MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 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, Celeste Roscoe, Edna Talon-Jemison, Melvin Zilka, David Paul, Daniel McAnally, Jessica Workman and Cathy Freitag.

   Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner; Robert McCraight, DPS Director, Marcus McNamara, OHM and Christina Wilson, Planning Secretary

3. Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to approve the amended agenda and place New Business (B) first: Ayes — Zilka, McAnally, Roscoe, Workman, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays — none. Motion Carried.

   Agenda

   1. Pledge of Allegiance

   2. Roll Call

   3. Approval of Agenda

   4. Approval of Minutes

   5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items

   6. New Business

   A. SPR-2017-032; 34th District Court

      Applicant: Fred Meinberg, Partners in Architecture
      Tina Brooks Green, 34th District Court

      Request: Site Plan Approval

      Location: 11129 Wayne Rd.

      Project: Development of a 50,455-sq. ft. courthouse building on the City of Romulus Municipal Complex

      (Action Required: Approval, approval with conditions or denial of the site plan or postpone action)

   7. Public Hearings

   A. RZ-2017-005/SLU-2017-002; Hamdan Gas Station

      Applicant: Randy Hamdan, 29387 Airport LLC
      Marsha Hornig, Jeffery A. Scott Architects, P.C.

      Request: Conditional rezoning of 0.93 acres of property from C-2, Local Business to C-3, Highway Business

      Request: Special land use for gas station

      Location: 29387 Airport, Parcel #80-050-02-007-302

      Project: Redevelopment of the former Denny’s restaurant to a gas station and convenience store with restaurant
(Action required: hold a public hearing on the conditional rezoning and special land use requests and then recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial to City Council of the conditional rezoning agreement and special land use or postpone action)

6. New Business (B - continued)

B. SPR-2017-025; Hamdan Gas Station

Applicant: Randy Hamdan, 29387 Airport LLC
            Marsha Horning, Jeffery A. Scott Architects, P.C.
Request: Site plan approval
Location: 29387 Airport, Parcel #80-050-02-0017-302
Project: Redevelopment of the former Denny’s restaurant to a gas station and convenience store with restaurant

(ACTION REQUIRED: Approval, approval with conditions or denial of the site plan or postpone action)

8. Old Business

A. PC-2016-020; McLane Food Service

Applicant: Jose Restrepo, Director Construction & Real Estate, McLane
            Tom Sovel, Spalding DeDecker
Request: Site plan approval extension #1
Location: 15670 Wahman
Project: Development of a 241,379-sq. ft. warehouse distribution building

(ACTION REQUIRED: Approve, approve with conditions, postpone or deny request for site plan extension)

B. PC-2015-029/030; Michigan Components

Applicant: David McGee, Michigan Components
            Alan Cruz, Hennessy Engineers
Request: Site plan and special land use approval extension #1
Location: 28111 Northline
Project: Contractor’s storage yard

(ACTION REQUIRED: Approve, approve with conditions, postpone or deny request for special land use and site plan extension)

9. PC-Cases Involving Advice or input from the Planning Commission

10. Reports

   A. Chairperson
   B. City Planner
       1) Planning Department Status Report
11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Motion by Giotfety supported by Workman to approve the minutes of the joint DDA/Planning Commission meeting held on November 20, 2017 and the Planning Commission special meeting held on December 6, 2017.

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

5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items – None.

6. New Business

A. SPR-2017-032; 34th District Court, 11129 Wayne Rd., requesting site plan approval for the development of 50,455-sq. ft courthouse building on the City of Romulus Municipal Complex. DP# 80-082-01-0015-309.

- Dan McAnally declared a conflict of interest and informed Chairperson Freitag that he will not participate in discussion and will abstain from voting on SPR-2017-032; 4th District Court.

Fred Meinberg, Partners in Architecture, PLC, 65 Market St #200, Mt Clemens, MI 48043 stepped forward as petitioner on behalf of 34th District Court.

- Mr. Meinberg presented the commissioners with a PowerPoint presentation of the site plan demonstrating various stages of the building, parking, landscaping, lighting, utilities, underground, etc.
- Mr. Meinberg stated that he would be happy to answer any questions from the commissioners or staff.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that the proposed building is beautiful and asked Mr. Meinberg if the parking would be disrupted in the municipal complex during construction.
- Mr. Meinberg replied yes, the north side of the municipal parking would be completely reconstructed and the parking on the south side would remain as is.
- Mr. Giotfety agreed that the proposed building is beautiful but, was concerned about the parking. He acknowledged that the project is still in the premature stage but, he believes that the parking is lacking 1 handicap space.
- Mr. Meinberg commented that the current proposed parking is just past the minimum requirement but, since it was a recommendation from the city’s traffic consultant, they would be happy to take another look at it and possibly redistributing the parking so that it is accessible to all entries.
- Mr. Giotfety also commented that he would like to see a Romulus landscape company get awarded the job of landscaping for this project.
- Mr. Meinberg acknowledged Mr. Giotfety’s comment and stated that he will make sure that any Romulus landscape company that wants to bid on this project will have the opportunity to do so. They will advertise in the local newspaper.
• Mr. McCraight commented that all barrier free parking will be addressed during building review of the construction plan. Also, AUK, the company in charge of bids is well aware of the city’s desire to hire a local, Romulus businesses as needed.
• Mr. Paul and Mr. Frederick inquired about the judges and prisoner entrances.
• Mr. Meinberg explained that there are separate entrances within a secured access control holding area. There are a couple of security measures that keep people from having access to the elevator and secured areas that shouldn’t be allowed.
• Further discussion was had regarding the elevator and secured areas and entrances.
• Judge Brian Oakley explained that they are very security minded and that the building is being prepped for long term use.
• Mr. Zilka asked Mr. McCraight what would become of the current police station.
• Mr. McCraight replied that the city has a few ideas for that building. It will require financial planning but, the city does not want to see the building sit vacant.
• Chairperson Freitag noticed a few minor changes that need to be noted on the site plan.
• Ms. Maise commented that these minor changes were discussed at the ARC meeting and that the applicant will be submitting revised plans.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Zilka to approve SPR-2017-032; 34th District Court located at 11129 Wayne Rd. subject to a revised site plan being submitted for administrative review to address the minor comments noted in the ARC reports.


7. Public Hearings

A. RZ-2017-005/SLU-2017-002; Hamdan Gas Station, 29387 Airport, requesting conditional rezoning of 0.93 acres of property from C-2, General Business to C-3, Highway Business and special land use approval for the redevelopment of the former Denny’s restaurant for a gas station and convenience store with restaurant. Parcel #80-050-02-0017-302.

In attendance for Hamdan Gas Station: Harsha Horning, Patrick Howe, Teon SuJak, Jeff Foresight, Dan Westendorf and Julie Kroll

Marsha Horning, Jeffrey Scott Architects, 32316 Grand River Blvd., Farmington, MI 48336 stepped forward to speak on behalf of Randy Hamden.

• Ms. Horning showed the commissioners a brief PowerPoint presentation of the proposed project. She commented that they are proposing to breathe new life into the vacant building by redeveloping the building to accommodate a gas station, convenience store and a restaurant, such as a Subway sandwich shop.
• Ms. Horning explained that the building footprint would remain the same with a couple of exceptions. The attached connection to the hotel will be removed as well as the vestibule. The front entrance will be moved to face Middlebelt Road. The gas pumps and canopy will be positioned to the north of the building with 6 double sided pumps. The parking will be reconfigured and will accommodate some additional handicap parking next to the building for safety.
• Ms. Horning stated that there is currently shared parking and access with the Quality Inn that will remain. The parking requirements for both the hotel and the gas station have been met.
Ms. Horning commented that they are proposing a new curb cut along Middlebelt Road and have spoken to Wayne County, who are in favor of the new driveway. This will allow for better traffic flow for vehicles and fuel trucks. The current curb cut along Airport Drive will remain.

Ms. Horning also commented that they are proposing to enhance the landscaping along Middlebelt Road and Airport Drive. They will also be installing a decorative fence with masonry piers. All of the foundation landscape along the building will be redone and refreshed.

Ms. Horning explained the materials that will be used on the outside of the building will be of stone veneer up to 5 feet from the bottom with EIFS accent but the majority of the building will be stone veneer. The canopy columns will be masonry to match the building.

Ms. Horning also explained that the canopy will not have a logo on it at this time but there will be price signs on the north and west sides.

Let the record show that an affidavit of first class mail has been shown and is on file.

Chairperson Freitag opened up the public hearing portion of the meeting for questions and comments from the public.

Scott Munzel, Attorney, Pear Sperling Eggen & Daniels, P.C., Domino’s Farms, Lobby D, 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105 stepped forward to speak on behalf of Mike and Hassan Ouzza, property owners of 9999 Middlebelt Road, Romulus, MI 48174

Mr. Munzel stated that he represents Mike and Hassan Ouzza who own property to the south of the proposed gas station. He noted that both Mike and Hassan Ouzza object to the rezoning and special land use applications by the petitioner for this project. After reviewing the Master Plan, the land use element talks about creating a diversity of uses, avoiding adverse traffic patterns, which is echoed in the transportation element of the Master Plan, where it encourages traffic safety and reducing traffic conflicts. They do not believe that rezoning from C-2 to C-3 is consistent with the Master Plan or is a gas station the best use for this particular piece of property.

Mr. Munzel explained that he believes that the property is too narrow for the proposed use and it currently doesn’t have the curb cut on Middlebelt Road. The property was once used as a family restaurant and it should continue as such. He also commented that there will be a beehive of mass confusion with traffic if this project is allowed.

Mr. Munzel touched on the planner’s report for the number of concerns with regard to the special land use. With the variety of waivers that will be required for this site, because it is so tight, the use may not be suitable for this particular development. Therefore, they ask that the Planning Commission deny the request for the rezoning and special land use application.

J. Patrick Howe, PLLC, attorney for Randy Hamdan, 280 W. Old Woodward, Suite #12, Birmingham, MI 48009 stepped forward to speak on behalf of Randy Hamdan, 29387 Airport Drive LLC

Mr. Howe thanked the City and staff for working with his client on issues arising from this project since the building has sat vacant for so long. Mr. Hamdan is prepared to pour hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars into this site to make it a very beautiful development that will be an asset to the airport community and the region by redeveloping a building that has sat vacant and dark for many years.

Mr. Howe ran through the approval conditions as outlined in the City of Romulus Ordinance, reviews from staff and consultants, and the applications. He explained why they believe that the conditional rezoning from C-2 to C-3 and the special land use is appropriate for this site. He
noted that after looking at the City’s Future Land Use Map, which was passed in February 2017, and contrary to what the previous speaker, Scott Munzel, noted, this property is being called for a more intense use that what is being proposed. This area has been designated a Regional Commercial District, which is what they believe that this gas station and convenience store will be. In that light, they are asking that this property be rezoned from C-2 to C-3 but only allowing one additional use, that being a fuel center/service station. Any other use in the C-3 District has been stricken and will be attached accordingly as Exhibit B to the conditional rezoning agreement.

- Mr. Howe stated that all they are asking is to include one additional use that’s in the C-3 zoning designation, which is much less intense than what they could be asking for. Regional commercial uses, or something more intense, is what this board contemplated when it passed the Future Land Use Plan. In addition to the Future Land Use Plan, the rezoning and special land use requests have also received the approval of the staff; the planning staff is recommending approval after their due diligence on the matter. They have received comments from LSL Planning, MKSK Studios, OHM, Department of Public Works, Fire, and Building & Safety. All of these comments have been taken into consideration and they can meet all conditions. There are a few waivers that they will be asking for when it comes to the site plan. But all in all they have met the comments that have been proposed by city staff and the consultants and they feel they are in a good position to proceed with the development.

- Mr. Howe also stated that the conditional rezoning agreement was reviewed by the city attorney, and his comments were approved and are ready to go. In addition, they have talked to the adjacent hotel and have reached out to them on numerous occasions and they have not heard back from them since October and without their response, they assume that they are concurring with the plans which have been shared with them.

- Mr. Howe ran through the rezoning standards that were before the commissioners and with respect to Rezoning, Section 23.04, which outlines the standards of the City of Romulus:
  1. Is it consistent with the land use map? Yes, it is consistent and even less intense than what the future land use calls for.
  2. Is development at the current zoning practical? The building sat vacant for 5-7 years, with the notion that this could be used as a restaurant, they think that’s come and gone. They are here to redevelop the property and at a use that our consultants, analysts and market studies think that it is ripe for development as a gas station. They believe that adding the one additional use from C-2 to C-3 would allow them to proceed as proposed.
  3. The compatibility to use the site as a vehicle service station, per all the departmental reviews, they believe that it can be used as a service station and redeveloped in that manner.
  4. The compatibility of all potential uses allowed in the zoning district with surrounding uses; they’ve worked with the neighbor, reached out to them, and they believe it is compatible. The curb cut that they are proposing is going to add to the traffic flow to the site and they believe that it is consistent with what the city wants for this corridor to be Regional Business.
  5. The capacity of city infrastructure; per departmental review it’s acceptable.
  6. Extent that traffic can be accommodated; they’ve had a full-blown traffic study done and it is in the commissioner’s packets and their traffic engineer is here to answer any questions. They believe that the signage, curb cuts etc. that are proposed will address any concerns with traffic.
  7. Apparent public need for the use; their studies have shown that the proposed use is needed in this area and that the Middlebelt corridor is appropriate for this use as well as the future land use.
  8. Compatibility with basic intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance; they are taking an old building and redeveloping it and bringing it back to life, which will hopefully spur additional development in this corridor.
Mr. Howe commented that these are the zoning requirements and that they meet all of them. They are proposing to add only one of the allowed uses within the C-3 designation which is vehicle service and fueling. They are not opening the door to any additional uses that may be included in C-3.

Mr. Howe stated is it necessary to make sure that the property is developed in such a way that it protects the surrounding neighborhood in minimizing any potential impacts. They would argue that it is. This building has been vacant, a nuisance and potentially dangerous along with all of the parking around it. They believe that this is necessary to ensure that the property develops in the proper way.

Mr. Howe also asked if it is necessary to allow the rezoning. The property cannot be rezoned without the proposed conditional rezoning. The proposed gas station use is not allowed in the C-2 district and the corridor has a number of C-3 uses to the north and south, so they believe that they are in line with the surrounding area.

Mr. Howe commented on the compatibility of the development with the abutting properties? Several surrounding uses are C-3 and the area is designated as regional commercial. Clearly the public interest is consistent with the recommendations of the master plan.

Mr. Howe stated that with respect with special land use, Section 18.05 outlines the standards. The proposed use is consistent with the master plan, consistent with the zoning ordinance, compatible with adjacent uses, traffic impacts are minimized, impacts on adjacent uses are minimized, environmental impact; they have some really neat green infrastructure plans. They will collect rain water from the canopy and other nice attributes that they will do to reduce the environmental impact. They are not expanding the footprint of the building, they are reusing the existing building. Public services, it will be located where it can be adequately served by the public. The departmental reports show that it’s appropriate.

Mr. Howe summed up his presentation by stating that all in all they believe that they meet all of the requirements and respectfully acknowledge the comments from the southern property owner, which they believe is a vacant piece of property and that should be taken into consideration. His client has been approved for a loan to commence construction immediately in January and if all goes as planned, the property will be opened within 3 months.

Mr. Howe expressed that they have a team of people to address any questions or concerns that the commissioners may have.

Chairperson Freitag closed the public speaking portion of the meeting and opened it up to questions and comments from the commissioners.

Ms. Maise commented that if the commissioners do decide to recommend approval to City Council, the site plan can easily be cleaned up and handled administratively. Both the rezoning and special land use requests require a recommendation to City Council and site plan falls under Planning Commission authority.

Mr. Glotfelty inquired if there will be some pillars around the pumps.

Mr. Foresight replied that there will be since per State law there has to be protection around the pumps.

Mr. Glotfelty asked Ms. Horning if there will be a door to the building from the attachment to the hotel.

Ms. Horning replied no. There is an emergency door there and although they have reached out to the hotel repeatedly, they would like to break that connection completely. If there needs to be a door there they will work with the hotel to do so.

Mr. Westendorf stated that there is a sidewalk to the emergency exit and the door doesn’t affect this corridor to the hotel.
Chairperson Freitag asked Ms. Horning if anyone from the hotel can access the corridor.

Ms. Horning replied that it appears that the corridor is full of junk and at this point no one is accessing it from the hotel side. On the old Denny’s side it is boarded up and has been for many years. It does seem like there is a wall unit missing and it created an opening and it appears that someone has gotten in there and may possibly be living in there.

Mr. Giotfelty commented that he drives past there several times a day and although he hopes that both businesses can work together, there seems to be a lot of buses and semi-trucks in the parking lot.

Ms. Horning noted that there is a lot of parking for the hotel that is on the north and east side and the way that the property was developed, the front parking lot was shared. The majority seemed as though it was used by the Denny’s restaurant customers. The hotel does have their own parking for their customers with adequate parking to the east and south for their buses to park.

Ms. Maise commented that when the site plan was approved there was parking along the east and south of the property and at one time there was striping there that has since been removed and overnight parking was accommodated for trucks. They got rid of the parking to the rear and they are using the parking that is closer to the front of the property, which is on the Hamdan property. There is space on the property to meet the parking requirements. The hotel has had code enforcement in the past for park and fly which is not approved on this site.

Chairperson Freitag asked if there was a new owner for the hotel and if they have a C of O.

Ms. Maise replied yes, it is a new owner and they do not have a C of O.

Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Horning if there will be restricted access to the property with either of the driveways.

Ms. Horning replied that Airport Drive will remain as is. As far as Wayne County, they don’t believe there will be any restrictions on the Middlebelt driveway but they have not heard back from them.

Further discussion was had regarding roof pitch and storm water management.

Mr. SuJak commented that they are still working out the details of the storm water management with the county.

Mr. Zilka inquired about the Wayne County approval for the drive off of Middlebelt Road.

Mr. SuJak replied that the county didn’t have an issue with the location of the curb cut but they have not issued all of their approvals yet. They are requiring more engineering on the curb cut, utility and storm water details. They have preliminary comments back but more work to do.

Mr. Zilka also inquired about the agreement with the hotel for the shared parking.

Mr. Howe commented that there is a recorded agreement that dates back several years between the restaurant owners and their successors and the hotel owners and their successors. That is something that they are willing to respect. What that calls for is shared access so they can’t put a fence up on the property line. It is a shared non-exclusive access parking agreement, meaning that they can park on their property and they can park on theirs. However, despite the cross access parking, the agreement allows them to develop the property however they want and place any rules on the parking that they want.

Ms. Workman asked about the traffic information provided in their packet.

Ms. Kroll stated that they worked with the city to provide a traffic study with input from OHM and M.K.S.K. They came up with two alternatives to determine if one or two driveways were needed, one on Airport and one on Middlebelt. The analysis showed that having two driveways provided the same operations that beget that type of service but, only having one driveway would end up in increased delay of traffic at Airport Drive and Middlebelt section with longer queue lengths on Airport Drive. The biggest issue was that the fuel trucks could not access the site.
with proper flow in and out without going around the hotel and that would create a safety issue. They have recommended that there be two driveways on the site to operate safely.

- Ms. Workman questioned the signage on the site plan in regards to cut-through traffic.
- Ms. Kroll stated that it is suggested that there be signage depicting no cut-through traffic since there is concern that vehicles would cut through the hotel to the north to avoid the light on Lucas Drive.
- Mr. Frederick asked Ms. Kroll why there is no left turn on Lucas onto Middlebelt Road. It seems to make no sense.
- Ms. Kroll reached out to Wayne County in regards to that and they stated that the biggest issue that they had was that the drive is so close to Lucas that with all of the trucks that are in the rear of the development and if two or more trucks are queued at the same time to make a left turn it blocks the left turn lane going left into the airport. They wanted to align Lucas and Airport when it was first developed but the Airport Authority owns the airport property and they said “no deal.” The next step would be to have the Airport Authority, Wayne County and all interested parties together in one room to figure it out.

- Further discussion was had between the commissioners, the applicant and their team regarding details of the site plan, dumpster, charging ports, restaurant, convenience store and revisions.
- Mr. Frederick was concerned about the dumpster being on an angle. On the back of the building there is a transformer and a gas meter, which seems like a potentially bad combination.
- Ms. Horning stated that the transformer will be moved and they looked at the location of the dumpster and are trying to get it off of Middlebelt.
- Mr. Frederick asked if the dumpster could be straight and not on an angle because he believes it would be safer for everyone involved. He asked if the trucks could back straight in and out if the dumpster was not angled.
- Ms. Horning replied that there would not be room to get a truck around the dumpster and the building if the dumpster was straight but, she can look at it further and work with staff to see what the possibilities are to make it better.
- Mr. McAnally asked about the (3) free-standing charging ports for the vehicles. He wondered if they were going to be near utilities and how they would be set up and function.
- Mr. Forsyth, contractor, Oscar W. Larson Co., replied that they would be powered from the building.
- Mr. McAnally asked if the power would come underground from the building and if they would be metered.
- Mr. Forsyth replied yes.
- Chairperson Freitag asked if the charging ports will be on Middlebelt.
- Mr. Forsyth replied yes.
- Mr. McAnally asked if the parking would be restricted for vehicles charging only.
- Ms. Horning replied that they didn’t want to restrict the parking there but it’s mostly a convenience for 3 electrical vehicles to have a place to park.
- Mr. Paul commented that he looked at the floor plan and really didn’t understand it. He was looking for more information regarding the restaurant and set-up, who the tenant of that space will be and if there will be convenience store as well.
- Ms. Horning gave an overview of how they see it working. She also stated that they see a less intense use going into the small space, such as a Subway without a drive-thru. The typical gondolas for convenience items and a large cooler would also fill space inside.
- Mr. Glotfelter asked if the fuel pumps will be diesel or all gas.
- Jeff replied that they will be auto diesel, not truck diesel. No long hoses for big trucks since this site is not suited for that.
Ms. Talon-Jemison commented that she noticed on the drawings that the charging stations will be near the storage tanks underground and asked if there should be concern.

Mr. Forsyth replied that the storage tanks will be more to the south of the charging stations.

Ms. Talon-Jemison reiterated that the drawings show that the tanks will be under the charging stations.

Mr. Forsyth replied that after looking again at the plans it does appear that the charging stations are above the tanks but, it would not affect the operations for the pumps or the tanks.

Ms. Talon-Jemison replied that she wasn’t concerned about the operations she was concerned about electrical charging going down where the gas is and wondered if there was some kind of buffer to make sure there is not an electrical charge from the charging stations to hit the tank. It appears on the drawing that the 3rd one that is maybe more south is over where the underground tank is located.

Ms. Horning stated that she understands Ms. Talon-Jemison’s concern and she will look into that and make sure that there is no conflict.

Mr. Frederick inquired about where the vents to the underground tanks were located.

Mr. Forsyth replied that they will move those vents to the south, away from that angle that directs the traffic. He also commented that on gasoline tanks, you have pumps with virtually the same voltage as a well pump, as is the charging stations. These are operated all the time and there is electric in the tanks as well. The vents are probably the most concern and we will shift these all the way to the south.

Chairperson Freitag wondered if the hotel and the applicant will have future disputes on parking since the hotel has been used to parking as they currently are.

Ms. Horning stated that she didn’t believe so since the canopy and fuel tanks will be replacing the parking section that the hotel has been using on the proposed site.

Chairperson Freitag asked Ms. Horning what company will be filling the pumps since they don’t currently have a name on the canopy.

Ms. Horning replied that it will be Mobile Gas.

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to recommend approval to City Council of the conditional rezoning (Zoning Map Amendment) and conditional rezoning agreement for RZ-2017-005; Hamdan Gas Station located at 29387 Airport Drive from C-2, General Business to C-3, Highway Business to allow for the redevelopment of the property into a gas station and convenience store. The conditional rezoning shall be subject to:

1. City Council approval of the Conditional Rezoning Agreement;
2. City Council approval of the Special Land Use for the gas station; and
3. Planning Commission review and approval of the site plan.

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

Motion by Workman supported by McAnally to recommend approval of the Special Land Use for SLU-2017-002; Hamdan Gas Station for a vehicle (automobile) gas station to City Council subject to:

1. Approval of the Conditional Rezoning (Zoning Map Amendment) and Conditional Rezoning Agreement by the City Council;
2. Approval of the site plan by the Planning Commission.
Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Workman, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty, Roscoe, Zilka and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

Motion by Paul supported by Talon-Jemison to approve **SPR-2017-025; Hamdan Gas Station** located at 29387 Airport Drive subject to:

1. Approval of the Conditional Rezoning (Zoning Map Amendment) and Conditional Rezoning Agreement by the City Council;
2. Approval of the Special Land Use by the City Council;
3. Waivers to the following:
   a. Section 11.07(f)(1), to reduce the pump island setback of 40 feet to 30 feet on the east side since the pavement is part of a shared parking area between the proposed gas station and the hotel;
   b. Section 11.07(f)(3), to allow a driveway that is more than 30 feet wide at the property line (note that correct dimension must be provided) as approved by Wayne County; and
   c. Section 14.06(e), to reduce the driveway spacing requirements from 350 feet to 170 feet since the proposed location provides maximum separation from Airport Drive and Wayne County has approved this location.
4. No signage is approved as part of the site plan; review and approval by the Building Department is required;
5. All comments of other departments, consultants or agencies;
6. Submittal of a revised site plan that addresses all comments of the Planning Commission and ARC (Administrative Review Committee) that includes the following:
   a. A description of the fuel delivery and refuse removal trucks to verify that the operations will not negatively impact the adjacent hotel;
   b. Verification that the adjacent hotel has sufficient parking spaces;
   c. Consistent dimensions on the new driveway width at the property line;
   d. Consistent information on the proposed lighting (engineering plan notes metal halide where lighting details are LED);
   e. A revised landscape plan to include the requirements per Section 13.02(h)(3) such as additional hedgerow plantings so that the headlights facing the roadways are screened; note also that parking lot trees must be increased to 2.5” – 3” caliper and all shrubs increased to 30” – 36” per Section 13.02(k);
   f. A cost estimate of the plant material in accordance with the recent Zoning Ordinance amendment and maintenance notes per Sections 13.02(m) and (o); Note #5. References cobblestone mulch which is not permitted;
   g. Material calculations to determine compliance with the building appearance standards of Section 13.01;
   h. More detail on the proposed solar panels on the roof of the building including detailed elevations or photographs to be reviewed and approved administratively to determine if there will be any negative impacts;
   i. Approval from the Fire Chief that the dispensing area is clearly visible; modifications to the proposed parking lot layout may be required (note on engineering plan states “No Parking in front of attendant’s area which is a parking);
   j. The correct address being included on the engineering drawings;
   k. The proposed zoning being provided on the engineering drawings; and
   l. A detail of the proposed electric vehicle charging station.

8. Old Business

A. PC-2016-020; McLane Food Service, 15670 Wahrman, requesting site plan approval extension #1 for the development of a 241,379-sq. ft. warehouse distribution building. DP #80-125-99-0008-700.

Tom Sovel, Spalding DeDecker, 905 South Boulevard East, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 on behalf of Jose Restrepo, McLane Foodservice stepped forward to speak

- Mr. Sovel stated that McLane Foodservice still has full intentions of building on the site. They had to reprioritize a few projects and delayed this project. In doing so, they had to renew the lease at their current location in Plymouth and were forced into a 3 year extension on the lease.
- Mr. Sovel also stated that they are hoping to break ground on this property in the spring of 2019.

Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve PC-2016-020; McLane Foodservice for a 12 month site plan extension for the development of a 241,379 sq. ft. warehouse distribution building located at 15670 Wahrman. Site plan will expire on February 15, 2019.

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

B. PC-2015-029/030; Michigan Components, Requesting extension of special land use and site plan approval for an existing contractor’s yard located at 28111 Northline Road. Parcel #80-097-99-0001-002.

- Ms. Maise commented that this request is a little different and reminded the commissioners that some of the work was already started. She gave the commissioners a brief history of the project and noted that one of the conditions of approval was that the project to be completed in November 2017.
- Ms. Maise also commented that the documentation provided by the applicant, Building Department and the City Engineer shows that the project is not complete. There have been some modifications on the site and the applicant is working towards completion, but will require an extension of special land use and site plan approval. There may be some discussion needed with the applicant and the commissioners since there were some modifications to the site.

Alan Cruz, Hennessey Engineers, 13500 Reek Road, Southgate, MI 48195 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the applicant, David McGee

- Mr. Cruz stated that they had a preconstruction meeting with the city engineer, DPW, Fire Department and Building Department. They have also posted a performance bond, inspection escrow and David installed the fire suppression. They have every intention of moving forward with the project and though it hasn’t happened as fast as they wanted it to, they have taken big steps in completing the project and they are positive that they are going to complete the project by spring of 2018 at the very latest.
Chairperson Freitag commented that she read in the applicant’s letter to the commissioners that the pipe needed for part of the completion on this project was required from a company that was affected by the hurricanes and that was reason for delay.

Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Cruz if that pipe was now in.

Mr. Cruz replied yes, they have a really good contractor now and are ready to start right after the holidays in January.

Chairperson Freitag questioned the wooded area in the rear of the property, which was not part of original approval, and that it appeared that the trees have been cleared. That is fine since Robert McCraight has granted approval of the tree clearing but, there was not permission to put outside storage back there.

Mr. Cruz stated that the owner, David McGee agrees with the chairperson’s assessment and will promptly remove the storage materials from that area, per the approved site plan.

Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. McCraight if he had any comments that he wanted to add.

Mr. McCraight commented that he had spoken with Mr. McGee and he had the inspection through the Building and Fire Departments and we did grant them a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy today. Ms. Maise did make us aware of the revisions to the site plan that will be required.

Mr. McCraight also commented that he did meet with David McGee on site and he gave him approval to remove thick brush and dead trees but, the rest will be worked out tonight.

Chairperson Freitag noted that the Planning Commission did have any issues with the clearing of the trees but, they do take issue with the outside storage that was not part of the original approval.

Ms. Maise stated that the site just needs to be in compliance, one way or another. The outdoor storage needs to be removed, as well as the gravel, and restored or amend the site plan and special land use, if Mr. McGee is wanting to keep the outdoor storage.

Mr. Cruz asked Ms. Maise what steps would need to happen if they decided to keep the gravel on site.

Ms. Maise commented that a revised site plan and an amended special land use would have to come back to the Planning Commission. One of the questions that may come up is that this site plan and special land use was approved with outdoor storage and the commissioners granted a waiver on the amount, in this district outdoor storage is allowed at 125% of the square footage of the buildings. It is above that now with what was approved with the waiver so, if adding on any additional it would certainly be another waiver that would need to be considered. The gravel itself would also need to be a waiver.

Chairperson Freitag wondered if they could go back and approve 125%.

Mr. McAnally stated that the commissioners can enforce the applicant to live up to the approved site plan.

Ms. Maise stated that if the applicant wanted to keep the storage near the building they would have to remove and restore somewhere else.

Mr. Cruz stated that they are leaning towards just restoring the area that was expanded, per the original approved site plan with waivers to avoid a revised site plan and amended special land use.

Mr. McGee agreed. He stated that he has already taken steps towards restoring the area and a portion has already been completed. The fire hydrant process is about to commence and that will go through where the storage is now and it will be disturbed for about 3-4 weeks but, he agrees to comply with the current approved site plan.

Mr. Cruz commented that the area will probably be used for staging but, when the project is complete and C of O is issued, the area will be restored, per the approved site plan.

Ms. Freitag asked Mr. McCraight how long a Temporary C of O is good for.
• Mr. McCraight stated that they are good for 6 months but, if weather is a hindrance it can be extended past 6 months or deny the request to extend.
• Ms. Maise commented that the commissioners can also grant a shorter time period if they wanted to see it completed sooner.
• Mr. Paul commented, for the record, he did meet with Mr. McGee today on site and noted that he has come a long way. Mr. McGee has been handicapped with the back order on the pipe. His concern is that once it is cleared up and a temporary C of O is issued that the site doesn’t go back to where it is now and as long as part of the motion states that there will not be any further expansion on the final C of O and if Mr. McGee intends to expand he will be required to come back before the Planning Commission.
• Mr. Cruz stated that once the final C of O is issued they will have to abide by the exact approved site plan.
• Ms. Maise commented that in fact, it was the clearing of the trees that caused them to be back before the Planning Commission. The trees were part of the screening for the outdoor storage and the berm along the front. Now that the trees are gone there is going to be more of a view into the property. She suggested that the commissioners ask for additional screening from the applicant to block that open view or wait until the restoration is complete and determine if additional screening is needed.
• Mr. McAnally suggested that after the project and restoration is complete that the determination of additional landscaping be left to administration upon final inspection.
• Ms. Maise reminded the commissioners that they waived additional screening since there were already trees and brush in place.
• Mr. Cruz recalled that some of the trees were to be removed.
• Ms. Maise stated that some were but, not all of them and the brush. Even though the trees and brush were small they still provided some screening.
• Mr. McGee reminded the commissioners of the additional screening at the road and along the berm that is to be staggered that was approved.
• Ms. Maise stated that it may be adequate screening.
• Further discussion was had between the commissioners and Ms. Maise in regards to the time frame of site plan and special land use approval.
• Mr. Cruz stated that they were confident that the project will be complete within the next 6 months.
• Mr. McCraight commented that language can be added to the final C of O that states if they deviate from the original site plan the C of O becomes null and void.

Motion by Paul supported by McAnally to approve a 6 month site plan and special land use extension approval to the original approved site plan for PC-2015-029/030; Michigan Components. The 6 month approval will run concurrently with the Temporary C of O and will expire on June 18, 2018 and subject to:

1. Administrative approval of landscaping if additional screening is required.

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

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

10. Reports

A. Chairperson
• Ms. Freitag thanked the Director of Public Services, the city engineer and the Fire Chief for their time and help with tonight’s cases and encouraged them to attend more meetings.
• Ms. Freitag wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

B. City Planner

Planning Department Status Report

• Ms. Maise informed the commissioners that there will be a January meeting.
• Ms. Maise and the commissioners discussed a few projects that are currently under review and the rebirth of some blighted buildings within the city.

11. Reports on Interest Designation

• Ms. Roscoe announced upcoming city events.

12. Communications – None.

13. Adjournment

Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, McAnally, Roscoe, Workman, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

David Paul, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission