny it. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Thomas Kemp
Kemp Building & Development Co.

Secretary Mouri – And the final one.

Dear Commissioners and Planning Staff:

As a resident who lives just a short distance from the proposed development at Mound and Thirteen Mile Roads, I am deeply concerned about the impact this project would have on the safety and quality of our neighborhood. I respectfully request that the Commission deny this application.

The current site layout introduces significant traffic hazards. The design creates multiple conflict points at the driveways and along the frontage, encouraging short-notice turns, queue spillback into the roadway, and increased congestion. These conditions elevate the risk of crashes for everyone who uses this corridor, drivers, pedestrians, and nearby residents. These are design flaws, not issues that can be resolved through additional studies or conditions added later.

Furthermore, the type of traffic generated by a gas station would worsen these safety concerns. Frequent turning movements, constant in and out trips, and pump related queuing add layers of conflict throughout the day and night. For those of us who live, work and travel this stretch daily, these added risks are simply unacceptable.

Beyond safety concerns, the proposal does not align with City ordinances or with the established charter and intended appearance of our corridor. This area has a specific look and feel that residents

value, and the proposed development is incompatible with that vision.

For these reasons, traffic safety, ordinance conflicts and neighborhood character, the only appropriate action is to reject this application.

As residents, we welcome thoughtful investment that improves safety and enhances the corridor. Unfortunately, this proposal does not achieve those goals.

Please deny the application. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chris, I am not able to read the last name

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff:

Chair Smith – Public Hearing open for audience participation.

(Audience Portion)

Public Hearing portion closed.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I find this very interesting that after each time we've postponed something on this the drawing has changed, the location of the driveways has changed, the driveway off of Thirteen Mile has changed, I don't know what would happen if we postponed it again and what changes would come up at that point and time. We've been told that if it meets all the requirements that we have to approve it and so on, well you can argue about something with health, safety, welfare and I don't think that corner is safe. When I've come around on Thirteen Mile Road to either go straight or make right onto Mound it's kind of a blind corner and that's been my focus from the first meeting we had on all this.

They've put in a lot of time and effort into this, which I really do appreciate. They've changed it for the better, but I don't want to be a party of approving and waiting for somebody to get killed on that intersection. I've seen people slamming on their brakes, sliding

through and so on, so I'm not for this by any stretch of the imagination. One of the points that has been brought up is that there is nothing that would go to Zoning Board of Appeals, well they've got a dinky little sign there, number 18 by the driveway on Mound, I imagine it's going to end up in front of ZBA for a bigger sign, I'd be surprised if they don't.

If there was something else that we could put into that that isn't lit up 24/7, and I don't like having that entrance off of Thirteen Mile Road it scares the heck out of me and I sincerely think that intersection, once everything is lit up and built, is going to be the downfall or somebody is going to get hurt very badly there. I don't support it, I appreciate the work that's gone into it, but from the safety standpoint I cannot vote for this. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Commissioner Holowaty – Listening to Commissioner Duzyj, I second his opinion, I'm not against Mr. Weigand selling his property, but it's the type of property that's going there; I feel it's a safety issue. You've heard a lot of comments tonight through letters and from residents that are against it for safety issues. We also have to think about what's best for our residents at the same time. I second Commissioner opposition to this project, thank you.

Secretary Mouri – If I may call up one of the petitioners about the traffic study. There was a concern that was brought up when the second traffic study was done with that being on MLK Day can you touch on that for a second.

Mr. Josh Bratton – It wasn't done on MLK Day, she mentioned that it was done the day after, the week of, which we didn't feel it affected traffic because businesses and schools were open on that day.

Secretary Mouri – What about the snow that we had that week?

Mr. Josh Bratton – I just looked up the weather report, and it was described not as a blizzard but as overcast skies with periods of light snow showers, so we didn't feel like it was significant enough of snow fall to prevent us from executing the study.

Secretary Mouri – Thank you, that's all.

Mr. Josh Bratton – My Traffic Engineer would like to elaborate one step further.

Mr. Robert Matko – I'd like to go one step further, we actually did obtain GM's count when the gate was open from 2024, we took that traffic, it was just slightly higher on Thirteen Mile Road. We took Mound Road traffic from our initial count, which was the worse case out of five different counts we compared it to, so we took GM's count on Thirteen Mile Road and increased that by a growth rate for two years to come to 2026. We feel that the count is obviously overly conservative so regardless of when it was taken, we ended up using GM's count and took that from 2024 to 2026 and grew that traffic, so really, we looked at the worst case.

Going back to another comment, the right isle (sic) onto Thirteen Mile Road would be removed so there would be no exiting traffic onto Thirteen Mile Road. I just wanted to clarify that as well, thank you.

Commissioner Ansar – I agree with my colleague Duzyj that safety is the first priority. At the same time, this is the second time we are collecting the traffic report, after that, it was MLK Day and the weather was not good, so the third time is not reflecting the actual traffic report. If we consider everything, I think it's not safe and for the well-being of the City and for the neighborhood I'm opposing this site plan, thank you.

Commissioner Hoque – I would ask the petitioner to please come forward. How do you address the issue people brought up here and the letters complaining about accidents and that it's not safe.

Mr. Josh Bratton – Obviously there's a lot of commonality in the public letters, they all seem very similar, all addressing what they are calling as potential traffic hazards or safety issues. What we've done was hire a certified Engineer to complete the report with the traffic counts as accurately as possible to confirm from a technical standpoint that there are no safety concerns here. 7-Eleven doesn't want to create safety hazards as a part of their brand in the community. We again spoke with GM with their Engineer on a call on Friday they are not speaking out against this project as a result of that call.

Commissioner Hoque – GM said okay?

Mr. Josh Bratton – GM seems very particular on what's represented of them which is why I specifically had an email from GM sent to the City so the city could see verbatim what GM's response was. They confirmed that the email below is accurate and sufficient. In that

email I was asking them to confirm whether or not we sufficiently alleviated their concerns with the revised traffic study and site plan. They responded in the confirmation email that was forwarded to the City.

Mr. Pat Lennon – And didn't they have their Traffic Engineer look at it as well?

Mr. Josh Bratton – They did, the call included Kimley Horn.

Commissioner Hoque – You mentioned there is no driveway on Thirteen Mile, right?

Mr. Josh Bratton – Access only.

Commissioner Hoque – People can exit on Thirteen Mile?

Mr. Josh Bratton – You can only exit on Mound Road now. One of the concerns from GM, who obviously has a huge amount of interest in the safety of this intersection was we don't want people pulling out onto Thirteen Mile with that curb there, we are not comfortable with the line of vision, we took that into account and we agreed. To try to continue to address the concerns of the community we eliminated that, so you can only turn into the site, you can only exit on Mound Road.

Mr. Pat Lennon – One of the things I wanted to emphasize is there was some criticism of some of the changes, the changes were to make the property safer. There have been comments about this information, there's no disinformation here, these are highly paid consultants, and not only them, they've had others look at it as Josh mentioned. And with respect to that we provided a comment-by-comment response, that's been submitted to the City, with respect to every issue raised by the people who have been opposing the project since the first day.

I'd ask you to keep this in mind as you consider this, and I know some of you feel like you may have made up your mind, but remember this, we are the ones asking you to comply with your ordinance. The others are asking you not to. We are here to say this project complies and we are asking for your approval. We believe we have provided information that demonstrates that and there simply isn't credible other information that doesn't. Thanks.

Commissioner Hoque – Do you meet all the requirements from the County and the City?

Mr. Josh Bratton – We are still waiting for approval from Macomb County Department of Roads on our last revision.

Mr. Pat Lennon – One of the realities of reacting to new information, like when we get input as we've done, is we did something here. We decided for safety reasons to adjust the maneuvering at the Thirteen Mile entry. So that's a big change and that needs to be looked at by everybody and that's why we are willing to accept that as a condition of approval of course because they still need to go through their process and be sure that it meets the required standards. No one is trying to dodge standards we are exceeding them.

Mr. Robert Matko – We've had discussions with the County, and first of all, the County did not even require a traffic impact study. We did have a discussion with them about a week or so ago, they were acceptable on what we went through in terms of the revisions, why we restricted the right out, not only just due to any site concerns but basically too because of the queue length going in a westbound direction, so there was certainly concern about that.

When we went back after the last meeting, we literally took to heart all the different comments that you all had and we worked with GM, we worked with the adjacent property owner, we worked very diligently until we had something that was agreeable by GM and with what the County would accept. We feel that we have addressed all of those comments.

I'd like to point out to we did include an accident data section in the report and at that site driveway we went as far back as seven years and there was only one accident at the site driveway over those seven years. Granted there will be slightly more traffic but again with this type of development there will be a lot of pass by traffic or traffic coming off the existing street system.

I'd just like to note that, again, this was an effort of well over a month to try and address your concerns, GM's concerns, and also the adjacent parcel owner's concerns. Thank you.

Commissioner Hoque – Are you saying there is no exit on Thirteen Mile only to enter from there?

Mr. Robert Matko – That's correct, there's no exiting movement onto Thirteen Mile Road.

Commissioner Hoque – I know if someone accidentally makes a left turn trying to exit on Thirteen Mile Road, that is the people's concern because there's a very bad curve there. It's a triangle shape property and there's a huge amount of traffic there all the time.

Mr. Robert Matko – How the driveway is shaped it would be extremely difficult to try and exit onto Thirteen Mile Road, plus there will be onsite signage. If you look at the driveway it's kind of angled a little bit and there is a sharp radius to prohibit any outbound traffic.

Commissioner Hoque – Thank you.

Mr. Robert Matko – If I could, I know there were about 27 comments, the only reason I went over the first 3 is to show that some of the comments were about an Engineering seal, so I provided my registration; about using the 12th addition when the 11th addition was the only available information at the time, we updated the study to the 12th addition; adding a crash analysis, which wasn't required by the County, but I know some of you mentioned that in the last meeting, so we went ahead and added a crash analysis to the report.

So again, if you haven't, please read through that letter or thumb through it and you'll see a response to each one of those comments or questions. Thank you.

Commissioner Hoque – What about if you completely close Thirteen Mile driveway, how many open driveways do you have to Mound, how many do you have right now?

Mr. Josh Bratton – Was the question how many drives on Mound?

Commissioner Hoque – Yes.

Mr. Josh Bratton – One.

Commissioner Hoque – So how many total driveways, one on Thirteen and one on Mound?

Mr. Josh Bratton – Correct.

Commissioner Hoque – People are mostly concerned about the Thirteen Mile one, so can you close it completely?

Mr. Josh Bratton – We haven't done the studies to see how that would affect the traffic. We did the studies to ensure that the traffic still operates at a level and does not create queuing issues.

Commissioner Hoque – Thank you.

Chair Smith – I went over the new traffic study and I was pleased about changing the driveway on Thirteen Mile I think it's going to make it a lot safer. I read all the comments and the responses that you gave to those comments, all of them. Everyone is complaining about safety and accidents, the thing about it is, I see how people drive and they are not respecting each other. Everyone wants to be first; everyone is cutting in and out of traffic, that's what's causing accidents. As long as people keep disrespecting each other, you're going to have accidents. I think you did a very good job; I think you went beyond to try and make it work. I looked over everything, and I'm particular when I look over things. I've driven through the area quite a few times and I watch the traffic when I'm in that area and I see how people drive. I was coming to a meeting here one night and they were cutting in and out, cutting in front of people and everything else, that's how accidents happen. I didn't have anything to do whether you have a stop sign here or you have a curve here, it had nothing to do with that, it's how people are driving in these times. So the motion before us is a motion to approve by Vice Chair Boniecki, supported by Commissioner Hoque. We have to have a consensus of five Commissioners to approve or deny this resolution.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Mr. Chair, may I ask one more question?

Chair Smith – Yes, go ahead.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – The turnaround on Thirteen Mile Road to make a Michigan left onto westbound Thirteen Mile Road the drawing shows that is in line with entrance off of Thirteen Mile Road.

Mr. Josh Bratton – Correct, it's positioned to where a vehicle could turn into our site, you would utilize that lane just so they can turn around onto Thirteen Mile, which does not create a line of site issue based on the distance on Thirteen Mile from that queuing.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – It seems odd to me if there are two cars there and they both want to go, the way some people drive these days, have you folks considered how that will impact that entrance off of Thirteen Mile Road?

Mr. Josh Bratton – Robert can speak to it more, but from our perspective it doesn't create any additional risk than a current vehicle making that turnaround right now. Instead of doing the turnaround they are actually spending less time driving forward, but Robert's more qualified.

Mr. Robert Matko – What it does is instead of making a sharp left and then making a sharp right or even a right into the site driveway the vehicles could actually stop and wait and then go straight through. It would be no different than if you had a site driveway anywhere and you were making a right turn into the site driveway and there was a person going southbound making a left turn into the site driveway. It would be the same type of situation meaning that they are not going to go at the same time and have a conflict.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Well you would hope that they don't go at the same time.

Mr. Robert Matko – It would be very similar to just a regular site driveway off a three-lane roadway with a southbound left turn lane. If you're going northbound and you're going to make a right turn into the site driveway you're also looking at the southbound left to make sure you both don't go concurrently.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Alright, fair enough, thank you.

Chair Smith – Like I was saying, we need five votes to either pass or deny this. We have a motion on the floor to approve this application, Madame Secretary, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Vice Chair Boniecki..... Yes

Commissioner Hoque..... No

Commissioner Ansar..... No

The reason is for the safety and well-being of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes

Assistant Secretary Duzyj..... No

Based on safety concerns and the Thirteen Mile thoroughfare.

Secretary Mouri..... Yes
 Chair Smith..... Yes

Chair Smith – It's four to three so the motion gets automatically denied because we need five people to agree.

Mr. Josh Bratton – I believe the rule is it tables and then if you vote again then it's denied.

Ms. Mary Michaels – Correct, if it's denied the second time, it's denied. I'll read the rule.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Commissioner Hoque didn't give a reason for why he changed his vote.

Commissioner Hoque – Because of the safety concerns.

Ms. Mary Michaels – Under rule 8.4, should an item requiring five concurring votes not receive the requisite five votes either in favor or against the item, the item is automatically postponed to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Chair Smith – Well, being we have a four to three vote, according to our rules it has to be postponed to the next meeting.

Vice Chair Boniecki – I won't be here on March 9th, so we won't have a full commission.

Chair Smith – This keeps dragging on and I don't see the end being in sight. In the beginning I asked Mr. Weigand have you thought about putting something different there and nobody came up with any ideas. Everyone is saying safety, look at the drivers, people are driving erratically now, if people drove the way they were supposed to we wouldn't have all these accidents. According to our City Attorney we have to postpone it to the next meeting of March 9th, and we will be lacking a commissioner so that will affect the vote. We will postpone it to March 23rd, I need a vote to postpone to March 23rd.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Vice Chair Boniecki to postpone to March 23rd, 2026, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Mary Clark CER-6819
 February 23rd, 2026

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

Chair Smith – I want to state one thing, if we don't have enough to make a decision at that particular time then it will be denied. Thank you, have a good evening.

- C. SITE PLAN FOR THE OPEN STORAGE OF FERROUS AND NON-FERROUS METALS AND EQUIPMENT; located on the north side of Eight Mile Road, approximately 304 ft. east of Mac Arthur Boulevard; 8701 Eight Mile Road; Section 34; Tony Levin/Eight Mile/Warren Properties L.L.C. (Scott Brinkmann/Butzel Long); PSP260008.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Scott Brinkmann – Scott Brinkmann of Butzel Long, on behalf of Eight Mile/Warren Properties L.L.C., the owner of 8701 Eight Mile Road. We are here today for site plan approval for open storage. This particular business fronts on Eight Mile, it's got a building for employees and a parking lot of approximately 40 spaces with 2 handicap spaces. The operation is a scrap metal, for ferrous and non-ferrous scrap metal. The property is screened on all four sides between a chain link fence that is screened at the front, other industrial use buildings to the west and the east, and a concrete fence to the north. We are here for 13 small locations on the site for open storage. We have reviewed the Planning Director's recommendations; we completely agree with the recommendations. I just want to point out, under 2a, one of the buildings is over 30 feet; in an M-2 zone, 30 feet is the height, that building was built in 1950, the Zoning Ordinance, I believe, is dated 1964, so we'd be grandfathered in on the height restriction. Other than that, we completely agree with all the Planning Director's recommendations.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: This project has no issues with Building.

ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site indicates no difficulty in development.

POLICE: The Warren Police Department has reviewed the submitted site plan and does not foresee any issues at this time.

COMCAST: We have no conflicts with this proposal, but we have aerial and underground facilities in the area.

DTE: DTE Electric Company has received and reviewed the site plan for the open storage of ferrous and non-ferrous metals and equipment; and has no objection to the site plan for the open storage of ferrous and non-ferrous metals and equipment; impacting 8701 Eight Mile Road; Section 34; per the site plan provided. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978

MCPWO: The Macomb County Public Works Office (MCPWO) has reviewed the site plan for the project referenced above and has determined the proposed site disturbance is less than one acre and will not require a stormwater review from this office. If a no objection letter is required, please forward your request to Wesley.Jonik@macombgov.org.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Holowaty to approve with \$1,000 bond, supported by Assistant Secretary Duzyj.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Chair Smith – Do you understand we are recommending a \$1,000 bond?

Mr. Scott Brinkmann – Yes sir, no objection.

Chair Smith – I’ve been through a few areas in the scrap yard, it seems like you’re doing a good job trying to keep it up, I know it’s hard when you have all kinds of metal coming in and out. The last couple times I’ve been there I noticed they are trying to keep it up and keep it clean.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes

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

- D. SITE PLAN FOR THE OPEN STORAGE OF PALLETS AND TWO (2) SHIPPING CONTAINERS TO STORE SHEET METAL PARTS AND METAL TUBING; located on the north side of Ten Mile Road, approximately 191 ft. west of Bunert Road; 14219 and 14201 Ten Mile Road; Section 24; Nancy Morrow/American Fan & Blower (Tom Joysey/American Blower Supply Inc.); PSP260006.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – Good evening, I'm the Project Architect, I'm representing American Fan & Blower, I'm here with the owner's representative, Tom Joysey. I just want to point out that these people have been in this building for 30 years, they make clean air equipment for industrial uses.

We got the recommendations from the Planning Department, and we have no objections with the exception of a few minor ones that we'd like to discuss. Really 1A through F is fine, G 1 & 2 is fine, the only thing we have an issue with is 3, the Planning Staff recommends that the entire gravel area located in the front setback of parcel 2 be converted over to grass. That area is not being used right now; however, because of the Clean Air Act, the owners are going to make a large expansion. They own property to the west and what they are going to do is take that parcel and adjoin it to the larger parcel to the west and build an additional facility. This is a new development, because of the Clean Air Act requiring a lot of industrial buildings now to add better quality air in their facilities. This was a great opportunity for American Fan & Blower to considerably increase their business. They want to hold off on spending any money in that area until they develop the entire adjacent lot, and build another building over there. We don't want to spend any money on something that's going to be ripped up in a couple years.

One of the things that the Planning Department asked for is a trash dumpster. We actually have a small dumpster right now and we have no objections to putting a trash dumpster enclosure for that, so we are complying with that.

The other thing we have an issue with is you wanted to combine the two properties or put together a combined driveway or easement to that driveway, what we'd like to do is put that on hold because that property is going to be adjoined to the property to the west, which they also own.

One of the items we did have an issue with is the recommendation, and it wasn't a requirement, but a recommendation from the Engineering Department to increase the size of the driveways from 20 feet to 30 feet. Our question is we've been using that 20-foot driveway for 30 years and we've never had an issue, there's been no complaints, we are wondering why we need to widen something that works perfectly fine now.

Also, put a note onto that because it is a recommendation not a requirement, so we would like the Planning Department to waive that issue if possible. We have no problem with the variances, the only variances on this property are the setbacks of the existing building. Keep in mind that this building probably predates your ordinance and we are only talking about a few feet. I understand that the only reason we are not grandfathered in is because across the street on Ten Mile there are residents so therefore that triggers the requirement for variances. If there weren't any residents across the street there would not be a need for us to go for a variance, but since a variance is required, we have no objection to seeking those variances.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

ENGINEERING: We offer the following comments:

1. Combination of both the parcels is required to conform to site plan.
2. Drive approach width of 30 ft. back of curb to back of curb is required on both drive approaches.

POLICE: The Warren Police Department have reviewed the submitted site plan and does not foresee any issues at this time.

AT&T: AT&T does not object to the proposed storage plans. We do have facilities serving the building, but they should not be affected.

COMCAST: We have no conflicts with the proposal, but we have aerial and underground facilities in the area.

MCPWO: The Macomb County Public Works Office (MCPWO) has reviewed the site plan for the project referenced above and has determined the proposed site disturbance is less than one acre and will not require a stormwater review from this office. If a no objection letter is required, please forward your request to Wesley.Jonik@macombgov.org.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Item 3 – Show the picture of parcel 2, so they are not using it is that what you said, it should be grass, the entire location. They shouldn't be parking there; they have no parking spaces indicated on their site plan to be parking there. They need to stay on the concrete driveway that has been there for 30 years

I want to comment also on the thought process of using parcel 3 and connecting that, is to say combining it with the property to the west, that's what the owner before these people 30 years ago told the Planning Commission then and that would have been before then, that's what their thought process was. Over 30 years, that area gets to be a gravel mud pit, so I stand by what I've asked and indicate that 50 foot front setback needs to be grass and it needs to be landscaped.

Mr. Ron Wuerth continues with the recommendation of the Staff:

Item M – One other comment, if you look at parcel 2, the east property line of parcel 2, you might notice that the line runs 10 feet, I've measured, of the driveway. The driveway was 20 feet but sometime in the past, they didn't do it with approval, they added another 10 feet and then up in back you can see where it notches out and they added even hard surfacing. So, if they put the other parcel to the west with this one, what's going to happen there, are they going to chop out that piece and put a fence or something like that and reduce the driveway that goes to the back by 30 feet or will they split parcel 2 and allow that to remain? I don't know, there's some questions here.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Duzyj to approve, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I'd like to find out if you're going to need that scrap dumpster?

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – Yes, we will, it's in constant use because that's exactly what they do. They bring in raw stainless steel and build duct work for factories. They preconstruct the duct work, there's quite a bit of scrap left over, and then they have that recycled. We'd like to postpone this because the client's representative, upon reflection of what Director Ron Wuerth has said, he has decided that he will indeed enlarge the driveway 30 feet, he wants to basically have a chance to redraw the drawings and he also wants to add parking where the gravel mud grass is.

Also, he's talking about splitting that lot in half, giving half of it to the existing building and then giving the other half to the new building so that we won't have an issue with the driveway or the parking, and we think that might clean up a lot of that stuff. We are definitely going to add the concrete curbs along the parking, along the sidewalks. We will go through it and pretty much meet everything that's on the recommendation, instead of saying that we are going to do that we'd like to have the chance to redraw the architectural site plan in order to meet full compliance. As far as the trash dumpster we do need a trash dumpster, we have a little one it's probably 6 x 4, we will put that in a cement dumpster enclosure.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I will remove my motion to approve; I'll make a motion to postpone at the petitioner's request.

Commissioner Hoque – I support that.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Duzyj to postpone, supported by Commissioner Hoque.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's a timing thing, the question is how long is it going to take you to revise the plan?

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – I could revise it pretty quickly; my issue is I won't be in town.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's either we do it the next meeting on the 9th or the 23rd of March.

Mr. Jeffrey Graham – We'd like to postpone until the 9th.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- E. SITE PLAN FOR THE INSTALLATION OF TWO (2) NEW GUARD BOOTHS, SIX (6) NEW CRASH RATED GATE ARMS, ASSOCIATED ENTRANCE/EXIT MODIFICATIONS, AND INSTALLATION OF A SINGLE PEDESTRIAN TURNSTILE; located on the northeast and northwest corners of Eleven Mile Road and George Merrelli Drive; 7111 and 7133 Eleven Mile Road; Section 16; Greg Combs/General Motors (Ryan Debono/PE/HRC); PSP260009.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Ryan Debono – Good evening, Ryan Debono with HRC, located at 555 Hulet Drive, Bloomfield Hills, we are the Engineer representing General Motors for this project.

Essentially what the project entails is security improvements to two existing vehicle lots located off of Eleven Mile. The parcels are across the street from each other on the other side of George Merrelli Drive. The project is going to include installing new guard booths on each entrance to the site and improvements to the gate arms. There's been a lot of thefts of vehicles in that lot, so GM is investing in security to improve the perimeter of each lot. That would involve 6 crash barriers at the various entrances to the site, as well as screening on the perimeter, chain link fence and installation of concrete jersey barriers behind the fence on the property side.

There's also going to be a pedestrian turnstile to be installed for access to the building on 7111 Eleven Mile so the employees can cross George Merrelli Drive and enter the building from that way in a safe manner through a turnstile.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: A building permit/plan review application will be required by the Building Department for proposed scope of work.

ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site indicates that Planning Commission approval should be contingent upon the petitioner's compliance with the following conditions: The parcels are separate, but they provide a combined legal description despite having a public right of way separating the 2 parcels.

COMCAST: We have aerial and underground facilities in the area, but we have no conflicts with the proposal.

MCPWO: The Macomb County Public Works Office (MCPWO) has reviewed the site plan for the project referenced above and has determined the proposed site disturbance is less than one acre and will not require a stormwater review from this office. Prior to construction, a soil erosion permit will be required from this office. Contact our Soil Erosion Department at (586) 469-5327 for more information regarding same. If a no objection letter is required, please forward your request to Wesley.Jonik@macombgov.org.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendations of the Staff:
Remove B, because it's a duplicate of C so it will be re-lettered.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – How many cars were absconded within this area?

Mr. Ryan Bebono – I don't have that exact number, but I know there's multiple occasions where vehicles basically crash through the fencing to get into the lot because GM stores a lot of new vehicles in there, enough to where they want to move forward with this project.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – It's a good idea, when I had my business on Ten Mile, Stellantis or Chrysler, whatever it was back then, used to store vehicles and ten guys would go in there, the first truck would go through the gate, take out the gate, the rest followed out, they would get on 696, and they are gone. I imagine the same thing is happening there.

Mr. Ryan Debono – It will continue to be manned with security 24/7, 365 days.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I wish you all the luck, I don't know if this will fix the problem you have because if someone wants to steal cars bad enough, they'll figure out a way to get around it. Good luck, it's a good idea I hope it works.

Chair Smith – Good evening, on those barriers that are 12 foot long, what's connecting those? I've seen some when they do construction on the highway where they have rods going down through them and some have cables, are these going to have rods or cables?

Mr. Ryan Debono – They are going to have rods; they drop in, they are interlinked, and they are actually going to be tack welded on the top and bottom too so they will be all locked together in a continuous line.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

None at this time.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

REVISED SITE PLAN FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF GAS STATION AND CONVENIENCE STORE; located on the southwest corner of Ten Mile and Mound Roads; Section 29; 5830 Ten Mile Road, 5804 Ten Mile Road, and 24925 Mound Road; Sean Koza/10 & Mound LLC (Hatem Hannawa/B D and E Group); PSP240007. **Minor revisions are for an increase in building size and a decrease in building setback.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Hatem Hannawa – We recently got a site plan approval for a building that was 102 feet. What triggered us to increase the size of the building was we eliminated the storage mezzanine, so we were proposing a storage mezzanine, we decided to eliminate that to keep everything on a lower level. The footprint wasn't giving us the proper

tenants to come in because we are going to have a hot food user. We have a hot food user now that's requiring a little more space so we had the opportunity to increase the size of the building while maintaining the appropriate setbacks.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: Revised documents are required by the Building Department for review and approval for revisions to the building footprint (reference Building Permit/Plan Review Application PB25-001228).

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

1. Provide a complete and accurate written legal description of the individual parcels including the parcel identification before and after the parcel combination.
2. Also, provide the verification for the completion of the platted easement vacation on the parcel.

AT&T: AT&T does not object to this proposal. We do have facilities in the area, but they should not be affected. If any conflicts arise, please advise the petitioner to contact me.

COMCAST: We have aerial and underground facilities in the area, but we have no conflicts with the proposal.

DTE: DTE Electric Company has received and reviewed the revised site plan for redevelopment of gas station and convenience store. DTE Electric objects to the revised site plan for redevelopment of gas station and convenience store; impacting 5830 Ten Mile Road; Section 29; per the site plan provided. Please have petitioner contact DTE Energy at 1-800-338-0178 to discuss site plans and to get approval of the proposed new 12-foot easement. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978.

MCPWO: Our office will need to see plans showing where the stormwater from this site will be going. Not sure if the stormwater system from this site will be replaced, but since it is a gas station and a county drain runs close to the northern property line, will need to see if the stormwater from this site goes into our county drain. If it

does, possibly an oil separator will need to be planned for/installed before the stormwater makes it to our county drain.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendation of the Staff:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Duzyj to approve the revised site plan of gas station and convenience store, supported by Secretary Mouri.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Chair Smith – So you’re adding basically another 600 square feet so you can have a restaurant section in there?

Mr. Hatem Hannawa – Correct.

Chair Smith – Do you agree with all the recommendations?

Mr. Hatem Hannawa – Yes, I do.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

9. BOND RELEASE:

SITE PLAN FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE AREA, USED CAR SALES AREA, AND CANOPY ADDITION; located on the south side of Ten Mile Road, approximately 170 ft. west of Ryan Road; 3930 Ten Mile Road; Section 30; City of Warren. **Approved on October 13, 2008. Cash bond posted in the amount of \$2,500. Site plan expired. Release the bond.**

MOTION:

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

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

A) Planning Director's Report.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Just a few things here because there was a holiday and a few other things happened to me during this time period so it's a little short. We met with Harajli, he was the first person on the agenda, a second time and discussed the issues and hammered out that approval.

We also met with Ken Thompson of Shady Lane off of Warner, they are working on fixing that all up after we had approvals about two or three years ago. They are in phase 1, they have two more phases to go through; they wanted to make some changes to widen out some of the actual parcel plans, make them a little bit wider, a little more room in there, and make them longer so that you can get some larger homes in there. There were other things they had to change, one of the roads would be relocated a little bit and there's an issue with the open space or drainage on the site. I like what they want to do, it's just a matter of will they come back with those changes, we'll see.

I was on the Steering Committee and we reviewed two consultants for the Parks and Recreation Five Year Master Plan and decided Spalding DeDecker was the winner of the contract and hopefully that all gets approved tomorrow night at City Council.

I also had a meeting with some of the Stellantis representatives, in particular Valerie Knoll who is usually the person who comes here representing about five people each time. The location is Sherwood and Eight Mile and it's between the railroad track and Sherwood, that strip, they want to move, it's called a Mopar relocation, from north of us. That whole operation will come in there; it's not a big operation, it's more like opening some doors, I think they had five truck wells combined that they are going to put in and things of that nature it's more retro fit of that site.

I had a meeting with the Mayor and other Administrative Staff, it was actually Michelle and I, it's called the Environmental Sustainability

Task Force, we talked about a number of things. That's about it for me, if you have any questions, I'd be glad to try and answer them.

B) Planning Commission Discussion and Concerns:

None at this time.

13. CALENDAR OF PENDING MATTERS:

None at this time.

14. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Warren Smith, Chair

Mahmuda Mouri, Secretary

Meeting Recorded by: Megan Novak

Meeting transcribed by: Mary Clark – CER-6819

E-mail: maryclark130@gmail.com