

CITY OF WARREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on April 13th, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.,

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, April 13th, 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
Melody Magee – Ex-Officio
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 Administrative Secretary
Lisa Gibson – Office Assistant
Mary Michaels – Acting City Attorney
Don Carriere – Communication Department

1. CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Smith – Calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:
3. ROLL CALL:
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 – MARCH 23rd, 2026:
Chair Smith – This will have to be approved at the future meeting because the minutes weren't prepared in time.
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 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, February 9, 2026, February 23, 2026, and March 23, 2026.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Josh Bratton – Good evening, thank you for your time. So, I want to begin with one important update since our last meeting, the Macomb County Department of Roads has approved our proposed access on Mound, and they have no further comments to our traffic study.

At this point the record is clear and unequivocal. The project has been thoroughly vetted and meets all applicable standards, safety, and compliance. Despite that we still understand that there continues to be opposition from the neighboring property owner, Mr. Lloyd Brown, who has a direct interest in the adjacent parcel and has been consistent in his desire to prevent this use from moving forward. We've reviewed the latest letter from his traffic consultant; as with the prior submission we responded in detail and demonstrated that the comments raised are not only extraneous but ultimately immaterial to the merits of the application.

I want to be very clear about this point; this is not a disagreement amongst the experts, this is a single unsupported opinion standing against a clear and consistent body of professionals. The opposing neighbor's opinion contradicts the opinion of all qualified reviewing parties. Every qualified agency and independent expert has either approved this project or raised no concern. Our traffic study meets all standards set by MDOT and the County Department of Roads. It

concludes that the intersection will continue to operate at level of service B, which is an efficient and strong rating.

Macomb County Department of Roads has approved our access plan and traffic study. General Motors has withdrawn its objection after further review. General Motors independent Traffic Engineer Kimley Horn has found our plan and traffic study to be acceptable, and the City of Warren's own professional Planning Staff is recommending approval. There is zero, not one piece, of objective evidence that demonstrates that this project creates a safety issue or that it fails to comply with the ordinance requirements.

Our proposed use is permitted under the City's ordinance, the standard before this body is not preference, it is compliance, and on that standard, the answer is clear. At some point in this process, we need to rely on facts, data, and qualified reviews and not subjective opposition from an interested party. With that, our Traffic Engineer will come to speak to some of the comments of the traffic study. Thank you very much.

Chair Smith – Thank you, sir. Right now, we will go through correspondence and if we need him to come up, we will do that.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

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

1. Macomb County Department of Roads approval and permits 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, 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 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).

NOTE: Per the correspondence between Mr. Bush, MCDR, and Robert Matko, CESO P.E., Mr. Bush acknowledged two key points pertaining to the project:

1. The site driveway on Mound can be 40 ft. in width.
2. MCDR will not require a deceleration lane or taper on Mound Road at the 7-Eleven site driveway.

The revised site plan indicates the driveway to Mound Road at 40 ft. in width.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Chair Smith – This is a public hearing on this item, a lot of it was about traffic studies which we've had three or four traffic studies done, a lot has been about safety which we reviewed the concerns, and the drawings have been revised to add more safety to the area. The only thing I can think of seems like the petitioner has come in and gone over everything with a fine-tooth comb; they've made additional changes to satisfy the requirements. It meets the ordinances and all the requirements in the City. Unless there's something you can add to what we've already talked about, because everything we've talked about before has been recorded so it's already in the notes. Unless there's something new that hasn't been discussed that may be of interest at this point and time, come up and speak on it.

Mr. Pat Lemon – Pardon me, Chair, I just wanted to make it clear to the Planning Commission that the traffic consultant for the applicant is here and had actually updated his report again to address specific comments that were raised by a project opponent and refutes everyone of them. So he would like to have the opportunity to address those to this Planning Commission and we were also hoping to have the opportunity to reiterate our legal position that this

matter is entitled to approval as a matter of law. We'd like to have the opportunity to do that, but, obviously, you're the Chair.

Chair Smith – Thank you, sir, I was getting to that point, I was going to have him come up and say if he had some new things to say.

Mr. Robert Matko – Robert Matko, CESO, 13060 South US Highway 27 and that is in Dewitt, Michigan. Good evening, Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. You did receive, I'm sure, a packet and you'll probably be hearing opposition again tonight, they may even try and bring some new information to light, but we took that response letter, we provided you, I believe three weeks ago, the response to those comments and I'd like to briefly walk us through some of those concerns. I think the study adequately addressed those comments, but I think, again, going through this, I'll try and make it fairly quick, but I believe, upon conclusion, if you have any questions, I'll be free to answer any of those you may have.

With the first comment that we received about the traffic count data, I think it's been pretty clear we've stated we took all these different counts. We looked at MDOT's counts, we looked at GM's own count that they had a local traffic count preformed, and we took the worst-case scenario, which was the GM provided count, which was done in 2024. It clearly states that in our traffic analysis so in response to this comment in number 1, we actually even included in the report the text that calls out that we used the GM count we grew that by 2 years to come up with 2026 volumes, which again were by far the most conservative. The gates for GM were all open, there wasn't any construction going on and those were the counts that GM also wanted us to use. So again, we used the worse case scenario with that and I think our response clearly shows in our study that's exactly what we did.

In terms of number 2, I think it's the same thing, it talks about the balancing of the traffic volumes and what counts were actually used, and, we just indicate again, refer to response number 1, the GM traffic counts that were provided were used, that growth rate was carried through all of the volumes, not only at Thirteen and Mound but at the site driveways and the crossovers. So again, number-wise, very conservative.

Comment number 3 talks about construction timeline, about 18 months, I've worked on big boxed developments and they don't even take 18 months. Developments such as this, you're looking at 6 or 7 months, somewhere in that timeframe. Granted, the longer this

continues on, it's obviously pushing that date further and further, but 18 months is not what this construction is going to take. I'm sure you all know with other developments here in the City they certainly don't take 18 months to construct, so I think that response clearly indicates what's going to happen there.

Comment number 4, you can see here, there was a comment about our trip generation table in the report, you can see we put a side-by-side comparison, they are identical. Our table has clearly been used, we do numerous studies throughout the state, and we've never had a comment on how the data is shown. We actually do include a percent on inbound and outbound, which I think is important. I think the consultant that reviewed our study shows pass by as a separate line item, if you look to the right in our column, we actually have PB, below in the table calls out pass by trips. So in essence those tables are identical.

Continuing on to comment number 5, concerning the site driveways and how they should be accommodated. We indicated this again as a general statement by the reviewer and we feel that the proposed 7-Eleven site driveway does exactly that. They are designed to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. Not only do we feel that way, but, again, you heard from Josh Bratton indicating everyone from the County to GM, GM's consultant, the City Staff, we've had numerous experts review the study and they all agree that there's no issues or concerns that they have brought up that we haven't addressed.

Comment number 6 talks about the intersection delay and the synchro LOS mythology. We use that because that's specifically what the Department of Roads actually indicated for us to use was the delay that was based on a conversation. We took it one step further, you can see at the bottom of the page this is the level of service in our report, this is the PM peak hour which is the worse hour so you can see we had a B, I believe it's 19.1 second delay. You can see with the HCM 2000 mythology synchro doesn't look at it as a cluster intersection and that's why we looked at the delay. If you use the HCS 2000 mythology, what it does is, synchro doesn't look at it as a cluster intersection and that's why we looked at the delay. If you use the HCS 2000 mythology, which is an older mythology, but it will look at a cluster intersection you can see the levels of service, which takes each leg of Mound Road, it's almost like there's four signals, and it gives you a delay for each of those legs and you can see again they are B level service, except I think

the one direction is a very good level C condition. So, in other words very representative of what we have in our report.

If you go to the next slide, you can actually see, and we included the actual printouts of the HCM 2000 mythology, again clearly coinciding with what we came up with in our report.

Continuing on, the revised analysis shows the right turn lane is not warranted on Mound Road, I think we covered that we had talked to the County, and they agree, in this situation they did not feel a right turn lane was necessary at this site. I think if you go to different areas throughout Mound Road you can see that there aren't right turn lanes, we had this discussion, they actually brought it to the Director of Macomb County and they came back, I think the email was included also, but they will not be requiring a right turn lane or a taper.

I only have a few more to go through. Comment number 8 talks about the traffic volume at Thirteen Mile Road driveway will revise to reflect just below the threshold for a right turn taper. Due to the limited site distance at the intersection approach, a right turn lane would be recommended to reduce the potential for rearend crashes. Again, we only assign the traffic based on, I believe the initial comment was, about pass by traffic.

We worked very hard on this; we certainly aren't (inaudible) to try let's say show numbers that are lower than what they should be. We don't do that, it's not part of our business. So, we do feel that with the pass by trips and what is shown, obviously, a right turn taper is not required nor was it shown in the study.

Also, we eventually get to it, but you'll clearly see that initially one of GM's concerns was not necessarily site distance, but they were more concerned with vehicles turning out of that driveway and adding to the queue with the additional traffic. I think once we moved the site driveway and made that modification it was really to work with our neighbors and trying to appease everyone, and we do feel that the driveway that's there we eliminated any right turn out site distance concern. Also, at the same time we eliminated any concern that GM initially had, that's why they no longer indicate opposition they are okay with what is shown right now.

Again, we will get into the stopping site distance, shortly.

Comment number 9 talks about the queuing summary, it shows 95% (inaudible) which obviously is the worse queue that you could possibly experience during an hour. We will actually show a video, to show you, this is a sim traffic model and it's like you're looking down from a helicopter at the intersection, so this will just kind of show you how, especially this access on Thirteen Mile Road will operate so hopefully we can get that pulled up.

While that video is getting pulled up, I'll jump ahead to comment 10 about the safety review; again, it's obviously the opposition reviewing this and they are talking about Thirteen Mile and Mound Road, what they failed to mention too is the queue length, if you look, you'll see it in the video here. The queue length for that eastbound to northbound kind of left turn that will go into the site on Thirteen Mile Road, the queue length is about 40 feet. What that's saying is, obviously there is enough gap to where that left turn movement into the site on Thirteen Mile Road can be made very adequately. If that queue length for that left turn, where the crossover is, if that were an issue you would see queues two, three, four hundred feet in length and potentially backing up into Thirteen Mile and Mound Road, the maximum queue that was calculated for is 40 feet in length.

Again, that is not an issue, I know what they indicated and we show it in our report, Thirteen Mile and Mound Road, when you have over 4,000 vehicles travelling in an hour on a road, you're obviously going to have certain accidents up and down Mound Road, there's just that much volume. I do know that the volumes have slightly decreased since the improvements were done at Thirteen Mile Road and Mound Road. Specifically, there were upgrades to the signals, pedestrian crossings and of course the Mound Road itself.

I don't know if you all up there can see it or not, what we are showing here is the queue, so you can see coming in the westbound direction you'll start to see a queue up but pay attention to that crossover eastbound and northbound that goes into the site and specially pay attention to the queue there. We let this run for a couple minutes again this is using synchro version 12 Sim Traffic, it is a fairly detailed program.

You can see some of the queues starting to queue up and again this should be noted there's not modified signal timing here, this is the exact timing that the Road Commission has supplied. You'll see now how it just filters and clears out and you can see how the eastbound and northbound is able to enter the site, there is enough

gap. And again, I think the important think to note here is, certainly there is some queue that happens on Thirteen Mile Road, but I think the important thing is how quickly that actually moves through the intersection and also how important the eastbound and northbound can enter the site. I think that's the big takeaway here.

Comment number 11 was there is a potential for increased rearend crashes on both Mound and Thirteen Mile Road at the site driveway locations. Due to the projected turning movements, I assume, if you add one vehicle to any location here, sure there's a potential but what you need to do is review that in the proper manner and have professionals that review this and obviously the professionals that matter in this case have reviewed the study, have reviewed the analysis and have no comments but to have approved what was done. I think that's the big takeaway here.

To add to that too, even in the study we did show that there was only one accident at the site driveway on Mound Road in the last five years at the approximate location of where our site driveway is. Now that's not at the intersection of Thirteen Mile and Mound that's actually at the site driveway. I do understand that maybe a couple of months ago there might have been an accident just south of the driveway, I don't know if this person was reading the phone or something and hit a utility pole but obviously that is not a situation that would be because of our driveway or someone trying to turn right into the site.

Comment number 12 the TIA was not provided to the MCDR Department of Roads for review. The study should be provided for concurrence with the proposed site driveways and proposed operations. We actually have submitted the report to the Macomb County Department of Roads on two separate occasions and have had numerous conversations with the Department of Roads. They were contacted early on, I think we even included in the letter some of the email communication with the Department of Roads and, as stated, they have no further comments on the study other than to say they are not requiring a right turn into the Mound Road access.

We have comments and emails between the County and us regarding submittals, we also have emails included where the County indicates no need for the right turn or taper on Mound Road. We also have communication on the driveway width which the County has agreed to have 40 feet in width, this is from Robert Bush and also the Director of the Road Commission. They've had internal

meetings on that and the decision was about three to four weeks ago when they came up with the decision.

The only thing I might have skipped over was the site distance, stopping site distance, and I think we clearly showed in the letter. We actually put a diagram or exhibit showing the stopping site distance for the vehicle to show that there wasn't a concern for a rearend accident and we did satisfy the stopping site distance. I think what you have before you is a complete study. We've been through every possible entity to have another entity try and review this, I think there was mention of a third party reviewer, the County is there for that purpose, and your own City is there for that purpose.

We had meetings and discussions with GM, we've really tried to go above and beyond on this site. Again, you're going to hear comments from the public tonight, I think it's important to realize the comments that were upon us three weeks ago and how they were addressed. I'm here to answer any further questions that you may have; I thank you for hearing me tonight.

Mr. Pat Lennon – Well that's a tough one to follow, I don't have any visual aids or moving pictures. You know me, I'm Pat Lennon, I'm an attorney with the Honigman Firm. This is our client's fifth appearance before you on this project. We've submitted letters, we've submitted application documents, traffic studies, supplements to traffic studies, videos, 100's of pages of reports and hours of conversation with this Planning Commission. We've diligently answered every question, pursued and obtained all requested information, and put to rest virtually every question that's been presented to us.

Mind you this has all been done in connection with what's called by-right project. A by-right project has been recommended for approval by your own City, by Macomb County, and by every impartial governmental body that's looked at it, other than yourselves to this point. But this isn't news to you because at no point during this discussion have we been told that we don't meet particular requirements of the ordinance because everyone knows we do.

As we all know, due to vacancies on the Planning Commission, we were required to come back tonight, we had a four to three vote to approve, but because of the vacancies we need a 5th vote. We would like to think that a majority approval would be sufficient but under the rules of Warren, in this case, unfortunately it isn't.

I've gone through the legal standards with you before I know it's probably the most boring part of these discussions, so I won't go through them again in detail. You know the project legally entitled to approval under section 5015 of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act because it satisfies the objective requirements of the ordinance. This was made clear in our letter of January 7, and in the January and February meetings. We'll also share the Michigan case law which makes it clear that a Planning Commission cannot generally rely on the blanket excuse of safety to deny an application. In this case, the case of OCS vs. City of St. Clair Shores, a Michigan Supreme Court Case from some time ago, there was a public hearing where a building permit was denied based on general health, safety and welfare requirements. The court held in favor of the gas station applicant in that case indicating that a Planning Commission can't simply just generally deny something based on just safety.

I think you all know what the legal arguments are and what a lawsuit might be, but we are here tonight to avoid that, and we have the chance to do that. We would rather obtain a 5th vote tonight than go down another path. So, as we prepared for this meeting, we looked really hard at the prior meetings and tried to identify every question everyone had and after reviewing and analyzing all the videos and all the information, and all the comments particularly from those of you that voted against the approval we think we've addressed every one of those. So, as you just heard the team here has provided a thorough and professional traffic impact analysis. They've updated it multiple times, they've confirmed it with the General Motor's Traffic Engineer and have refuted all of the comments raised by the project opponent who is really just one group, it's clear that the project will only have a minimal impact on traffic. The traffic study confirmed that, following completion of the development, the intersection will continue to operate at level of service B, that was made clear both today and after the project is done so that is not a significant change.

To make the study even more conservative you heard that they increased the counts by 25% to account for potential changes in traffic. Again, the conclusion was level of service B. In an effort to satisfy some of your requests these are particular things that came at us not necessarily ordinance requirements, it's not been analysis as I believe 4 different dates. The first time someone said oh that was Election Day, the other time someone said that was Martin Luthern King Day, now we've looked at this I believe on four different separate dates, so they've been reacting to your feedback and saying okay you don't want this date we'll try this date; four dates

seems unrepresented to me. I have to tell you, each date, as you've heard, did not change the level of service.

There was a particular question, I believe it was Mr. Duzyj and Mr. Ansar, in the beginning were curious about General Motor's concerns because they spoke at the first meeting. And we were urged and had great effort, the team went and met with them, met with their Traffic Consultant, talked things through, now GM has withdrawn their objections. I believe they are officially neutral with respect to this application, which is a step forward. In an effort to eliminate any concern or argument, they closed the exit from the property onto Thirteen Mile, remember this, this was a big concession that wasn't in there originally but there was concern about site lines and they were willing to do it. You know what else they did, they expanded the width of the driveway entry from 30 to 40 feet. Macomb County wasn't suggesting that, it wasn't necessary, but that came from this team up here and we reacted to that and did it.

If you're worried about who's got skin in the game, or who's working for who's client, think about who isn't. Well, Macomb County isn't, and they've approved this, your Staff, they don't have an iron in the fire, they've also approved it, General Motors, they've withdrawn their objection, General Motor's Traffic Consultant, Kimley Horn, we aren't hearing from them. What does that tell you? If there's a safety concern, wouldn't they all be raising their hands and wouldn't our traffic consultant? Well, that's not been the case. So ultimately the applicant has addressed every comment from the Planning Commission, whether it was emanating from the ordinance or from your request. We feel like we've fully addressed them and solved them and we do not see the safety issue or any issue. So what we would ask you to do is follow your ordinance, and what your ordinance would tell you is that you should approve this project. So we truly hope you do that tonight and we look forward to discussing this further and as needed. That's all I have for you.

Chair Smith – Given all the facts that we've heard in this meeting, and the last few meetings, and the way the petitioners have answered all the questions brought to them, this is a public hearing, if anyone would like to speak on this item, my suggestion would be if you have something new that hasn't been heard in any of these meetings or something different than what's been heard tonight, then come up and state your request. This is a public hearing please come up and state your name and address for the record.

Public hearing open for audience participation.
(Audience portion)

Public hearing portion closed.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Duzyj to deny with discussion, supported by Commissioner Ansar.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – There have been a number of things that have been brought up here, I'm not an attorney, I don't play one on TV, we've got enough attorney's here to have a heck of a good time legally. My concern from the get-go has been that right turn, it's a blind turn and I'm very concerned that somebody's going to get killed in that intersection. The petitioner has gone over and above what could and should be there and they've done a terrific job on changing per meeting, it's actually a very good site plan. The problem is the location of the site plan, if this was on a 90-degree corner someplace, even across the street on Mound, I wouldn't have a problem with this at all.

As soon as you put that right turn from Thirteen Mile Road, and whoever has said that this is not a problem, well, I've been on that intersection, and I've almost gotten creamed by somebody coming up either Mound or crossing Mound on Thirteen Mile Road. It's also been brought up that there has been a lot people that looked at this and agree with it and that we shouldn't even be talking about this in terms of safety or otherwise. Well, at one point in time, the whole world thought the world was flat. I listen to these comments and that's the one thing that goes through my head.

I think Mr. Weigand, the owner of the property, has done a super job at The Gazebo. I've been there a number of times and it's just terrific but pulling into it or leaving leaves a lot to the imagination and it's scary every now and then. Coming into that and going westbound on Thirteen Mile Road after the left where the split between Chicago Road and Thirteen Mile Road is fine but that one turn going westbound Thirteen Mile Road, when it comes to Mound it's very scary. So on that basis I can't support this, if it was on a 90-degree corner no problem, I'd be the first one in line to approve this, but because of this crazy turn on Thirteen Mile Road, and I don't know how this was approved originally, so because of that turn and because of everything that everybody wants to do there, I can't support it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Commissioner Ansar – I agree with Mr. Duzyj, my mom’s house is on Thirteen Mile and Lorraine I take this road 10-15 times a week. It’s been 10 years, I know this road very well and completely agree with my colleague, safety is first. I heard one of our citizens say no, safety is not the main concern. As a Commissioner, when we are sitting here we (inaudible) our resident’s safety, when we make a decision, we don’t favor any party or any group that may benefit them, we always care about our resident’s safety. So, when we make any decision, our priority is always safety, our neighbors, and residents. So, I personally think for this location no, so that is the reason for my vote.

Chair Smith – I have a few comments I’d like to make. I don’t think we are looking at the big picture. You say you don’t want another gas station on the corner, we’ve approved a bunch of four complex units in Heritage Village which is right across the street so more units that are going to be over there in that area.

There are other things that can be done with the traffic, I’ve seen it happen in smaller towns than this. I’ve seen where they put up a sign on the main road that has a flashing yellow light that says if this light is flashing the light’s going to turn so prepare to stop. As far as the right turn off of Thirteen onto Mound you can have a sign that says no turn on red or have an arrow which will allow them to turn on red. So there are some things that can be done with the traffic to cure that problem, but the number one problem is people don’t use their brains. Everybody’s in a hurry, everybody wants to be first, they don’t think about the other people, they don’t respect each other. As long as people don’t think positively about moving in traffic, or making a right turn, or being respectful to the other person on that lane, you’re going to have an accident. You can’t control how people think and with people’s attitudes and everything going on in the world today, a lot of people are impatient. They are putting multiple units across the street at Heritage Village so another gas station probably wouldn’t hurt that area.

That’s my thoughts on this; I think that the petitioner has done a fantastic job putting this together and answered all the questions thrown at them. In my point of view, I’d say it should be passed, but that’s my point of view. That was a motion by Assistant Secretary Duzyj to deny support by Commissioner Ansar, roll call.

Secretary Mouri – I would like to make a comment; I know this project meets all the requirements with our City, we know it does.

However, I personally have to agree with having that flashing yellow light, if that could be placed there, I feel like I would definitely be leaning going forward with this project. I think the way this project is right now, not having that right turn available, and talking about we've had one crash in the last five years in the parking lot, I feel like it doesn't add up. We know Mound is busy, and when you said we only had one crash there, that does not add up to me. After we go through this motion maybe make a condition in there that we have something that approaches with a flashing yellow light or red light to prepare to stop and then bring that discussion up with the Commission.

Chair Smith – Anyone want to comment on that, seeing none, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

- Assistant Secretary Duzyj..... Yes
Based on safety factors.
- Commissioner Ansar..... Yes
Based on safety factors
- Commissioner Holowaty..... Yes
Due to safety factors
- Commissioner Hoque..... Yes
I do not agree because of very strong (inaudible) about the safety issues
- Secretary Mouri..... Yes
Keeping the consideration of safety
- Vice Chair Boniecki..... No
I think it should be approved
- Chair Smith..... No

Chair Smith – It's five to two to deny, thank you for all the work you've put in.

- B. SITE PLAN FOR MODIFICATION OF EXISTING SITE TO ACCOMMODATE TRUCK DOCKS, DETACHED STORAGE BUILDING, AND EXTERIOR DOORS; located on the northwest corner of Sherwood Avenue and Eight Mile Road; 6565 Eight Mile Road and 21555 Sherwood Avenue; Section 33; William Turner/FNLR Straight Six LLC (Johannes P. Palm/Albert Kahn Associates, Inc.); PSP260012. **Postponed from March 23, 2026.**

PETITIONER PORTION:

Mr. Art Sen – Good evening, I'm Art Sen, I'm a Facility Manager for Mopar, a division of Stellantis, we do all the parts and service. The purpose of this project is to update the building to accommodate new parts that we are going to be moving in there from our Marysville, Michigan facility. The parts in that facility are going to be moving to a new location that we are currently building. These infrastructure updates are required to basically improve the material that we are going to have inside the building. Thank you.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: Construction of modifications will require a Building Permit/Plan Review Application to be submitted to the Building Department.

ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded no comments from the Engineering Division.

FIRE: As of now, the Fire Department doesn't see any issues that may hamper our operations for PSP260012.

DTE: DTE Electric Company has reviewed the site plan for modification of existing site to accommodate truck docks, detached storage building, and exterior doors. DTE has no objection to this request impacting 6565 Eight Mile Road; Section 33; per the site plan provided as long as the 10-foot clearances are maintained from the power lines in the area of any new building or expansion of existing buildings. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

This item was postponed last time for the reasons of correction and modifying the plan so it was more legible. We had a meeting on that and, as you can see, they have plans that are very acceptable.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Commissioner Holowaty – Good evening, sir, just a couple quick things. You've seen the recommendations from the Planning

Department; do you have any comments or questions regarding them?

Mr. Art Sen – We plan to work with the City and be a good citizen in our current location, that's why we wanted to stay in Warren. We have our plant across the train tracks from us so we will work with the Planning Commission to make sure we have an aesthetically pleasing building and work with the community in that area.

Commissioner Holowaty – It used to be Chrysler, now it's Stellantis now, and they've been good neighbors and work with the City, so I was just making sure you have no problems or questions. Thank you, sir.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Before you sit down, you came up with a very good site plan. I was genuinely surprised at how much property east of Sherwood, does all that fill up?

Mr. Art Sen – To clarify, one thing is that we are tenants on that facility, so the owner on here, which is FNLR Straight Six, owns the property, our lease is for the entire property there and then currently we are using the lots across the street for our employee parking.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I was surprised at how much land you have for parking on the east side of Sherwood. That's one, and two how many semi-trailers have you got there? Just from driving up and down Sherwood there's over a couple hundred easily.

Mr. Art Sen – Yes, it's in the couple of hundreds. I think everyone has seen in the news that this facility is an important piece of our larger network optimization in the United States where we are consolidating our warehouses. So again, it's been in the news that we are opening a much larger warehouse in Van Buren, and this warehouse has been a critical part of that plan, so we've got a lot of pieces in motion. We currently have extra storage on the site that we need.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Are you planning on hiring more employees?

Mr. Art Sen – Currently what we have scheduled is going to be similar employee count as we work through the plan. The important thing is, and I probably didn't mention it earlier, this facility here will basically accommodate all after-market collision parts for Mopar in the world, so that's Chrysler, Dodge, Jeep, and Ram parts. As far as

the US market we've got parts coming in from Europe that will all be distributed from this location and shipped throughout the United States as well as overseas to any Chrysler, Dodge, Jeep and Ram dealerships that we've got there.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Are you flying into Willow Run or are you using the railroad?

Mr. Art Sen – Currently we're not using rail, it's all by truck.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair Smith – Good evening, sir, I just have a quick question. I know that Stellantis had a warehouse on Nine and Hoover and they had a lot of semis over there, were any of those trucks moved over to this location.

Mr. Art Sen – At the Nine Mile and Hoover location, it's a different group, that's with our manufacturing, our MLM Group, and I don't know their current plans.

Chair Smith – I just wondered because after that one closed down, I noticed more semis over there and I was just wondering if they moved some over there. One comment I do want to make is I think you did an excellent job on the drawing; I was able to read it and understand it. The only comment I have about the drawing is I would like to see a little more dimensions on the elevation drawings. You showed the elevation of the building but there's really no dimensions on the door locations and stuff like that. So, I would just like to see a few more dimensions on the elevation shots, other than that it looks like a very good job on the drawing. That was a motion by Commissioner Holowaty, supported by Assistant Secretary Duzyj, roll call.

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

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I'd like to request a five-minute recess, the court reporter needs to fix something, so if we could take five minutes, I'd appreciate it.

Chair Smith – It's now 8:23, we will take a five-minute recess.

At 8:23 p.m., proceedings in recess.

At 8:34 p.m., proceedings continued.

- C. SPECIAL LAND USE AND SITE PLAN FOR CHANGE OF USE FROM CAR WASH TO USED CAR DEALERSHIP; located on the east side of Dequindre Road, approximately 2,355.8 ft. south of Fourteen Mile Road; 32150 Dequindre Road; Section 6; Eddie Hano/Eddie & Steve Inc. (Alex Hano); PSPSL250002.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Alex Hano – We have been in this car wash since 2007 and we've had a bunch of car wash and competition open up in the area recently. We've wanted to go into a new business, a car dealership, so I'm bringing to you a special land use and site plan to change from a car wash to a used car dealership.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

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

1. Joint access agreement shall be required.
2. Use 24-inch x 36-inch paper for standard Engineering site plans.

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

AT&T: AT&T does not object to the proposal. We do facilities in the vicinity, but they should not be affected.

COMCAST: We have no conflicts with this proposal.

MCDR: Macomb County Department of Roads (MCDR) has received and reviewed the enclosed preliminary plan for the above-mentioned site. MCDR has no objections to proposed development at the above-mentioned site. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (586) 463-8671.

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. However, if any site work extends further west towards Dequindre Road, a permit will be required because the Red Run Branch B Drain runs through the property. If a no objection letter is required, please forward your request to Wesley.Jonik@macombgov.org. Prior to construction, a soil erosion permit may be required from this office. Contact our Soil Erosion Department at 586-469-5327 for more information regarding same.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Chair Smith – Ms. Katopodes, I have a correction I needed to talk to you about. In our findings, on page 14, item I, it says landscaping exist between the sidewalk and street curb along Nine Mile Road, but between the sidewalk and street curb of Groesbeck Highway islands are concrete, I think that needs to be eliminated.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – That should not be there.

Chair Smith – There was another one above, H, it says a 6-foot-high chain link fence exists along the east property line, and the site plan indicates this is to remain, how does that correspond with the fencing that they were talking about in the recommendation?

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – The fence in the recommendation has to do with what's required for the used car lots, it says a fence along the front, the decorative fence, is that the one you're referring to, no that's K.

Chair Smith – That's something different, okay. The chain link fence should not be allowed.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – That's in the front, along the front.

Chair Smith – Okay, I just wanted to make those clarifications in the findings. Thank you.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Mary Clark CER-6819
April 13th, 2026

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Is this the old Menlo Tool building?

Mr. Alex Hano – No, this has been a car wash for a long time, even before we took ownership.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – It looks nice, hopefully it works for you there, hopefully we won't be disappointed.

Commissioner Hoque – Did you talk with the Planning Department, because there are so many recommendations.

Mr. Alex Hano – Yes, we went through everything to make sure the zoning is okay, it took a long time to get to where we are here today. We went through everything, we read through all the laws required. Anything you need changed we will work with you on whatever you need.

Commissioner Ansar – Did you purchase this property to have a car dealer, or you owned it before?

Mr. Alex Hano – We are still the same owners; no ownership is changing.

Commissioner Ansar – Okay, you are just taking as a lease (sic).

Mr. Alex Hano – Yes.

Commissioner Ansar – Did you review all the recommendations, it's a big list; you also have to go to the Zoning Board because there are some variances.

Mr. Alex Hano – Yes.

Commissioner Ansar – Thank you.

Chair Smith – Good evening, number one I'd like to see a little bit better illustration of the mentions on the elevation drawings. The other thing is there's a note on here that the plan indicates no onsite irrigation proposed for the project; therefore, the petitioner shall indicate how they plan to maintain the landscaping on the site.

Mr. Alex Hano – We already have, we have a full-size riding lawnmower, we get enough rain in Michigan, the grass stays green with no problem. Whatever landscaping we put on the site plan we

will follow up with whatever non-invasive species of plant or bush that you recommend, whatever makes the City beautiful.

Chair Smith – The only thing we are concerned about, a lot of times we require irrigation, especially if you have a lot of plants and shrubs. So, we need to know if you have some sort of plan to go out and water them if we get a dry spell, if they don't get enough rain.

Mr. Alex Hano – We can definitely do that; we can figure out some kind of water to take outside and water the plants.

Chair Smith – I'd hate to see you plant all that stuff and then it go bad.

Mr. Alex Hano – It won't, if we are putting that much money in it, it won't.

Chair Smith – Thank you.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- D. SITE PLAN FOR NEW AUTOMATIC CONVEYOR CAR WASH; located on the west side of Schoenherr Road, approximately 156.17 ft. south of Twelve Mile Road; 28877 Schoenherr Road; Section 14; Joseph Paluzzi/JPTH Properties - Warren LLC (Samei Pataq/Clean Hub Car Wash); PSPSL260002.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Keith Lutz – I'm with API, 5101 Williams Lake Road, Waterford, Michigan. I'm here representing, Mr. Pataq, who is the owner of Clean Hub Car Washes, as well as Mr. Paluzzi, who is the property owner.

We are proposing a modern 3,800 square foot single tunnel automatic conveyor car wash. This car wash houses a 115-foot-long automatic conveyor, which uses the latest state of the art car wash

equipment and technology, which also includes 10 high velocity air dryers. The site will offer 17 user friendly vacuum stations, dual stacking lanes for 21 vehicles, user-friendly, well-lit pay kiosks, concrete parking areas, a 100-foot drying lane, and well-maintained landscaped areas throughout the site.

The proposed development sits on an existing vacant parcel which is located on the east side of Schoenherr approximately 300 feet south of Twelve Mile Road. The property is bordered by Warren Woods Middle School to the east, Tim Hortons to the south, and a BP Gas Station to the north. The site is part of a parent parcel which is 1.90 acres which contains Tim Hortons. We are proposing a .94 acre split for the Clean Hub Car Wash development portion. This lot split will maintain existing access drive easement shared with Tim Hortons and Warren Woods Middle School.

Our building is designed to fit in more of a retail type setting. Designed with contemporary architecture, which emphasizes clean lines and has a strong visual tower feature giving the building its identity. Our building uses strong contrast in colors and durable materials including accommodation of brick, split face concrete block, architectural cement board panels. Along with metal trips, facias and awning (inaudible) accent lighting to help accentuate the design.

Clean Hub Car Wash is locally owned and currently operating three locations, including Sterling Heights, Oxford, and Shelby Township. Hours of operation will be 7:00 am to 8:00 pm, Monday through Saturday and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Sundays. Thank you.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: Building will require Building Permit and Plan Review Application for construction of proposed car wash.

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

1. Lot split is required to conform to proposed site plan.
2. Note and show all the existing and proposed underground utilities.
3. Any work in the Schoenherr Road right-of-way shall require a permit from the Macomb County Department of Roads.

4. Accessible space must meet current ADA requirements.
5. Shown stormwater retention must comply with the current City of Warren Stormwater Ordinance.

POLICE: The Warren Police Department reviewed the submitted site plan and anticipates that the proposed shared use driveway (Tim Hortons, Warren Woods Middle School) may create major traffic backups extending onto Schoenherr Road, raising concerns about traffic flow and safety.

AT&T: AT&T does not object to this proposal, we do have facilities in the vicinity, but they should not be affected.

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

MCDR: Macomb County Department of Roads (MCDR) has received and reviewed the enclosed preliminary plan for the above-mentioned site. MCDR has no objection to proposed development at the above-mentioned site. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 586-463-8671.

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 may 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.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Chair Smith – Public hearing open for audience participation.
(Audience portion)

Public hearing portion closed.

Secretary Mouri – I would like to have a discussion; I would like to bring a discussion up with the rest of the Commission, if we can request the petitioner to do a traffic study. Especially due to the fact that this relates to the middle school that is there. There is three businesses that are going to be there that is using one driveway, so I'll be very interested and curious to see what that looks like especially in that interest.

Commissioner Ansar – You have to motion for a postpone date and then we can do the traffic study.

Ms. Mary Michaels – If I may, there should be a motion prior to this discussion.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Secretary Mouri to postpone until we receive a traffic study, supported by Commissioner Ansar.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I appreciate a traffic study there, but even the Police Department list that there could be backups onto Schoenherr. The problem from my standpoint anyway is that there's one driveway servicing three businesses and no matter what the traffic is, believing that there won't be a backup onto Schoenherr would be not thinking this whole thing through. Ron, I'm worried about the cars lining up on Schoenherr, is there any way to get another driveway in there or something.

Chair Smith – That's why we have a motion to postpone so he can look over and see what he has to do complete the traffic study and figure out if there's a different way.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – I agree with it, but after everything is said and done, I think it needs another driveway or something.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Mr. Chair, I think you have to give a time period on here unless you think this is an indefinite postponement.

Chair Smith – Normally when we postpone it would go to the next meeting, do we have room on our schedule, which we don't because it's next week.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – If you're asking for a traffic study you don't get it from the petitioner in one week, that takes time.

Chair Smith – What's your suggestion?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – A minimum two weeks, maybe a month, to do it properly. We went through this the first meeting about traffic studies, you can understand how long they take and if they are contested then it takes even longer. I don't know if that's going to happen in

this case, but it takes time to do the proper job by Traffic Engineers. I'd say a month.

Chair Smith – Seeing we only have one meeting in May why don't we do the first or second meeting in June.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – June 1st or June 15th.

Chair Smith – Sir, would that be good for you?

Mr. Keith Lutz – Is the submittal the same in that situation where we submit 30 days prior to that meeting?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – You submit the documents to us when you have them, but you really need to meet that timeframe.

Mr. Keith Lutz – We can make the June 1st meeting work.

Commissioner Ansar – Can you please do the traffic study on a weekday, on schooldays, and peak hour like 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm, please, so we can get the exact report.

Chair Smith – So that was a motion by Secretary Mouri, supported by Commissioner Ansar to postpone to June 1st, 2026.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- E. SITE PLAN FOR TIRE SERVICE AND MINOR AUTO REPAIR FACILITY; located on the east side of Dequindre Road, approximately 40 ft. south of Goulson Avenue; 22760 Dequindre Road; Section 31; Samir Yaldo/22760 Dequindre, LLC (Steve Dumont/ Designstruct); PSP260013.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Steve Dumont – Designstruct, 23617 John R Road, Hazel Park, I'm here representing this project on Dequindre for Mr. Yaldo. We

worked with the Planning Commission and came up with, originally, we were going to do a used car lot but it was too small for that use, I think you remember that, and working with Planning Director, Mr. Wuerth, and his staff, who came up with a much better solution for the site. It's an existing building there's a lot of non-conforming existing elements on the site that we are bringing up to code and we think this is a good use for this property.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: Building requires submittal of a Building Permit/Plan Review Application for proposed building modifications.

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

1. Show how you intend to drain the parcel.
2. Show and identify the location of all existing/proposed underground utilities in the vicinity of the project including pipe sizes and discharge point.
3. Drive extending to existing building shall not be permitted.
4. Dumpster pad shall be minimum 8-inch concrete.
5. Any construction within the Dequindre ROW shall require a permit from Macomb County Department of Roads prior to construction.

FIRE: In regard to the traffic letter and site plan for PSP260013, in the General Notes section of the site plan states that no vehicle service will take place in the building. However, there is a vehicle lift and service area on the plans. Please have the submitter clarify this.

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

AT&T: AT&T does not object to the proposal. We have facilities in the vicinity, but they should not be affected.

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

DTE: DTE Electric Company has reviewed the site plan for tire service and minor auto repair facility. DTE has no objection to this request impacting 22760 Dequindre Road, Warren, MI 48091;

Section 31; per the site plan provided. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978.

MCDR: Macomb County Department of Roads (MCDR) has received and reviewed the enclosed preliminary plan for the above-mentioned site. MCDR has no objections to proposed development at the above-mentioned site. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 586-463-8671.

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 may 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:

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Commissioner Holowaty – I just have a couple quick questions, what type of repairs will you be doing?

Mr. Steve Dumont – Tire repair, oil changes, nothing major on engines or transmissions.

Commissioner Holowaty – So you don't anticipate any overnight?

Mr. Steve Dumont – No.

Commissioner Holowaty – And what will your hours of operation be.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Ten to five.

Commissioner Holowaty – So you will not store cars overnight there?

Mr. Steve Dumont – No, in and out.

Commissioner Holowaty – Sometimes they have to store them overnight and then you end up with a lot cars on the lot.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Sam will schedule them, if he gets too much on a Monday, which typically happens, he'll schedule Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to come back.

Commissioner Holowaty – Any problems with any of the recommendations?

Mr. Steve Dumont – Everything on the recommendations from the Planning Commission, pages 10, 11, 12, and 13, we are in agreement with all of them.

Commissioner Holowaty – Thank you, sir.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – The only thing that I have is the trash enclosure is next to residential, and I don't know where else you'd put it.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Neither do we, you know those trucks are difficult and that's why we put it at a 45-degree angle in the corner, being that it makes it more accessible. The turning from Dequindre is too tight to navigate that without backing into the building and taking half the building down.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Do you think you need the trash enclosure; you can keep it all inside until you're done and throw it out once a week. The only thing that bothers me is the trash enclosure next to residential, and I don't know where else to put it.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Is that a Planning requirement, I don't recall.

Chair Smith – Mr. Wuerth can you come up and speak to that?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – If he believes he doesn't need that enclosure, if he's got room enough to store inside, then he can take that off of there and maybe put another parking space. He can indicate on the plan with a note that says the garbage will be stored inside the building.

Chair Smith – Thank you.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Would you be in agreement with that?

Mr. Steve Dumont – This is the owner.

Mr. Samir Yaldo – Good evening, I can store the garbage inside the building, in the meantime where can I dispose it once a week would it be curbside. If there's brakes or rotors done it has to be in the dumpster.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – So there's no food?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – The food would just be from the workers. Plus, behind me, I know it looks residential, but it looks like they do some lumber work behind the building.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – That's not a house right behind you, is it?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – The way I see it, it's lumber.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – If there's no house there, I'd say go ahead and put it there, I'm not a fan of putting enclosures next to residential. Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'll support it.

Commissioner Ansar – You just mentioned if motors are done--

Mr. Samir Yaldo – No motors, we don't do motors or transmissions.

Commissioner Ansar – You just mentioned in your speak when motors are done where are you going to put it--

Mr. Samir Yaldo – Rotors, brakes.

Commissioner Ansar – Rotors, brakes, and tire changes, is that all you're going to do?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – And oil change, minimum.

Commissioner Ansar – I go in this area, there's a lot of mechanic shops around there and they say it's a minor tire and oil change, but I see almost all of them doing other things like changing motors and full mechanic shops.

Mr. Samir Yaldo – If you change motors like a transmission they would stay overnight, I'm not planning on them staying overnight.

Commissioner Ansar – I saw a few of them, they say the same thing and then the cars are in the parking lot weeks after weeks having a full mechanic shop.

Mr. Samir Yaldo – I'm not planning on doing that.

Chair Smith – Good evening, sir, there's a door in the building to the south of that, which opens up into that parking lot do you have an ingress/egress agreement with the owner of that building?

Mr. Steve Dumont – No, there's no agreement.

Chair Smith – If you're not the owner of that property you're going to have to have an agreement with the owner.

Mr. Steve Dumont – That property is mine, that property line, see the gate, the adjacent property owner needs to do something about that.

Chair Smith – Right, but that door opens up into the parking lot of his property.

Mr. Steve Dumont – No, that's his property.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – We don't want them blocking the door but this is their parking lot. I don't know if it's an emergency exit or access door to their building that happens to open up into this area, that's why we suggested the access isle for the accessible parking space be placed in an area where it's in front of the other people's door because they shouldn't put a vehicle there blocking the neighbor's door. It's probably an access door, I don't know if they spoke with their neighbor, but the neighbor has a door that opens into their property.

Chair Smith – What would prevent the neighbor from pulling the car in there to go in that other building?

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – I don't think they have access to it that way, they just happen to have an access door.

Chair Smith – It's a regular door so you can access the other building.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – Not the building, just the parking lot. Kind of where their accessible parking space is, that's where I believe the door is at on the other building to the south. So, we just thought if

they moved the access isle so that it's open and no one's door is being blocked, they just need to show it, to get that dimension on there, to be 100% certain that's where it is, but based on what we can see and the field check, it looks like if you swapped it and make sure everything still meets ADA requirements that should address it so nobody's door would be blocked.

Chair Smith – What would happen if they closed that door off?

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – It doesn't matter, it's not their door, it's the neighbor's door.

Chair Smith – I understand that, how will that affect the neighbor if that door is closed off?

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – We are just saying there shouldn't be a vehicle there.

Chair Smith – But if the neighbor has access through a door into that parking lot there should be an agreement between the two owners.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Not to get nitpicky, but we don't have to give him permission to do anything, it's Sam's property.

Chair Smith – Does he own the building to the south.

Mr. Steve Dumont – No, Mike Hancz owns that building.

Chair Smith – Okay, if he doesn't own the building to the south, then he needs to get an agreement between him and the owner to the south, that they can have entrance into that property.

Mr. Samir Yaldo – I'll block it, I'll close that door because he's coming to my property.

Chair Smith – That's what I'm saying.

Mr. Samir Yaldo – Well that's going to be a safety hazard to him probably, if you want me to block it, I'll block it.

Chair Smith – If you owned both buildings it wouldn't be an issue, but being you don't own both buildings, if he has to come through that door into that parking lot then he's coming into your property. So, therefore, he should have some agreement that he's allowed to do that. I know they are putting accessible space there but what if

somebody parks their car there right in front of the door and he can't get out the door?

Mr. Steve Dumont – There's multiple entrances into that building, I know Mike, he's a heating and cooling, I use him as one of my subcontractors all the time. I don't know if you have a picture of the front of his building, he has overhead door, a main door, and several other doors in and out of his building, I don't believe that door coming into Mr. Yaldo's property is an emergency egress door. There can be conversations as a good neighbor, what Planning has suggested is a good suggestion we put the accessibility lane in front of that, we don't have to let Mike enter this property. He could walk out the sidewalk and into Mr. Yaldo's property, there's fence stopping people in and out of that parking lot. I've never seen Mike use that door; I've been in his office. We can look into something, but there's really no onus on Mr. Yaldo to do anything for the adjacent building to the south.

Chair Smith – My issue about the whole situation is if Mike moves and he doesn't own that building anymore and somebody else moves into that building then they are going to have a problem. That's the reason if you have some sort of agreement in place that you've got access that way then it falls in place with the property so if another owner moves in there, he has to be aligned with that agreement.

Mr. Steve Dumont – I understand your concern, but legally this is Sam's property he has to make no concessions to his neighbor to the south at all. If he wants to put a fence up along that wall it's his property to do so, I'm not trying to be aggressive here, but he doesn't have to do anything for his neighbor. To be a good neighbor we will talk to Mike, I can call him when we leave here.

Chair Smith – I have other issues I want to discuss also, that was just one of them. You're going to be doing tire changes and brake changes for rotors, grinding rotors and stuff down, while you're doing these changes are the cars going to be in the parking spaces on the outside and, if so, do you have enough room inside the building to store all the tires, brakes, and materials you'll need to do these things?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – Yes, sir, we do. We can store upstairs and downstairs, there's going to be storage too.

Mr. Steve Dumont – Typically all these automotive places now are on demand, they go get the parts they need for that job, because he does schedule things, so if he knows a Mazda X6 is coming in for a brake job, he'll already have the pads there. It's not like an automotive store where they store for every vehicle, it's just on demand, they go pick them up from their suppliers.

Chair Smith – So a person comes in and they need a set of 4 tires and he's got those tires, he can go out and put them on, so what will he do with the old tires?

Mr. Steve Dumont – He'll store them upstairs until he gets them to a recycler.

Chair Smith – Does he have enough room to store them upstairs when he does that?

Mr. Steve Dumont – Yes, it's like 1,200 square feet.

Chair Smith – My concern is the driveway coming up to that gate in the front, you can't park any cars or work on any cars in that right of way.

Mr. Steve Dumont – They are not going to be worked on in the lot; it's strictly for parking.

Chair Smith – So the cars will be pulled inside the building to work on them?

Mr. Steve Dumont – Yes, there's two overhead doors, one coming off Dequindre and one off the parking lot.

Chair Smith – How much business do you think you're going to generate doing the tires and the brakes and stuff like that?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – To make a living hopefully.

Chair Smith – I guess what I'm concerned about is you said you can schedule jobs and days off if you need to, to prevent an overflow in the parking lot with parking, correct? You'll come in to do what you got to do and then they will leave, so you already know what you're going to need for this particular vehicle when it pulls in, right?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – 100%, it’s like any company, like Discount Tire, when you walk in, if they don’t have it, they’ll send you back and reschedule.

Chair Smith – And that’s what you would do also?

Mr. Samir Yaldo – Yes, same thing.

Chair Smith – Those are the concerns I had. The biggest concern I think is the ingress, talk with the neighbor, like I say if Mike decides to move tomorrow and another person moves in then you’ve got an issue and I think it’s something that needs to be written stating that this is what this is for, for the benefit of both owners. That was a motion by Commissioner Holowaty supported by Commissioner Hoque, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

Chair Smith – See if you can work those things out, I think it’s important, thank you.

Mr. Steve Dumont – I will call Mike, thanks for your time.

- F. SITE PLAN FOR THREE (3) NEW MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT BUILDINGS CONTAINING A TOTAL OF EIGHTEEN (18) UNITS; located on the south side of Twelve Mile Road, approximately 120 ft. west of Van Dyke Avenue; 7602 Twelve Mile Road (13-16-226-019, -020, -022, -026, -044, -045, -046, -047, -061, -063); Section 16; Assaad Sobh/4Ward Development Inc.; PSP260014.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Assaad Sobh – I’m here on behalf of 4Ward Development, my address is 567 Chesterfield Avenue, Birmingham, Michigan. I’ve had this site for almost 10 years; I own the building front, the shopping center right next door to the gas station. We’ve played around with it for a numerous different thing of what can be put

there, because it's a little tight next to Consumers. After meeting with Mr. Wuerth and his team we thought a multi-family would be the thing, the site is beautifully located right at Twelve and Van Dyke, we could always use more housing. I do this for a living, I've been licensed since 1987 as a real estate broker, I'm a property management with a full office. We do our own maintenance from landscaping to snow plowing; we maintain our own properties.

We came up with three buildings that would occupy that site and it would give Twelve and Van Dyke what it really deserves. Consisting of 18 units, three buildings, one building would be west of the Consumers building next to that auto service place. It would consist of 4 units, next to the gas station, six units, and on Stanley Road, it would consist of 8 one-bedroom units.

Secretary Mouri reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: Current.

BUILDING: Building requires submittal of a Building Permit/Plan Review Application for each proposed building.

The Michigan Residential Code 2015 Section R320.1.1 requires where there are four (4) or more dwelling units in a single structure, the provisions of Chapter 11 of the Michigan Building Code (MBC) 2021 applies. These provisions require Accessible Route accessibility.

This project would be classified as a Group R-2 per Michigan Building Code 2021, Section 310.3. Section 1108.4 requires that not less than one (1) accessible route to a dwelling unit to be accessible.

MBC 2021 Chapter 11 Section 1108.3 requires dwelling units to be Accessible Units (Type A or Type B). Section 202 Type A and Type B Unit provides a definition.

Section 1108.6.2.2.1 requires not less than one (1) Type A based on the total of eighteen (18) units.

Section 1108.6.2.3 requires one (1) accessible unit per Table 1108.6.1.1.

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

AT&T: AT&T does not object to the project, but we do have a concern. The site plan shows the existing overhead pole lead through the center of the property. If the pole lead is to remain, there is no issue. If the final plan is to have those lines removed, the petitioner must discuss the relocation with the Wire Center Engineer, Joe Sikorski. He can be reached at js3649@att.com or 586-764-8261.

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

DTE: DTE Electric Company has reviewed the site plan for three (3) new eighteen (18) unit multi-family apartment buildings. DTE has no objection to this request impacting 7602 Twelve Mile Road (13-16-226-019, -020, -022, -026, -044, -045, -046, -047, -061, -063); Section 16; per the site plan provided. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 586-783-1978.

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

1. Provide deceleration and taper lanes per Macomb County Department of Roads standard Detail 11B in MCDR's right-of-way. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 586-463-8671.

MCPWO: The Macomb County Public Works Office (MCPWO) has reviewed the site plan for the project referenced above and has determined this site is under the jurisdiction of MCPWO. This project is impacting and/or discharging to a county asset including one or more of the following: a county drain, county road right-of-way, or other (See table 1.1. in the MCPWO's Procedures and Design Standards Manual for Stormwater Management) (Rev. March 1st, 2024) for further explanation). Any site disturbance over 1 acre will require the proposed site to conform with the MCPWO's Procedures and Design Standards Manual for Stormwater Management (Rev. March 1st, 2024). Review Section 5 for stormwater detention and drain easement requirements. Prior to the site plan approval, it is highly recommended that the design consultant and landowner schedule an engineering meeting with this office to discuss how our standards may apply by contacting Heather Morin at heather.morin@macombgov.org or 586-307-8280.

MDOT: The applicant's site plan does not appear to have work in MDOT Right-of-Way (ROW). Any work (watermain taps, sanitary sewer taps, drainage, or driveway modifications) in MDOT ROW or changes to the drainage system that may impact MDOT's storm water system, will require a permit.

Secretary Mouri – I also have a letter from a resident, so I'll go ahead and read it into the correspondence, this was sent on April 10th, 2026.

My name is Irene Baldrige Elson and I live across the street from this building, 7568 Stanley, Warren, Michigan, 48092. I have lived here for more than 40 years, I am against the building of apartment buildings on Twelve Mile Road, where are these people supposed to park. I feel this is too many people in this small space; I'm totally against this.

We have enough traffic from the gas station, pizza place, hamburger place, and sushi place. This is a quiet residential street, putting 3 buildings of 18 units is unacceptable to our residential neighborhood. We have children on bicycles playing and we do not want this.

Sincerely,
Irene Elson
7568 Stanley

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff:

The Planning Staff is certainly at odds, we don't do this too often, with the MCDR, Macomb County Department of Roads, requiring the deceleration or tapered lanes, per Macomb County Department of Road standard detail. If you take a look at the site plan in front of you, there's already a taper in there, that's the right turn lane for everyone who goes to Van Dyke. What's left, well, room enough for a sidewalk. So where do you put the deceleration and taper lanes? I'll question that and contact those people and find out what they were thinking, because I don't see any room unless they decide to take part of the property and put these lanes in. So, it's got to be explained to Planning Staff.

Chair Smith – Public hearing open for audience participation.
(Audience portion)

Public hearing portion closed.

MOTION:

Mary Clark CER-6819
April 13th, 2026

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Commissioner Holowaty – Mr. Wuerth, correct me if I'm wrong, if I can recall, maybe about a year ago, we discussed something happening at that same corner?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – No, it was a rezoning.

Commissioner Holowaty – Okay so he came forward with the zoning so that he could do this.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – April 22nd they got approval to rezone the property to R-3.

Commissioner Holowaty – Alright. Are these going to be medium income apartments or low income?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – The one bedroom, we are gearing for one person or young couple, so between low and medium, we don't want them to be too low, we want them to be affordable. We just don't want big families with kids, it just doesn't occupy, that's why we are a couple spots short of the parking spots.

Commissioner Holowaty – Warren could use more housing like that, thank you.

Commissioner Hoque – I'd like to ask a few questions, there's three different buildings, right?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – Yes, sir.

Commissioner Hoque – Six units, is it up and down?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – Is it up and down, the first floor will be brick and the second floor would consist of hardy back.

Commissioner Hoque – Will the parking spaces be assigned or park randomly.

Mr. Assaad Sobh – The way they are designed, there's four units on Twelve Mile Road west of the Consumers Building, there's a six unit right behind the gas station, and pretty much the parking close to each building. So there's no need to assign them unless we get to a

point and put numbers on each parking spot where each unit would get one or two depending on how many people are in there.

Commissioner Hoque – Is there a basement?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – There will be a basement for the mechanicals, for the hot water tank and the furnaces.

Commissioner Hoque – A Michigan basement.

Mr. Assaad Sobh – A full basement, we will have laundry on-site for convenience, no storage, there will not be any storage down there.

Commissioner Hoque – Will there be property management, who is going to management the property?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – I have a full staff, which consist of 10 people and my son just graduated from Western Michigan and he'll be joining me. We have a full office at 696 and Van Dyke, we've been there since 2003.

I do this for a living, I have a property management license, a real estate broker license, full staff, we do our own snow plowing, we do our own grass cutting. I'm there on-site with my crew just to make sure the streets are clean and the sidewalks are edged, this project will not disappoint you. I've built homes and they came out absolutely beautiful. I own Table 53 Pizzeria on Van Dyke, the old Taco Bell, and it came out stunning. I'm very familiar with the City, I've been here for a while. I have 41 condominiums on Kennedy Circle and on Hoover between 696 and Martin, since 2008, and they are very well maintained, there's no issues. It's a full-time job; I'm not an investor, I'm hands on.

Commissioner Hoque – You said there's one-bedroom apartments, right?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – They consist of two and one, building number one will have eight units, they are all one bedroom, building number two will have four units, will consist of two bedrooms, and building number three, which is on Twelve Mile Road, will consist of six units, four of them are two bedrooms, two are one bedroom.

Commissioner Hoque – Do you have any idea how much rent will be?

Mr. Assaad Sobh – For the one bedroom, we want to keep them under \$900 - \$950, for the two bedrooms between \$1,150 - \$1,200, that would include water, gas and electric will be separate.

Commissioner Hoque – Thank you, good luck.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Two things, Mr. Wuerth, the MDOT businesses do not appear to have work in MDOT right-of-way so you might as well ask him because there's a driveway coming out on Twelve Mile Road. So, see what MDOT's got to say. When you were reading number 4 with the 10 parcels you mentioned 20, 21, you didn't mention 22, there is no 21, there is a 22, so if you go through the numbers, I want to make sure everything is the way it ought to be. I was actually paying attention.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – MDOT has no interest in this particular right-of-way, it's a county road, you can ignore that.

Assistant Secretary Duzyj – Thank you.

Chair Smith – I didn't get the updated recommended sheet.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – We looked at it in a little more depth, excuse me I was off a couple days last week, so I didn't have a chance to help Michelle review it, we were able to do it this morning. So yes, there's a difference in your recommendation and our recommendations.

Chair Smith – I just wanted to make sure. I do have a question on page three of our findings number F, it says on April 28th, 2022, a letter was sent to Lee Zimmerman, Deputy City Assessor with information including three parent parcels, and it's got 13-16-226-062, 13-16-226-050, and 13-16-226-051. The 226-051 doesn't seem to be listed as one of the parcels that's being included and also it says Lot 64, 14 feet east of Lot 63, and Lot 61 and 62 along with half the vacated alley. My concern was the one parcel didn't show it on the assessment in 22 is not in the provision for the new units, so I don't know what that went to or if it was just overlooked or what.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – All I can tell you right here and right now is we will look into it and make sure we make the correction.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – This is a parking lot that is behind their business, they did a split with one of the lots, half is with this

property and half of it went to that parking lot. So, some of those parcels don't exist anymore because they were split and combined and now there's new parcel numbers that were assigned. That's why they are not the same, but that happened before, when he was working on the parking lot for the commercial building, so that's what that is.

Chair Smith – Okay, very good, thank you. One other thing I wanted to verify, it says the proposed 6-foot-high concrete wall shall be set back 25 feet from Twelve Mile Road property line, that's in your recommendation also?

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – Chair, we removed one of them, if you're referring to the wall from Twelve Mile Road.

Chair Smith – Yes.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – We looked at the plan, it's a little harder to see in the site plan, but the other landscape plan with the wall, you can see that the wall is going to setback like 35 feet so that was removed from the recommendation.

Chair Smith – Okay, thank you. That was a motion by Commissioner Holowaty, supported by Commissioner Hoque, roll call.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

None at this time.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

SITE PLAN FOR TWO (2) NEW STORAGE CONTAINERS; located on the east site of Gloede Drive, approximately 328.8 ft. north of 11 Mile Road; Section 13; 27050 Gloede Drive; Angelo Jadan/27050

Gloede Investments LLC (Pietro D'Aleo/Serra Marko & Associates Inc.); PSP230025. **The Petitioner was required to obtain a use variance for this project prior to being scheduled for a Planning Commission public hearing. The use variance was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals on December 13, 2023; therefore, the site plan application process could not proceed. The Planning Department is requesting a close-out of the site plan project as it was never heard by the Planning Commission.**

MOTION:

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

9. BOND RELEASE:
None at this time.
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 general report on what we've done and what I've done since March 23rd. We've had numerous meetings just to highlight some of them, on the 25th we had a meeting with, I forgot the name of the church, it's on Mound Road right next to the post office, that's the industrial building and there's a lot of shared use, the church is on the top floor. The property expands quite away to the west, enough so that they can put in a rather large stand-alone building in the back. It's probably one of the few places that we still have woods, we met with them and discussed, and it sure looks like they want to do it, we expect to see them come before the Planning Commission.

This was also on the 25th, on the east side of Sherwood there was a truck well and they wanted to put it in the front setback, we try not to do that anymore, there was a time when we would allow that, but we do the best to keep trucks from maneuvering and backing in and using the public road to be able to do that. I don't know if we talked them out of it, but I think we did.

Next, we had the follow-up meeting with Stellantis and Valerie Knol and like I said that meeting went very well as you can see and you got a site plan that you can read and ask questions about.

April 2nd, we had a meeting with a woman named Faye Baker, she is a developer when it comes to residential dwellings, she's already developed one development west of Van Dyke and she's working on the second one, which is off of Eight Mile and Hoover, over in that area. She's also looking at this location behind Shaw Park, off of Warner. Behind the park is this open area, it's owned by the Chrysler Corporation whose property has a frontage on Nine Mile and their property spans way back behind Shaw Park. They wanted to sell that parcel, and she grabbed it up and she wants to put in some more dwellings, so we had a considerable discussion there. She was, at one time, looking at putting a driveway through the park to Warner, we discouraged that particular way of getting access. She can get access to Dequindre, you have to drive down some roadways with some housing that need some work, so she was hoping to get a different way in there.

On the 7th, we met with Home Depot, we've been working with them for quite a while now because of their outdoor sales, whether it's temporary, seasonal or permanent. Right now, they are working off of one of our site plans, I believe it's the 2019 site plan, that they are permitted to do certain things. They tried to do some things last year and it went against our wishes with the City and Zoning. We had a discussion about what they want to do next and they are coming back with another plan before the Planning Commission on some of the temporary seasonal and I think they'll need to get a variance, that's usually what follows and that's what they've experienced over the years anyway.

So that's about it, other than doing findings and answering questions for the public. I wanted to remind you that City Council has their budget hearing for us, the Planning Commission, and that's going to be this Saturday, tentative time 11:45 in the morning. I don't know who is attending, you're all welcome, it's in Conference Room A, that's where our meeting will be with others. Warren, I know you usually attend, and anybody else who is interested please attend, the staff will be there at that time. That's all I got.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes – We are going to be moving our Planning Commission Meetings to the cafeteria in the Community Center for a while. The next meeting will be here, but starting May 11th, until

tentatively September we will be meeting in the cafeteria, our public notices and agendas will be updated.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – We've had meetings there before; from experience, that's not the greatest setting to have a meeting. I've talked to the Communications Director; I'll talk to the Parks and Rec Director, both who monitor everything that goes on at the Community Center to get your computers and that sort of thing because in the past it hasn't been that way. So, we will have a meeting and try to make sure it's comfortable not only for you but for the public.

Commissioner Hoque – How do you schedule the site plans for the meetings, like there's too many on one day.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – I'll say this, there are times when there are too many and we know enough in advance before we send out the agenda to say no, we can't have this on any particular meeting until we've reviewed it and we usually send out a letter. So, if we can get them before the agenda goes out then they're held until we can get them to change the plans and come back with less items, as you see that doesn't always happen. So we give it to you guys, if you think there are too many items, I've seen other former Planning Commissions postpone it until the plan comes back and it's been amended in a much better way. They can use the recommendation, fix their plan, come back two weeks later or whatever it is, and we don't have to spend time talking about it and all the reading. That's an option the Commissioner could use.

Commissioner Hoque – Thank you.

B) Planning Commission Discussion and Concerns:

Secretary Mouri – I think I mentioned this a couple months ago, I'm going to be missing next week's meeting because I'll be out of the country, I just wanted to remind and let Assistant Secretary Duzyj know, I will not be here. Thank you.

Chair Smith – I'd like to thank the officer for sitting in our meeting tonight, sorry it was so long, we tried to keep it as short as possible, but it didn't work out.

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 10:18 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