

WARREN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
May 27, 2015

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Zoning Board of Appeals was called on Wednesday, May 27, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. in the Warren Community Center Conference Room A, 5460 Arden Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Members of the Board present:

Steve Watripont, Chairman
Jennifer Vigus, Asst. Secretary
Jean Becher
Jules Descamps
Henry Brasza
Sherry Brasza
Ann Pauta

Members of the Board absent:

Judy Furgal, Vice-Chairwoman
Roman Nestorowicz, Secretary

Also present:

Roxanne Canestrelli, City Attorney
Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Watripont called the meeting to order at 7:45 p.m.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL**

Motion:

Board Member Descamps made the motion to excuse the absence of Secretary Nestorowicz and Board Member Furgal as they both had things to take care of tonight. Board Member S. Brasza supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7-0)

4. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Board Member S. Brasza stated there was a change that the Board received a letter for item number 9 that is being rescheduled to June 24, 2015.

Chairman Watripont stated motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

is almost half an acre and almost 1,500 square feet of big backyard and if he is going to maintain his big backyard, he needs a big shed to keep all of his equipment and everything for his garden maintaining. The shed has already been inspected by the Electric Department and Building Department; they all gave him the permission to keep it since it is already to Code, but the Zoning has an issue that it is quite a large shed, but it exists and it is to Code and really wants to keep the shed to maintain his big backyard. He has his neighbor also present to support him tonight; he has no issue with him keeping the big shed and also 21120, the other lot, is his property too. Basically, 21088 and 21120 Sunset both are owned by him and at his right hand side; who is his neighbor, is here tonight and he has no issue to keep the shed. So, he really wants to keep the shed to maintain his big backyard and since it is up to Code shed and he wants to keep it.

Chairman Watriont stated he will allow his neighbor to speak when he opens the matter to a Public Hearing and to wait until he says 'Public Hearing'. He gave the reason at this time. He asked if there was anyone in the audience that wishes to speak regarding this item to approach the podium.

Alex Miga, 21044 Sunset, appeared before the Board and stated that he came tonight on his own, his neighbor did not even ask him; he just received this letter. He does the maintenance on his own yard and he was doing it on his neighbor's also until they got equipment; the people that live there. He has a half acre of 300 feet long, he needs a lot of equipment and he could see where they do too, plus it creates a privacy; he has an issue with a neighbor two (2) doors down or three (3) doors down and he would prefer that there for privacy—he does not want to get into details of why—but he would like that.

Chairman Watriont thanked Mr. Miga and asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak on this matter. Hearing and seeing none, he turned the matter over to the Board.

Board Member Becher asked if there is a ratwall under the shed.

Syed Mutaher stated yes it does; the building department already inspected it and they already gave him a pass on it.

Board Member Becher stated that he is telling the Board he has gotten a building permit for it.

Syed Mutaher stated the Building already approved him and the electrical already approved him...

Chairman Watriont stated really that is not a matter before the Board, they just say whether or not and then he has to go to the Building Department and get the permit and everything.

Syed Mutaher stated they already inspected it because he bought the building from a bank-owned and five inspectors have been there.

Board Member Becher stated no, that was not what she was asking.

Chairman Watripont stated regarding the ratwall; there will be another inspection once they approve it and he would have to pay for that inspection and everything else. He has to go and see Lynn Martin and she could tell him what to do from there.

Board Member Becher stated then he does understand that if the Board gives him an approval tonight for his shed that he would have to go in to the City and he will have to pull a building permit for his existing shed and then they will come out and re-inspect it and that was why she was asking him if he had the proper foundation and ratwall; because she went passed his property and he does keep it very nice and it is hard to see his shed from the street because it is directly behind his house. She asked if there was any further discussion from the Board Members.

Board Member Pauta stated she had one question. She asked what the size of his garage was.

Syed Mutaher stated he has a two-car garage, he does not have the exact measurement but he has two (2) cars that he keeps in this garage and after he puts the two cars, he does not have enough room in his garage.

Board Member Becher stated he needs a tractor.

Syed Mutaher stated he has an attached two-car garage.

Board Member Pauta stated right.

Board Member Becher asked if there were any further discussions.

Motion:

Board Member Becher made the motion to approve the petitioner's request to:
Retain his (20' x 10') 200 sq. ft. shed to no less than 3' of the north property line.

Reason being: Not a detriment to the area and size and shape of the property.

Board Member H. Brasza supported the motion.

Chairman Watripont stated there is a motion by Board Member Becher, Support by Board Member H. Brasza; reasons being, size and shape of the property and not a detriment to the area. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (7-0).

Board Member Becher	Yes, as stated in the motion.
Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	Yes, as stated in the motion, assuming that he gets the proper permits and inspections done.
Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watripont	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED**.

Syed Mutaher thanked the Board.

7. PUBLIC HEARING
REPRESENTATIVE:
COMMON DESCRIPTION:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ZONE:
- APPLICANT: Rev. Alberto P. Bondy**
Rev. Alberto P. Bondy, Pastor
32000 Mound Road
13-04-151-001, -003, -004, & -005
R-1-C

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to:

To conduct annual PARISH FESTIVAL on the Church property during the following:

1. September 25, 2015, (Friday) From 5:00 p.m. to 12:00 midnight,
2. September 26, 2015, (Saturday) From 12:00 noon to 12:00 midnight,
3. September 27, 2015, (Sunday) From 12:00 noon to 10:00 p.m.,

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

SECTION 4.35: Festivals require the approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Rev. Bondy, Pastor at St. Anne's Parish, 32000 Mound Road, Warren, appeared before the Board and stated he is requesting a variance to have their festival from the 25th of September to the 27th.

Chairman Watripont stated this is a public hearing, anyone wishing to speak on this item. Hearing and seeing none, he turned the matter over to the board.

Board Member S. Brasza stated if there was no discussion...

Chairman Watripont stated he had a couple of questions but he was going to wait and let other Members ask.

Board Member Becher stated she knows that Father Bondy runs a pretty tight ship over there when it comes to the festival and she was just wondering what time in the evenings is he planning on turning off the music on the rides; those really loud rides?

Rev. Bondy stated usually about 10:30 p.m.

Board Member Becher stated that sounds wonderful and she is glad that he mentioned that.

Rev. Bondy stated alright; he does not like it either (Laughter).

Board Member Becher stated well it was just that his neighbors are right on top of them.

Rev. Bondy stated right, they have to think about others.

Board Member Becher thanked Rev. Bondy.

Chairman Watriont asked if this was the same setup as it was in the past couple of years.

Rev. Bondy stated yes.

Chairman Watriont asked nothing has changed with that?

Rev. Bondy stated no.

Chairman Watriont stated because they did not have the previous variances on their sheets to say what everything was at this time; unless someone has them with them?

Board Members responded with a no.

Chairman Watriont stated okay and asked if anyone else had any questions?

Board Member S. Brasza stated if not, she would like to make her motion.

Motion:

Board Member S. Brasza made the motion to approve the petitioner's request to: Conduct annual PARISH FESTIVAL on the Church property during the following:

1. September 25, 2015, (Friday) From 5:00 p.m. to 12:00 midnight,
2. September 26, 2015, (Saturday) From 12:00 noon to 12:00 midnight,
3. September 27, 2015, (Sunday) From 12:00 noon to 10:00 p.m.

With the **Condition**, the music would be turned off at 10:30 p.m.

Reason being: Needs approval of the Board.

Board Member Pauta supported the motion.

Chairman Watriont stated there is a motion by Board Member S. Brasza, Support by Board Member Pauta, to approve the variance as written with the **Condition** that the music on the rides and everything, be turned off at 10:30 p.m. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (7-0).

Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Becher	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watriont	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion; good luck this year again.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED**.

Rev. Bondy thanked the Board.

8. PUBLIC HEARING **APPLICANT: Elizabeth OJO-Kids Avenue LLC-USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Ronald Kachman
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 7600 Ford
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-33-230-013
ZONE: R-1-P

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to: -USE-

1. Establish a play area for a state licensed day care facility at 22605 Van Dyke.
2. Waive the required wall/greenbelt adjacent to residential and allow a four (4) foot chain link fence.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 8.01 Uses in R-1-P (a): uses permitted in R-1-C; (b) parking of private passenger motor vehicles.

Section 2.26 (a): wall or greenbelt requirements adjacent to residential uses.

Chairman Watriont asked the individual at the podium to state his name and address for the record.

Ron Kachman, Design and Construction Group, 291 Elmwood, Troy, Michigan, appeared before the Board.

Chairman Watriont asked for the reason for the petition.

Ron Kachman stated they are present before the Board to use a vacant lot near her property; she (meaning the owner) is establishing a daycare center and wants to use the lot as a play area. As being part of the commercial zoning they have to request the Use Variance to utilize that and also they are requesting to just put a chain link fence up to minimize the impact of the area; it is just going to be a kids play area, and they are hoping this would minimize the area and also just to keep the safety of the kids and so forth in that area.

Chairman Watriont stated okay and asked if he had anything else to add.

Ron Kachman stated that was all.

Chairman Watriont stated okay; this is a public hearing, anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item to approach the podium. He asked the individual at the podium to state her name and address for the record.

Lark Samouelian, One City Center, Warren, Michigan appeared before the Board and stated she is the DDA Director for the City of Warren and she is also the TIFA Director and they were very pleased to be supportive of Ms. Ojo who bought a building in the TIFA District and the TIFA Board over several years had purchased some of the property behind the businesses to be able to be supportive initially for parking because there is no parking on Van Dyke, but also whatever need would come up for the commercial environment. She approached their Board and spoke before them that she was all ready to go and when she bought the building, there was a school a couple of blocks away with a playground and the State considered that to be fine, but by the time she finished the purchase process, the school and the playground were gone, so she was in a pickle; she had this building and could not go any further, so she came before the TIFA Board and they took their time and investigated it themselves and then declared to her that they were very happy to be supportive of the business. There is a plot and it is just like right kitty corner to the back and they talked to the neighbor business that is right in front of that and she was happy to have the neighbor in the neighborhood and so the TIFA Board sold her the property—in the process of selling her the property—with the understanding then that she would follow through with these processes and Ms. Ojo has been with them and keeping in communication with them all along and the TIFA Board is certainly looking forward to having the Zoning Board of Appeals support so they could support a very much needed...; the reason she brought the daycare center; she already has a daycare center elsewhere and she was getting Warren residents and that was why she went and bought a distressed building and enabled it and has the architect to upgrade it, and so she could serve Warren resident that they could be right near their home. That is all she has to say.

Chairman Watriont thanked Lark Samouelian and asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak.

Kyle Atkins, 8316 Cadillac, appeared before the Board and stated he has been watching the Board a whole lot, but he has not been around much and the reason he has not been is if the Board could see (deep inconsistent breathe) he has a problem breathing. Anyhow, he is the president of the Lincoln Neighborhood Association. He is also the agent for the rental property next door at 7600 Ford. The people that own that Elkaminss LLC, and he just has to say this. First of all Elizabeth I does not have anything against her and he wants to make that good and plain, but he definitely does not feel; most of them know where the South end is and he is not down there—but since that alley runs right through between this property and the barber shop, although the paperwork says that she is willing to put up a four (4) foot fence; a four (4) foot fence is not going to keep people out of that park. You may ask how he might know, well if they stop to think just a minute and there is no four (4) foot fence but look what they have at Toepfer Park; confidea at one side and down the other and he is afraid that they are going to have the same problem here on Ford and another thing, if he understands what he thinks he understands, her building is going to be on the right side of the street; is that correct?

The individual at the podium's response: Yes.

Kyle Atkins stated the playground that she is wanting is going to be on the left side of the street and those kids are going to have to walk back and forth across that street. He just does not feel it is safe, he does not think it is a good idea but he would like the Board to think about this and to tell her that that was the first time he has seen her but he is not doing this because he does not like her not at all, but he is trying his best to do it for the safety of the children. He thanked the Board.

Chairman Watripont thanked Mr. Atkins and asked if anyone else wishing to speak in the audience. Hearing and seeing none, he turned the matter over to the Board. Before he answers anyone else's questions, he does have that concern with the kids crossing the street as well. He does not know what type of playground equipment they are going to have in there and so forth and the fact of the four (4) foot fence, he does feel is not a deterrent for the area as well. As he looked at their plan and everything else; was it possible for that area could be made a parking lot and they could put a play area in the back where the parking lot currently is; is that possible? That is his question. He turns this matter over to the Board for other questions as well as he listens to the petitioner's answer.

Ron Kachman stated the city owns the property in the parking behind it and they will not change it.

Chairman Watripont stated he thought that was part of it, so, he thanked Mr. Kachman.

Ron Kachman stated yes, they will not. That was the reason they are doing what they are doing too also.

Individual at the podium stated: And if she could just to ...

Chairman Watriont asked the other individual at the podium to state her name and address also.

Elizabeth Ojo, 4397 Hycliffe, Troy, Michigan appeared before the Board and stated she thinks they offer the opportunity but it has been a long journey. First and foremost, the first thing that jumped out in making the choice of the building was the safety of the children, but with State Licensing, she would have their understanding that children could walk with adult supervision even to a park in the neighborhood; that was one of the pluses and also the choice of that building was initially to have a hope of putting in an indoor playground as well to serve all seasons; but what really made it a big highlight was the hope of the neighboring school park, but either way, if they are going to be able to use the neighboring park, was to have to walk the children over there and even with playgrounds that are attached to the building, they still cannot go there without adult supervision; that is just a very big clause in the licensing of any childcare center, so she hopes that she answered the question that them being able to cross the street, they will always be with adult supervision.

Board Member Pauta asked how many children she would have attending approximately; average?

(Ron Kachman and Elizabeth Ojo converse between each other) Ron Kachman asked Elizabeth Ojo how many kids at a time?

Elizabeth Ojo stated how many about 50?

Ron Kachman asked her how many does she take across the street at a time though, because they go in different sections.

Elizabeth Ojo asked Board Member Pauta if that was her question and stated they do not all go at the same time, they go in sections, so as an example; if toddlers are going, they are going to have two (2) teachers to about six (6) toddlers and if infants are going, there are always going to be two (2) teachers; older children and when she means older she means three (3), four (4), five (5) year olds; they will have a teacher to about eight (8) children.

Board Member Pauta stated so it is pretty much State regulated then?

Elizabeth Ojo stated yes, Ma'am.

Board Member Pauta stated she agrees with her colleague, she thinks that that fence should be higher, if that is not a problem.

(Elizabeth Ojo asked Mr. Ron Kachman can they? That the Board Member thinks the fence should be higher; six (6) feet maybe?)

Ron Kachman stated they are not trying to protect the kids, the six (6) foot fence; no kid is going to climb over a four (4) foot fence with supervision anyways, it is just to keep the kids a little bit safe from the area and everyone in that whole subdivision and all the kids that play in that area are all on a four (4) foot fences. He means this was not different than kids playing in their own backyard, there would be supervision there, and a four (4) foot fence would be plenty high enough while there is supervision. Now to keep other kids from climbing in, they could climb more the wall behind the building, they do that all of the time, but they feel the four (4) would be just like the neighborhood more and it would be in tuned with everything else that is around there, so they do not think a six (6) foot fence would be necessary.

Board Member Pauta stated well, are they going to be allowing other children from the neighborhood to play in that playground?

Ron Kachman stated no; it is only for the daycare. They are licensed to have just so many kids and they take care of those so many kids to play in that play area.

Board Member Pauta asked if the gates are going to be locked as the children come in.

Ron Kachman stated yes.

Elizabeth Ojo stated yes, they will be and that is just to make sure that they prevent against the neighborhood children just going in and out of the environment unsupervised.

Board Member Pauta stated well she would still like to see a six (6) foot fence though.

Board Member Becher stated she likes her idea and she knows that children need fresh air and she realizes that she is planning on having a supervised area and to tell her the truth, she grew up in that neighborhood, and so she knows what it was like. She asked what kind of equipment the petitioner was planning on putting in the play area.

Elizabeth Ojo stated they were mandated by the State to provide children safe equipment and what she is trying to explain is that they have people that are assigned by the State to certify their playground so they have to be able to provide children—child safe playground equipments there.

Board Member Becher stated she was just wondering, but she is planning on putting like swings or something of that nature in; because she is just not going to take those kids over to an empty fence lot.

Elizabeth Ojo stated no, absolutely not. Yes, they are planning on putting playground equipments in there.

Board Member Becher stated okay and as far as not having the wall, she thinks that was a superb idea because then they are not closed in and that was one less place for graffiti to be sprayed, if they have an open chain link fence. She is all for her idea.

Elizabeth Ojo stated yes and thanked Board Member Becher.

Board Member H. Brasza asked between this lot and Van Dyke what was between them; is there a parking lot right there where the lots are, is it just a barber shop, was that the only thing there?

Elizabeth Ojo stated yes, the barber shop.

Board Member H. Brasza asked if there was an alley there.

Ron Kachman stated there is an alley there; yes. They are on the west side of the alley.

Board Member H. Brasza asked how often she thinks they would be having the kids out there; is it going to be like once or twice a day?

Elizabeth Ojo stated they are mandated at least a couple of hours a day.

Board Member H. Brasza stated especially during the summertime.

Elizabeth Ojo stated during the summer; yes, but during winter, at least weather permitting they just need about 10 to 15 minutes of natural air.

Board Member H. Brasza stated right; he thinks it is a good idea; he thinks it is an improvement to the area, so he is in favor of it of the way it looks right now.

Motion:

Board Member Becher made the motion to approve the petitioner's request to:

1. Establish a play area for a state licensed day care facility at 22605 Van Dyke.
2. Waive the required wall/greenbelt **with the Condition** of the fence being twenty-five (25) feet from the north lot-line and adjacent to a residential to allow a four (4) foot chain link fence.

Board Member Becher asked the petitioner that she will be putting the fence twenty-five (25) feet from the lot-line, correct?

Ron Kachman stated yes.

Reason being: Not a detriment to the area, size and shape of the lot and needs approval of the Board.

Board Member Pauta supported the motion.

Chairman Watripont stated there is a motion by Board Member Becher, Support by Board Member Pauta, to approve it as written. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (6-1).

Board Member Becher	Yes, as stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	Yes, as stated in the motion.
Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion, and just a reminder to call her insurance agent; she has to add that property to her liability.
Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watripont	No, because he thinks the petitioner is going to have problems down the line and he is only looking out for their best interest at this time.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED** as written with the **Condition** on variance #2 to 'Waive the required wall/greenbelt **with the fence being twenty-five feet (25') from the north lot line** adjacent to residential and allow a four (4) foot chain link fence')

Ron Kachman stated that is for the use and the...nothing was stated in the use.

Chairman Watripont stated it is for the whole petition as requested.

9. PUBLIC HEARING **APPLICANT: Mr. Ali Jizzini-USE-**
REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Ali Ralchouni
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 24660 Schoenherr Road (entire site)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-25-101-005
ZONE: M-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to: -USE-

1. Waive seventy-eight (78) required off street parking spaces for inside auto salvage.
2. Continue a six (6) foot chain link fence in the front setback as per the plan.
3. Continue hard surfacing in the front setback for parking as per the plan.
4. Allow a seventeen (17) foot maneuvering lane in the rear as per the plan.
5. Allow outdoor storage of 11,842 sq. ft. for salvage vehicles as per the plan. All salvage to be inside the building. (Open storage is less than ½ of the total building square footage.)

John Wyeth, First Industrial Realty Trust, appeared before the Board and stated that he was present for 5500 Enterprise Court.

Chairman Watriont asked for the reason for his petition.

John Wyeth stated the reason for their petition is that their tenant is a U.S. Government facility that requires a secure perimeter for their facility. This decorative fence would act as a deterrent to pedestrian traffic approaching the building for security reasons. The additional pointed finials would just cap the individual pickets of the wrought iron style aluminum decorative fence.

Chairman Watriont stated this that was a public hearing, anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item to approach the podium.

Evelyn Walker 28518 Grobbel, appeared before the Board and stated she is right behind the building and as it is right now she does not know if they are planning on putting any extra lights up, but as it was right now there are lights all night long; she has not been able to use their deck in the night time for years and she is hoping that they are not going to be putting any more lights up. She would like to see them having indirect lights instead of having lights on the wall and on the roof. Because those are two (2) big buildings and their lights are the only ones lit up. She is inside her house and the lights are lit up all night long.

Chairman Watriont thanked Mrs. Walker and stated the Board has a letter to be read into the record.

Board Member Vigus read the letter: "Dear Board, I am opposed to the fencing of subject address, in this industrial site, as it is aesthetically displeasing and visually non-conforming. I am afraid that the surrounding property values will decrease, simply because it looks strange and out of place. As their site is directly west, and adjacent to my building, I would be concerned as to how many feet from the property line they propose to erect the fence? As my building is ON the property line, a fence would hinder painting and other maintenance issues. These three issues are of grave concern." Signed by Arlene Atikian, at 5590 Enterprise Court.

Chairman Watriont stated this is a public hearing; hearing and seeing no one else, he turned the matter over to the Board.

Board Member Becher stated as for the first person who spoke regarding their lightings, since the Board is not dealing with the lighting she thinks that she should be directed to call the city because they have rules in place that if their lights are shining onto her bedroom and onto her property that she should call the city and the problem could be addressed. They could redirect their lighting that they are only lighting their property and not someone else's property. Also, she went through her packet; she asked if the representative had a rendering of the fence they want to put up?

John Wyeth stated he has some pictures. *(He passed photos to the Board)*

Board Member Becher stated she worked for a defense contractor so she understands the thing about the security of the fence *(referring to the photos)* and these are the spears they want to put on top the caps? This is with the decorative spears, was this what he was speaking of?

John Wyeth stated yes, and...

Board Member Becher stated the white fence?

John Wyeth stated it would be a black fence.

Board Member Becher stated a black fence but that would be the style they want to use?

John Wyeth stated yes it would be. They would replace the existing concrete barriers that are at the site.

Board Member Becher stated that would be an improvement then. She also noticed they had several large rocks in front of their building, she assumes they are going to put the fence...they are going to leave the rocks outside and put the fence on the other side of the rocks?

John Wyeth stated yes, the fence would be on the building side of the rocks, so farther offset from the road up by the sidewalk.

Board Member Becher stated okay and they are going to leave the rocks in place?

John Wyeth stated they are evaluating that, they are planning on it at this point for more of a decorative element.

Board Member Becher stated okay she understands his request and thanked Mr. Wyeth.

Board Member H. Brasza stated in regards to the letter that was read into the record; what was their plan to do as far as the adjacent building and the fence up to the building, inside the property line and that type of thing.

John Wyeth stated the fence would actually stop at the front of their building and the side of their building that is right up against the property line would be free actually; they are kind of using that as the wall for the fence that will stop. So there would be no fence between that building and their property. It will be free access to the side of that building.

Board Member H. Brasza stated so if they need access to paint and things like that maintenance issues, there would be no issues?

John Wyeth stated correct, absolutely, they would have free access to pain the building.

Chairman Watripont stated they would have to go onto their property anyways, so hopefully there is some understanding.

John Wyeth stated they would be welcomed to that.

Board Member H. Brasza asked if no other Board Members had any further comments, he would like to make his motion.

Motion:

Board Member H. Brasza made the motion to approve the petitioner's request to:

1. Install a six foot (6) decorative fence and gates in the front setback as per the plan.
2. Install spear top on decorative security fence in front and along the side of the facility as per the plan.

Reason being: Not a detriment to the area and needs approval of the Board.

Board Member Descamps supported the motion.

Chairman Watripont stated there is a motion by Board Member H. Brasza, Support by Board Member Descamps. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (7-0).

Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Becher	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watripont	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED**.

John Wyeth thanked the Board for their time.

11. PUBLIC HEARING

**APPLICANT: The Project Collaborative /
Kroger Fuel Station**

REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Matthew Pisko
COMMON DESCRIPTION: 13700 14 Mile
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 13-01-101-009
ZONE: C-2

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to:

Permission to install the following wall signage:

1. Five (5) Fuel Dispenser signs 27.49" x 7.50" = 1.43 sq. ft. each (total 7.15 sq. ft.)
2. Five (5) Valance Graphic signs 8.02" x 8.03" = .045 sq. ft. each (total 2.25 sq. ft.)
3. One (1) changeable copy sign on the kiosk 1'-6" x 7'-3" = 10.88 sq. ft.
4. Two (2) changeable copy signs on the kiosk 1'-6" x 4'-3" = 6.38 sq. ft. each (12.76 sq. ft.)
5. One (1) vinyl fixed graphic sign 3" x 7'-3" = 1.81 sq. ft.
6. Two (2) vinyl fixed graphic signs 3" x 4'-3" = 1.06 sq. ft. each (total 2.12 sq. ft.)
7. One (1) 1'-8" x 1'-3" = 2.08 sq. ft.

Total 39.05 sq. ft. in addition to the existing wall signs 35.29 sq. ft.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4A.35 (c): Total wall signage of a size not to exceed forty (40) sq. ft. shall be allowed for each business in C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1 and M-2.

Chairman Watriont asked the individual at the podium to state his name and address for the record.

Stephen Webster, The Project Collaborative, 37704 Hills Tech Drive, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48331, appeared before the Board and stated he is representing the Harvard Development Company, owner of the property and the public company of Michigan.

Chairman Watriont stated the Board has Mr. Matthew Pisko as the representative listed; does he have a business card?

Stephen Webster stated he has a...

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated if they look at the Affidavit of ownership, his name is on there as well.

Chairman Watriont stated his name is on there?

Stephen Webster stated yes.

Chairman Watriont stated he will allow it then.

Stephen Webster stated yes, Matthew is in Mount Pleasant this evening (slight laughter) attending another public hearing.

Chairman Watriont stated okay; and/or it says, but it was not written that way. Okay, and asked Mr. Webster to proceed.

Stephen Webster stated okay; they are present to request the additional signage for the fuel station. Originally when it was constructed they had dispenser graphics, the Kroger Logo on the dispensers, the symbol on the valance, and some changeable copy signs with the product offerings inside the kiosk for sale; they were told those exceed the forty (40) square feet allowance and they had to remove those temporarily and apply for the ZBA application; as they have looked around the City of Warren, he does not think there is a fuel station around here that does not have graphic on their dispensers, on the doors and on the valances. Most of them exceed the forty (40) square feet allowed for signage on canopies alone on building signage; they are not asking for relief for a self-imposed hardship, that was something that is written into the zoning ordinance and they are just trying to ask for fair competition with their competitors in the City.

Chairman Watriont stated this is a public hearing, anyone wishing to speak on this item to approach the podium. Hearing and seeing none, he turned the matter over to the Board. (*Directed to Mr. Webster*) So, these were there before and they have taken them down once they were notified and asking for...because he lives right at 14 and Schoenherr, so he knows he had seen them before and he had no problem with them before, so he has no problem with this request.

Board Member Becher stated he just had a question; she has no problem with the signage she thought their sign package would look very nice and everything but as she was leaving the shopping center and she drove down by the store, she noticed they had all those outdoor sales. They are selling landscaping product and she does not have the list of their previous variances for that particular piece of property and she does not remember anybody coming and asking permission to have those outdoor sales in front of the grocery store so she is just real curious about that.

Stephen Webster stated he could not address that at the moment. He means if they are at the store he is associated with the fuel station product and consultant for Kroger's, so...

Board Member Becher stated well, they have this rule in the City that if they are going to have outdoor sales they have to get permission, so she is just real curious about that one.

Stephen Webster stated he knows. They have had other fuel stations in the City as well where they had outdoor sales and those had been removed as well for the time being, because they were not part of the site plan approval. This store the fuel station is not allowed to have...

Board Member Becher stated she is sure the other Kroger stores are doing the same thing that the Kroger's store at 14 and Schoenherr is doing and selling plants outside; they are supposed to get permission for that. She just thought it was the same corporation and that was why she brought it up; she thanked Mr. Webster.

Board Member Pauta to Lynn Martin, stated that her colleague is very correct in expressing outdoor sales like not just Kroger's but everywhere and she knows with their many inspectors that they have on hand that they have all kinds of time to notify these people.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated every time they notify a store then the manager changes and everything gets lost in the translation.

Board Member Pauta stated in the shuffle.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated Ron Wuerth in Planning has been after people to get their outdoor sales, site plan approval, and then they have to come back here every year. If they want she will have an inspector in that area, send notices or drop it off at the manager's.

Board Member Pauta stated that would be fine.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated okay?

Board Member Pauta stated yeah because she really has a bug about Menards; they have been doing everything not according to the book.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated okay she will have her inspectors at each of the Kroger's.

Board Member Pauta stated okay and thanked Mrs. Martin.

Board Member Descamps to Mr. Webster stated he understands he has no control over the actual store outside sales and he just had to listen to that for a minute.

Stephen Webster stated that was fine (slight laughter) and he could address it with the people that do have control.

Board Member Descamps stated he hopes he does. He asked if there were any other questions, he would like to make a motion.

Motion:

Board Member Descamps made the motion to approve the petitioner's request as written. Permission to install the following wall signage:

1. Five (5) Fuel Dispenser signs 27.49" x 7.50" = 1.43 sq. ft. each (total 7.15 sq. ft.)

2. Five (5) Valance Graphic signs 8.02" x 8.03" = .045 sq. ft. each (total 2.25 sq. ft.)
 3. One (1) changeable copy sign on the kiosk 1'-6" x 7'-3" = 10.88 sq. ft.
 4. Two (2) changeable copy signs on the kiosk 1'-6" x 4'-3" = 6.38 sq. ft. each (12.76 sq. ft.)
 5. One (1) vinyl fixed graphic sign 3" x 7'-3" = 1.81 sq. ft.
 6. Two (2) vinyl fixed graphic signs 3" x 4'-3" = 1.06 sq. ft. each (total 2.12 sq. ft.)
 7. One (1) 1'-8" x 1'-3" = 2.08 sq. ft.
- Total 39.05 sq. ft. in addition to the existing wall signs 35.29 sq. ft.

Reason being: Size and shape of the lot, needs approval of the Board, not a detriment to the area and lack of identification.

Board Member S. Brasza supported the motion.

Chairman Watripont stated he has a motion by Board Member Descamps, Support by Board Member S. Brasza for needs approval of the Board, not a detriment to the area, lack of identification. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (7-0).

Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Becher	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	Yes, reluctantly, as stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watripont	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED**.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 12. PUBLIC HEARING | APPLICANT: Julian Auto Sales/ Vazkin Awades |
| REPRESENTATIVE: | Mr. Kerm Billette PCP |
| COMMON DESCRIPTION: | 20735 Albany |
| LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | 13-32-482-031 |
| ZONE: | R-1-P |

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to:

1. Permission to increase from 13 to 28 vehicles to be stored on property Zoned R-1-P, as per the plan.
2. Permission to hard surface to no less than one (1) foot of the Albany property line for parking vehicles being stored.
3. Allow an eight (8) foot fence and gate for 40' to no less than one (1) foot of the front property line on Albany and along the front property line.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 8.05 Front Yard in R-1-P Zone: Front setback shall not be less than twenty-five (25) feet.

Section 4D.07 Setback requirements (fences): Walls, fences, landscape screens shall conform to the setback requirements for the zoning district, unless otherwise provided in this article.

Chairman Watriont asked the individual at the podium to state his name and address for the record.

Kerm Billette, 38628 Warwickshire Drive, Sterling Heights, 48312, appeared before the Board and stated he is in attendance tonight representing the petitioner on the problems that come with the site plan approval at the Planning Commission. The Board of Appeals has approved all of the items on there and when they went to the Planning Commission for site plan approval, they found that the Board also had previous motions to approve the north east corner, which is the lot adjacent on north of the property that had three things on it. It had seventeen (17) vehicles and it had a five (5) foot setback from the sidewalk that had a plain strip and there was another item on there—he forgot what the third one was—for the fence. They had a fence on the property approved by the residence at the house but the city requires in the zoning ordinance an eight (8) foot concrete fence with a setback of twenty-five (25) feet from the front property line where the house is and that would have the regular eight (8) foot approved fence for the rest of the property and this also would apply to the same form over on Albany and over onto Syracuse. The petitioners also have a problem here, not much of a problem to schedule the demolishing of the buildings on the property but they wanted to start in April but things did not progress with the site plan approval and the demolishing of the buildings will be probably in another month or two, provided that the site plan are approved by the Planning Commission; they have to file for the assembly of properties under one parcel number, the one number for the assessor and they also have to petition to vacate the alley across the property and that takes time and the outcome of that would be determined whether the fence line would be able to fence the alley or not fence the alley and the one approval of the Planning Commission had a number of items on there that had been corrected already. There is one outstanding that they do not agree with and that is that they vacate the entrance to the property on Syracuse; this eighteen (18) foot wide served the property for many years; it could be widened to twenty (20) feet; that is the main entrance to the property. If the fence is allowed to go across the alley that they fence, that would be the only access to the property. They are petitioning the Board of Appeals to approve the final thing for the property that they could go to the Planning Commission with the site plan.

Chairman Watriont stated this is a public hearing, anyone in the audience wishing to speak on this item to approach the podium. Hearing and seeing none, he turned the matter over to the Board, but before he does so, he wants an understanding (*to Mr. Billette*). What they are asking for is basically the property on Albany to mirror the property on Syracuse that they were given permission on March 11, 2015.

Kerm Billette stated yes.

Chairman Watriont stated that was what they were asking; okay. He thought that was the way he read it and wanted to verify.

(A Board Member's question is inaudible)

Chairman Watriont stated the question is, hadn't the Board already given the twenty-eight (28) vehicles? The twenty-eight (28) vehicles is for the...is it the south lot?

Kerm Billette stated the north east lot.

Chairman Watriont stated the north east lot and this is the north...

Kerm Billette stated the north east lot had the previous approval of seventeen (17); their site plan they submitted had twenty-eight (28) just like the one over to the North West.

Chairman Watriont stated they will allow Lynn Martin explain all this.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated when they came in March, they did not ask specifically; the Board had allowed back on February 9th, thirteen (13) vehicles for storage with a certain maneuvering lane and...

Chairman Watriont stated in 2011?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated yes.

Chairman Watriont stated that was when he was not taking down the buildings or anything else. He was not changing all of that stuff.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated correct. This variance was still in effect, it was not relinquished when they did the March of this year, so he wanted to come back because the Board had approved that they had asked for hard surfacing to the front property line and the Board said no, it has to be five (5) feet back for the planting. The March 11th, showed it was to the property line, but it was not an approval of the March 11th, because this one was in effect; this one was not rescinded.

Kerm Billette stated that was right, yes.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated so they came back with the request of one (1) foot, because they cannot come back with the same request that they were already denied for. In 2011, they were denied to the front property line so they made it one (1) foot of the front property line and now they want to put the fence along that one (1) foot so that it blocks in that property. In 2011, it was five (5) feet back was where the fence was going to be. Does that make sense? So what was approved in

2011 was never withdrawn or relinquished and was not asked for in the March 11, specifically.

Chairman Watriont stated but if they asked for variance on something else that really does not....they really do not need to relinquish that.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated no, but they have to re-request a variance to that variance and that is what they are doing here.

Chairman Watriont stated and that is what they are doing here on the property specific.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated correct and it is not to waive the wall along the north property line; she believes that wall is still going to be there on both the Syracuse and that six (6) foot masonry wall...

Chairman Watriont stated it does not go all the way down though.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated to within twenty-five (25) feet, correct and then they want the eight (8) foot fence.

Chairman Watriont stated okay and thanked Lynn Martin for all of that clarification.

Board Member Becher stated now in 2011, it says to hard surface to no less than five (5) feet of the front property line and to the side property line north and south as per the plan. So the five (5) feet they are talking about, what faces Albany correct?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated correct.

Board Member Becher stated well, where is that fence now?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated it is not up at all, she does not think.

Board Member Becher stated yes it is. There is a fence that faces Albany, there is that wrought iron fence and where is that fence?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated she has not seen the property, she does not know.

Board Member Becher stated because she was just down there and it looked to her like that fence was like a foot to the west of the sidewalk.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated it has to be two (2) feet from the sidewalk, because the property line is one (1) foot inside the sidewalk; it has to be two (2) feet in.

Kerm Billette stated if it is not, it will be two (2) feet.

Board Member Becher stated it is going to be two (2) feet from the sidewalk, because according to what the Board gave them before, was supposed to be five (5) feet.

Kerm Billette stated five (5) feet yes.

Board Member Becher stated and now they want it to be a foot.

Chairman Watriont stated which would be six (6) from the sidewalk.

Board Member Becher stated and then they just said that it would be two (2) feet, so she is totally confused.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated the property line is normally one (1) foot inside the sidewalk. So, he is asking for it from the property line, not from the sidewalk.

Board Member Becher stated okay.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated that foot is actually...

Board Member Becher stated so then that should be three (3) feet...

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated two (2) feet.

Chairman Watriont stated no, no; he is asking for one (1) foot, so it would be two (2) feet.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated it should be two (2) feet from the sidewalk, one (1) foot from the property line.

Board Member Becher thanked Mrs. Martin.

Kerm Billette stated if it was necessary, they would relinquish any approval of the Board of Appeals that was done before.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated well they cannot, because it was a Use Variance and she did not republish this as a Use Variance; they do not want to give up the Use Variance to use it for storage.

Chairman Watriont stated no. They are going on a variance that they are requesting now that will change the numbers that were in that variance because it is address specific, so it is going to overwrite those on that address. When they came earlier this year they listed all of the addresses together, which is part of the problem, so he thinks he understands it.

Board Member S. Brasza stated so her understanding, there is going to be fifty-six (56) cars?

Chairman Watripont stated yes that is his understanding, he will allow the petitioner to answer. Total of fifty-six (56) cars in the back?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated on both Syracuse and Albany.

Chairman Watripont stated twenty-eight (28) back to back, not for sale.

Board Member S. Brasza stated this is all depending on the alley being vacated.

Kerm Billette stated yes; twenty-eight (28) along the north lot, both north lots; twenty-eight (28) and twenty-eight (28).

Board Member S. Brasza stated but this will be pending their approval of the alley being vacated.

Kerm Billette stated yes, as according to site plan.

Board Member S. Brasza stated okay and thanked Mr. Billette.

Board Member Pauta stated she is not going to approve this. There are so many used car lots in the City right now, it is ridiculous. To expand this more, is insane; she means, they do not need a whole city full of used cars; she is sorry.

Chairman Watripont asked Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector to come to the podium again.

Board Member Vigus asked on item number 3, under the variances is to allow the eight (8) foot fence; it is tying back to item number 2, on the variance from 2011 to install the eight (8) foot wrought iron fence?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated correct.

Chairman Watripont stated but it does not have the gate on the...

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated but it was five (5) feet back from the property line, now it is one (1) foot back.

Board Member Vigus stated correct. She is just questioning; they are saying allow an eight (8) foot fence, previously they said allow a wrought iron fence, if they do not say wrought iron again, do they end up with, chain link; do they end up with whatever they want to put up?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated she thinks and correct her if she is wrong, but they are going to make it look wrought iron the whole way around the property. It is all going to match.

Kerm Billette stated yes.

Board Member Vigus stated so it is going to be a wrought iron fence.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated yes, it is going to be a wrought iron fence.

Board Member Vigus thanked Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated and basically this is housekeeping too because they did approve it in March of 2015, but this variance was there and was not handled at that time; this is a housekeeping item.

Board Member Descamps stated he thinks everyone has gotten that figured out now, so if there are no other questions, he would like to make the motion.

Motion:

Board Member Descamps made the motion to approve the petitioner's request:

1. Permission to increase from 13 to 28 vehicles to be stored on property Zoned R-1-P, as per the plan.
2. Permission to hard surface to no less than one (1) foot of the Albany property line for parking vehicles being stored.
3. Allow an eight (8) foot **wrought iron** fence and gate for 40' to no less than one (1) foot of the front property line on Albany and along the front property line.

Reason being: Not a detriment to the area, Size and shape of the lot.

Board Member H. Brasza supported the motion.

Chairman Watriont stated he has a motion by Board Member Descamps, Support by Board Member H. Brasza to approve the variance as written. He asked for Roll Call.

Roll Call:

A roll call was taken on the motion to approve and the motion carried (7-0).

Board Member Descamps	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member H. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Becher	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Pauta	No, because she thinks they have enough used car lots.

Board Member S. Brasza	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Board Member Vigus	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.
Chairman Watripont	Yes, for the reasons stated in the motion.

The Petitioner's request has been **GRANTED** as written with the **Condition** on variance #3 to 'Allow an eight (8) foot **wrought iron fence** and gate for 40' to no less than one (1) foot of the front property line on Albany and along the front property line.

13. PUBLIC HEARING REPRESENTATIVE:	APPLICANT: TGM Properties LLC -USE-
COMMON DESCRIPTION:	Mr. Robert J. Tobin
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	26160 Groesbeck
ZONE:	13-24-253-005
	C-3 and 30 ft. "P" zone along Groesbeck

VARIANCES REQUESTED: Permission to: -USE-

1. To allow a non-conforming residential building to be used as a beauty salon existing at no less than 8' of the north property line.
2. To allow a 100' x 245' storage area.
3. Eliminate hard surfacing in the vehicle storage area, allowing MDOT 22 A GR., but we are providing site storm water drainage of this lot.

ORDINANCES and REQUIREMENTS:

Section 4.17 (a): a non-conforming building...or use thereof shall NOT be structurally changed, altered or enlarged...

Section 15.07 Side yards on interior lot lines: Side yards in C-3 are not required along an interior side lot line where all walls of buildings, abutting upon such interior side lot line are wholly without windows. If windows or openings are provided, a side yard of not less than ten (10) feet shall be provided

Section 17.02 (s): Open storage may not exceed 50% of the gross floor area...

Section 17.02 (s): The designated area shall always be hard surfaced...

Chairman Watripont asked the individual at the podium to state his name and address for the record and the reason for the petition.

Robert Tobin, 2201 Twelve Mile Road, appeared before the Board and stated there is a problem that he has tonight. When he submitted to the Board of Appeals about two (2) months ago, there were three (3) items that he was requested to be waived; meanwhile in the last couple of days, things have come up and the owner has done something to the site that he is not even prepared to figure out how to solve the problem, so he would like to table his meeting for whenever the meeting is, until he could straighten the things out, so he prefers not to be heard tonight, because he has some sort of a problem with the owner and he is not prepared to handle it tonight.

Board Member S. Brasza stated June 10 is the next meeting.

Chairman Watriont stated the Board has the agenda already; it is already out. He is trying to see how packed that agenda is and whether or not they could add anything on.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated the property owner has added a fence along the front property line without any approvals or variance request, so it might have to be re-noticed.

Chairman Watriont asked reposted?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated it might have to be re-noticed unless he wants to remove the fence; he cannot pull a permit, it is in the front setback and the sign that is on the fence as well; those were added, she just heard about it today and if he wants to request it, it will have to be on the plan and it will have to be re-noticed.

Chairman Watriont stated if it has to be re-noticed, he would have to get another petition in and probably go through the process then, or should they set a date certain now?

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated she does not know how fast they could do that; if he could do it in the next week or two weeks, they could get it retyped and sent over for maybe the June 24th meeting.

Robert Tobin stated he could do that.

Chairman Watriont stated and then they need fifteen (15) days to post.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated it would have to be by June 9th is when the notices will go out for the 24th, so if he gets it in within the next week and she could get it over to the Council Office by the 8th or sooner.

Robert Tobin stated he could not do it in a week.

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector to Mr. Tobin asked he could not?

Robert Tobin stated no, he has to speak to the owner and...

Lynn Martin, Chief Zoning Inspector stated then it will be in July then, whatever the July meeting is.

Robert Tobin stated July would be better.

Chairman Watriont stated July 8th, would that work Mr. Tobin?

Robert Tobin stated yes, sure, he could make July 8th, but he could not do the June meeting, but July he could do it.

Chairman Watripont stated okay, and asked for a motion?

Motion:

Board Member Vigus made the motion to table the item to the date certain of **July 8, 2015.**

Board Member H. Brasza supported the motion.

Chairman Watripont stated he has a motion and Support to reschedule the hearing to July 8th, 2015; it will not be re-noticed unless it is required to, depending on what happens with the owners, so if anyone is present for this item, it will be heard on July 8th if they take care of the other problems, if not then it will be re-noticed and go from there; voice vote.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7-0)

The Petitioner's request has been **RESCHEDULED** to **July 8, 2015.**

Robert Tobin thanked the Board.

14. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Watripont stated as everyone except for Board Member Becher knows that they received candy and a Certificate, someone had their name spelled wrong or incorrectly there, but this was from the Council of Commissions that put on the dinner that was attended by Board Member Becher and himself and what they need is a member from their council to be the representative for the 2015/16 year; Board Member Becher was that member last year but has informed him that she does not wish to continue that again this year, is that correct? So does he have a volunteer or should he volunteer someone? He figured they had two (2) people absent so, either he will do it or if one of those wants to do it, he will find out with them and if so, then he will be the alternate, unless someone else wants to be an alternate. There are only four (4) meetings a year, so it is not much. He asked for any other new business?

(Inaudible discussion between the Board members)

15. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Board Member Becher made the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board Member S. Brasza supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

A voice vote was taken on the motion. The motion carried (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Jennifer Vigus
Assistant Secretary of the Board

APPROVED