MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 2017

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Freitag at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call Showing: Jerry Frederick, Mike Glotfelty, Daniel McAnally, David Paul, Jessica Workman, Celeste Roscoe, Edna Talon-Jemison, Melvin Zilka and Cathy Freitag

   Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner and Christina Wilson, Planning Secretary

3. Welcome New Planning Commissioner, Jessica Workman

4. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, McAnally, Workman, Roscoe and Freitag. Nays – none. Motion Carried.

   Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Welcome New Planning Commissioner, Jessica Workman

4. Approval of Agenda

5. Approval of Minutes

6. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items

7. Public Hearings

8. Old Business

   A. PC-2015-027; Logos Logistics

      Applicant: John Romano, D&G Building Co.
      Mike Brock, Hennessey Engineers
      Request: Amended Site Plan Approval
      Location: 16490 Wahrman DP# 82-80-128-99-0011-000

      (Action required: approve, approve with conditions, postpone or deny amended site plan.)

   B. TA-2017-001; Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 11, Use Standards; and Article 24, Definitions

      (Action required: resume consideration of the application and then approve, approve with conditions or deny the amended site plan)

9. New Business

10. PC-Cases Involving Advice or input from the Planning Commission
11. Reports
   C. Chairperson
   D. City Planner
      1) Planning Department Status Report

12. Reports on Interest Designation

13. Communications
   E. Planning and Zoning News – Medical Marijuana Laws in the U.S.

14. Adjournment

5. Approval of Minutes
   A. Motion by Glotfelty supported by McAnally to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission regular meeting on July 17, 2017 and the special meeting of the Planning Commission held on July 26, 2017.

      Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Glotfelty, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Roscoe, Workman, Paul, Zilka and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

6. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
   Yada Phillips, 31957 Newcastle, Romulus MI 48174 stepped forward to speak to the commissioners.
   • Ms. Phillips stated that she witnessed her neighbor get hit by a car at Ecorse and Merriman. She expressed her concern regarding heavy traffic and pedestrian traffic on Ecorse Road and Merriman Road. She noted that there are paths from foot traffic along Ecorse and Merriman roads where there are no sidewalks. She has some special needs neighbors and is concerned for their safety and others that live in her neighborhood, as well as the out-of-town visitors that stay at the hotels on Merriman Road.
   • Ms. Phillips stated that she is worried about the increase in traffic once Amazon opens. She would like to see sidewalks in place with the growing economy.
   • Chairperson Freitag and the commissioners informed Ms. Phillips that although they agreed with her, the roads are Wayne County roads and she was speaking to the Planning Commission, she would need to voice her concerns to City Council.

7. Public Hearings – None.

8. Old Business
   A. PC-2015-027; Logos Logistics, requesting amended site plan approval to include a temporary asphalt milling parking lot and access road, reconfigure the parking, modify the detention pond, reconfigure the berm, modify landscaping and add used truck sales. The property is located at 16490 Wahrman, Parcel #82-80-028-99-0011-000.

      John Romano, D&G Building Co., 30735 Cypress, Romulus, MI 48174 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the owners; James Kim and John Shin.
• Ms. Maise referred to her report that highlights the changes from the approved site plan that
the applicant would like to make. She noted that the Planning Commission had previously
conditionally approved the site plan at the November 16, 2015 meeting.
• Ms. Maise explained that it’s not uncommon for changes to happen during construction and for
a site plan to be amended. She referenced the list of items in her report that will need to be
addressed.
• Mr. Romano stated that a performance bond will need to be posted and they have no issue with
doing that.
• Mr. Romano explained that they are requesting approval to allow them to leave the asphalt
millings for the future development. These millings are a change to the approved site plan and
they were put in place after the facility was built. The temporary road on the south side of the
property was for staging of equipment and parking and they would like to leave it in place.
• Mr. Romano stated that if the applicant does not move forward with the future development of
the site, the millings would be removed. This is the reasoning for the performance bond.
• Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Romano if he had seen the report with some recommendations from
the city engineer.
• Mr. Romano replied no.
• Ms. Maise commented that D&G and the engineer received the reports.
• Mr. McAnally read the recommendations from OHM, the city engineer to Mr. Romano:

   1. A cost estimate for the temporary conditions shall be provided. The estimate will be
      reviewed and approved by OHM and the City. Upon acceptance of the amount, a surety
      bond shall be provided to the City. The cost estimate shall include:
      a. Hard surface paving of the southerly emergency access road with HMA pavement and
         concrete curb and gutter.
      b. Removal of the HMA curb along the south side of the lot and replacement with concrete
         curb and gutter to City standard.
      c. Removal of the HMA millings south of the paved lot.
      d. Associated site grading and restoration including topsoil, seed, and mulch.
   2. The applicant should commit to a timetable to complete the berm extension.
   3. The applicant should commit to a timetable to address landscaping issues such as
      replacement trees and berm maintenance.

• Mr. McAnally stated that he understands that ARC has additional items that need to be
addressed but these items he would like to be done.
• Mr. Romano commented that most of what Mr. McAnally is referring to was all a part of the
original site plan. Millings were temporarily allowed for access around the warehouse building.
He is not sure why the bond was never put in place but they have no issues with removing the
millings within the agreed 5 year timeframe if the applicant does not develop the site. He also
stated that they have no objection to extending the berm.
• Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise if the 5 year timeframe for removing the millings was from
the original site plan approval date.
• Ms. Maise replied yes and the applicant was also supposed to submit a cost estimate during
engineering for the curbing, paving and removal of the millings but that did not happen.
• Mr. Romano stated that he was waiting for the bond amount from OHM.
• Ms. Maise informed Mr. Romano that the cost estimate would be required first from them in
order to set a bond amount.
• Mr. Romano questioned if the berm extension would be part of the bond.
• Ms. Maise stated that the berm was incomplete and what was done as part of phase 1 would need to be continued all the way down.

• Mr. Romano asked Ms. Maise what was not there now.

• Ms. Maise stated that the underground irrigation was not in place and the permanent surface has not been established. If the commissioners agree to keeping the driveway, it will be an amendment. If they say no to the driveway as constructed, then the berm will need to be constructed in accordance with the original plan approval and it will need to be extended all the way down. Regardless, it needs to be extended further than it is currently. The plans were confusing because it said it was to be extended but the landscape plans don’t show that.

• Mr. Romano stated that the berm wasn’t shown to be all the way to Wahrman Rd. and he is confused as to why it has to be extended.

• Ms. Maise presented the approved site plan showing the berm extension. She explained what happened was that the road was put in and the berm was cut into. The phase 1 berm was completely constructed while phase 2 is not complete at this time. The plans are confusing because on one sheet of the site plan it says that the berm will be extended and it shows it extended beyond the new road but the new landscape plan stops it on the other side of the road.

• Mr. Romano stated that he has no problem with doing whatever the commissioners want. He also stated that they didn’t add the road, it was already there.

• Ms. Maise commented that the road was not there but the driveway was. It is an access drive for the billboard on the south side of the property but the builder extended it in the opposite direction for construction access.

• Mr. Romano reiterated that they were just trying to keep the roads clean so they had a surface for the contractors to drive on and that was the intent for the temporary road.

• Ms. Maise replied that the temporary staging is normally part of a building permit and she spoke with the Building Department regarding this and they had not approved temporary staging/road or gate.

• Mr. Romano explained that these were some of the reasons why they are before the Planning Commission. If they have to get a permit for these things they will.

• Mr. Paul stated that he would like see Phase 2 developed within 2 years, before the agreed upon 5 year timeframe.

• Mr. Glotfelty mentioned that he was not happy about the millings being dumped illegally and the whole place is an eyesore to him. He mentioned that the berm was not built to the standards of the agreed site plan. He noted that he is very disappointed and that there is a city ordinance against illegal dumping of millings.

• Mr. Romano apologized and asked that they all work together. They are trying to keep the roads clean and that it was more of a money issue with the building owner.

• Ms. Freitag asked Ms. Maise if the Planning Commission had approved the millings on the approved site plan.

• Ms. Maise replied that the temporary drive along the side of the warehouse was approved for millings based on the future layout of phase 2 development.

• Ms. Talon-Jemison wanted to clarify that the commissioners were not trying to give Mr. Romano a hard time about the removal of the millings but the cost estimate required for phase 1 was not submitted by the applicant and the bond was never posted. The lack of these two things make her and the commissioners have pause and caution that make them question what else the applicant and owners will do that are not a part of their agreement. They aren’t being inconsistent, they are just questioning the validity of the agreements going forward.

• Ms. Talon-Jemison stated to Mr. Romano that the commissioners only want him to do what was promised the first time he came before the Planning Commission. For example, installation
of more trees for shielding. It was agreed that if more trees were needed for shielding of the trucks at the time of inspection more would be added. She commented that the city would like to change their image and having sites out of compliance makes the city look bad. We are trying to bring more business to Romulus and when they see sites that look bad it makes them think that the city doesn’t care what they look like, and we do care. We want all of our sites to look nice.

- Mr. Frederick commented that the plantings to the south view of the property were in-lieu of expansion as well and that’s why we waived trees on the south side.
- Ms. Freitag noted that they had a lot of discussion on how the southern gateway of the city should look and how they wanted to see an attractive setting for future business with beautiful buildings and landscaping, not factory looking sites with trucks and things of that nature. We wanted a pristine looking area from all future businesses.
- Mr. Paul commented that the city spent a lot of money on the road over there so that these businesses would come in and the city would like to keep it that way.
- Ms. Freitag explained that other businesses in the future may say that Logos didn’t have to abide by the agreement, so why would they have to and that is a big concern of the Planning Commission.
- The commissioners questioned whether the owner had a state license to sell trucks.
- Mr. Romano commented that he wasn’t aware if the property owner had a state license.
- Ms. Freitag informed Mr. Romano that if they intend to sell trucks, they will be required to get a license from the State of Michigan.

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to approve the amended site plan for PC-2015-027; Logos Logistics subject to the following:

1. Removal of the temporary asphalt milling parking lot and access road.
2. Parking of used trucks and trailers for sale is limited to the 14 truck parking spaces along Wahrman Road.
4. Building Department approval of the location and configuration of the barrier-free parking spaces.
5. A cost estimate in accordance with the original approved site plan to be reviewed and approved by the City and OHM and a performance guarantee being established prior to issuance of a C of O, to be completed within 90 days of this approval.
6. Submittal of a revised site plan and landscape plan to clarify improvements to the berm along Wahrman Road.
7. The as-built landscape plan must verify plant quantity and size noted on Sheet LP-1 of the approved landscape plan.
8. The Phase 2 portion of the berm must be sodded and maintained consistent with the Phase 1 portion of the berm.
9. All dead and dying landscaping must be replaced and all weeds must be removed.
10. Any conditions of other agencies or departments including the recording of any right-of-way and utility easements.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, Workman, Zilka and Freitag. Nays –Glotfelty and Frederick. Motion Carried.
B. TA-2017-001; Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 11, Use Standards; and Article 24, Definitions

- Ms. Maise stated that the zoning ordinance was being codified by LSL Planning to include several amendments that are currently on our website. In the amendments proposed the commissioners will notice several random strikethroughs and additions as they are also trying to clean some areas to make it more user friendly.
- Ms. Maise noted that the key section for discussion is under vehicle and truck repair, service and parking. She pointed out some of the changes and corrections especially to the standards for gas stations and truck fueling stations. Some of the standards that need to be applied are that it must be demonstrated by the applicant that the truck fueling station will primarily serve trucks from nearby industrial areas. We are not looking to have these in areas that are going to generate more truck traffic.
- Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise how an applicant would demonstrate that.
- Ms. Maise replied that they would need to have a traffic study performed to show existing versus anticipated volumes of traffic. She also stated that the applicant would need to make sure that there is enough on-site storage space to accommodate at least 2 queued tractor/trailer trucks waiting to enter or exit without using a portion of the public right-of-way so that there is no obstructing vehicle sight distance or otherwise interfering with street traffic. This was a concern and a standard that was added because we don’t want trucks hanging back out into the road waiting to get in. While there are setback requirements, this will encourage them to push things further back.
- Ms. Maise went over other standards that an applicant will need to consider before going in front of the Planning Commission for approval.
- The commissioners gave Ms. Maise advice and suggestions for wording and standards regarding bonding for removal of fuel tanks, above ground fuel (containment tanks) storage tanks, and junk yards/scrap yards.
- Further discussion ensued between Ms. Maise and the commissioners regarding special land use, use standards and changes to the ordinance.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to recommend conditional approval to City Council of TA-2017-001; Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 8, Industrial Districts Article 11, Use Standards and Article 24, Definitions with additional information to be provided as it is developed and discussed.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Zilka, Roscoe, Workman, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.


10. PC Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission – None.

11. Reports
   A. Chairperson
      - Ms. Freitag welcomed Jessica Workman as the new Planning Commissioner.

   B. City Planner
      1. Planning Department Status Report
• Ms. Maise informed the commissioners that there will be a meeting in September. The Planning Department has received an application to rezone the credit union on Ecorse Road to allow a banquet facility.

12. Reports on Interest Designation

• Ms. Roscoe announced upcoming city events.

• Mr. Frederick commented that it appears that Special Tree has finished their landscaping, driveway and swales. He also stated that the cell tower that was recently approved near I-94 is up but, he wasn’t sure if it was complete. Wayne County has barriers for the roadwork to begin at the Northline & Hannan Rd. project by D&G Building Co. and they have also dug their pond already.

13. Communications – None.

14. Adjournment

Motion by McAnally supported by Roscoe to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Roscoe, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glottfeldy, Workman, Zilka & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

[Signature]

David Paul, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission