MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2018

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, Daniel McAnally, Jessica Workman and Cathy Freitag

   Excused: David Paul

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

3. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes — Zilka, Glotfelty, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, McAnally, Roscoe, Workman 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. Public Hearings

   7. Old Business

      A. SPR-2017-011; Pritula Trailer Storage – Phases 2 & 3

         Applicant: William Pritula

         Matt Diffin, Diffin-Umlor & Associates

         Request: Site plan approval for expanded trailer storage including 361 trailer spaces

         Location: 28034 Beverly, #80-001-99-0016-701

         Project: Expansion of trailer repair and storage facility

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

   8. New Business

      A. SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons

         Applicant: Steve Kalabat, Ecorse Commons, LLC

         Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, Inc.

         Request: Site plan approval

         Location: 37350 Ecorse, Parcel #80-024-99-0005-703
Project: Construction of a 416,000 sq. ft. cross dock warehouse distribution center and trailer parking

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

B. SPR-2018-003; Romulus Airport Logistics Center

Applicant: Shawn Smith, Wildamere Capital Management, LLC

Scott Kreutzer, JB Donaldson Company

Request: Site plan approval

Location: 6999 Cogswell, Parcel #80-024-99-0004-702

Project: Development of a 311,500-sq. ft. warehouse/distribution facility

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

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

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

B. City Planner

1) MAP Planning & Zoning Essentials Workshop March 20, 2018

2) Planning Department Status Report

11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Communications

A. WCAA – Runway Reconstruction

B. Van Buren Township Notice of Master Plan Amendment

C. Planning & Zoning News – Solar Energy

13. Adjournment

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Motion by Glotfelty supported by Workman approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on January 17, 2018 and the revised minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on December 18, 2017.

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

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

6. Public Hearings – None.

7. Old Business –

Matt Diffin, Diffin-Umlor & Associates, 49287 West Rd, Wixom, MI 48393 stepped forward on behalf of William Pritula

- Mr. Diffin stated that he was in agreement with everything that the planner had to say in her report and they will comply with any issues and outstanding items.
- Ms. Maise apologized for the timing on the information submitted to the commissioners. She noted that the key items have been addressed for planning, for the most part, and is recommending conditional approval but, there are some pretty big conditions that are moving it beyond the planning department and Planning Commission and getting it on to Engineering. She stated that Marcus McNamara, OHM and Bob Mc Craight, DPS Director can address any questions or concerns that the commissioners may have. Some questions were generated by comments from the Planning Commission and we need to get on record how these have been met, if they haven’t been met then we need to decide what needs to be done to get it moved on.
- Ms. Maise referred to Mr. McNamara’s summary letter.
- Mr. McAnally commented that the commissioner’s packets were delivered late last night and they usually have more time to review and process all the information.
- Ms. Maise noted that the commissioners may recall, the applicant was given 90 days from the last meeting to submit and the Planning Department received their information late Friday. With the holiday, ARC reviewed as soon as they got it and over the weekend and forwarded them to the commissioners as soon as they possibly could.
- Mr. Diffin commented that there are no changes to the site plan since they were last before the Planning Commission. The plan before the commissioners are the same plans that they submitted to Wayne County in January but, there are no new revisions. The last time that they were before the Planning Commission they were in agreement then and nothing has changed.
- Chairperson Freitag stated that there were concerns of the culvert, the letter back from Wayne County says that they have no record of this culvert.
- Mr. Diffin agreed and noted that he spoke with the manufacturer, the reviewers at Wayne County and the Director. Its’ not that they don’t have a record of it but, it’s been 7 years since the culvert was installed and getting someone to go find the records since they have been filed and boxed away seems to be the issue. The manufacturer stated that Wayne County does not give them any paperwork. Wayne County inspectors show up to the plant, get the thumbs up and ship the materials but, nothing leaves the plant. It’s a Wayne County project without it being inspected by Wayne County.
- Chairperson Freitag asked if Wayne County was present to inspect the installation of the culvert.
- Mr. Diffin stated that Wayne County was present for the inspection. Wayne County doesn’t have any issues with the culvert being there. If they hadn’t did their inspections they would have issued a violation letter and they would have made Mr. Pritula remove the culvert.
- Chairperson commented that if it a matter of getting Planning Commission approval, then he should probably apply to get the inspection report.
- Mr. Diffin replied that he did file the paperwork to get the inspection report but, there is nothing further that he can do on his part, maybe the city has more pull with Wayne County to get a copy.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that when the culvert is installed it comes with a letter from Wayne County and the manufacturer, along with a stamp at each end of the pipe into the concrete. Typically it doesn’t matter which county you’re working in, they will be there when that pipe is installed. He would like to see the date of the manufacturer and up to Wayne County standards.
- Mr. Diffin commented that it is a corrugated arched metal culvert, they poured concrete on either side of the culvert. He reiterated that he has been trying for 6 months to gets records from Wayne County and he can’t force them to look for this letter.
• Chairperson Freitag stated that Wayne County’s letter states that they certify that the records do not exist, not that they won’t look for the letter in their records.
• Mr. Diffin commented that Wayne County does not have a problem with the culvert being on the site. Either they inspected it and it’s ok or they didn’t and there is something wrong.
• Chairperson Freitag noted that basically, this is where we are at. We have no proof that anyone inspected it.
• Mr. McCraight commented that the Building & Safety Department was able to locate the permit by Wayne County for the installation of the culvert but, what is missing and will be required is the final inspection results.
• Mr. Diffin offered to have Wayne County come back out to respect but, someone other than himself that there is an issue here for them to re-inspect. He has been working with them for over 25 years and trying to get documentation, other than a permit is very difficult.
• Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Diffin if the land owner has tried to get any documentation from Wayne County.
• Mr. Diffin replied no.
• Mr. Glotfelty commented that he has installed a lot of those pipes, for probably over 40 years, and bought them from many manufacturer’s over Southeast Michigan, and when a pipe arrives, doesn’t matter if its metal or concrete or if a head wall goes around it, a date is stamped on it at either end to inspect. He looked it over fairly well and from what he could see and he couldn’t find it. There needs to be something because he wouldn’t want to be liable for something he permitted and wasn’t legal to begin with.
• Mr. Diffin wondered how much liability the city had when it is a county drain. He wondered how this can be resolved.
• Chairperson Freitag stated that the problem is that the petitioner doesn’t have a good track record with approvals from the Planning Commission. That has some bearing on this project.
• Mr. Diffin asked the commissioner if they would be satisfied with Wayne County coming back to look at the culvert again and issuing a letter that they’ve inspected it. We have an open on-going permit with them and they have a lot more work and inspections that will need to be done and they would rather that they come inspect it all at once at the end of the project and get an approval letter then.
• Chairperson deferred to Mr. McNamara or Mr. McCraight.
• Mr. McNamara commented that if this weren’t an issue the activities associated with Phase 2 & 3 of the development require Wayne County permitting and the applicant is going through that process and he would consider it a reasonable condition of approval. The Planning Commission could attach that any undocumented work from Phase 1 be on file prior to final acceptance of Phases 2 & 3.
• Mr. Diffin commented that he does have some leverage with Wayne County, since he has to give them easements and there is no reason why they can’t revisit the culvert and re-inspect it since they are going to be there anyway. There shouldn’t be any reason that they can’t revisit it.
• Mr. McAnally referred to item #3 on the OHM letter dated February 20, 2018 and asked Mr. McCraight if confirmation of acceptability with DPW and Fire would happen regarding the hydrant elevations.
• Mr. McCraight commented that it has happened.
• Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Diffin if all of the debris has been cleaned from the property.
• Mr. Diffin stated that it was the neighbor’s property that the debris was on.
• Chairperson Freitag noted that there was a fence between the properties.
• Mr. Diffin confirmed that there is an existing fence between the properties.
• Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise inquired about the Temporary Use that the BZA recently granted the applicant and asked if they were all set.
Ms. Maise stated that they were not all set. She noted that the Planning Commissioner's packets contained the notes and minutes from the BZA meeting and that there were several items that the applicant needed to submit. She understood that the applicant contacted the Building Department today and talked to Mr. McCraight.

Ms. Maise commented that she would recommend that the applicant comply and pull a zoning compliance permit from the Building Department.

Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. McCraight if the applicant has applied for the zoning permit.

Mr. McCraight stated that they have not issues a permit yet. They have reached out through email, which was not received but, that could be our email, since the city has a tough firewall some of the emails don't come through. He noted that he has given them the list of all the requirements and is still waiting on their submittal. Basically what they need to submit is: hours of operation, method to maintain the site, when they will complete the operation there, proof of insurance and a $10,000 bond; that will not be released until the site is finished being used and cleaned up.

Ms. Maise noted that the $17,000 cash bond is part of the site plan review, not the temporary use by the contractor for the concrete curb along the east side of the drive.

Ms. Maise commented that the applicant is requesting a couple of waivers. One is a waiver for the irrigation. As you may recall, several years ago irrigation was discussed as part of Phase 1 and they had to provide irrigation for the front greenbelt. We are requesting the same for this phase where we are asking for the plantings to be put on the berm that is there now. The applicant is replying that there are some challenges to that, as Mr. McNamara commented, the applicants concerns are valid and requesting a waiver at this time.

Mr. Diffin explained why the irrigation is not reasonable but that they are willing to place a bond for the landscape.

Chairperson Freitag asked for clarification on when the landscape will be complete.

Mr. Diffin stated that the landscape will be complete between Phase 2 & Phase 3.

Ms. Maise recommended that the commissioners determine what items are still outstanding that were requested from the applicant at their meeting in November. She noted that a lot of the items will be picked up in engineering but, they may want to give the applicant a time limit to complete these items since they have history of getting site plan approval and never submitting engineering.

Ms. Maise asked Mr. Diffin when they could possibly be ready for engineering.

Mr. Diffin replied that they could have the plans ready in a few weeks.

The Planning Commissioners agreed that they would give the applicant 30 days to submit for engineering.

Mr. McNamara read from the list of outstanding items from his report and focused on items 6 & 8 with a recommendation that the commissioners place a time limit of five years on the remaining development.

Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Diffin if they have applied for combination of the addresses through the Assessor's office.

Mr. Diffin stated that they will as soon as they get site plan approval.

Mr. McAnally commented that the commissioners needed to agree to waive the irrigation and curb.

Chairperson Freitag agreed.

Mr. Glotfelter commented that he would still like to see something on the culvert.

Mr. McAnally noted that they are expecting to see that as part of inspections from Wayne County.

Mr. McCraight stated that the Building Department has the option to not issue a certificate of occupancy until there is final approval from Wayne County on the culvert.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to conditionally approve SPR-2017-011; Pritula Trailer Storage - Phases 2 & 3 subject to:
1. Compliance with the conditions of temporary use approval for the pipeline contractor’s establishment granted by the BZA on January 3, 1918 including the submittal of a Zoning Compliance Permit application through the Building Department.

2. Submittal of all required information as directed by the Planning Commission at the November meeting.

3. A parcel combination through the City Assessor’s Office.

4. A copy of the recorded quit claim deed for the dedication of the Beverly Road right-of-way to the City of Romulus must be provided.

5. A cash bond in the amount of $17,440 for the concrete curb along the east side of the proposed drive and south side of the proposed paving.

6. Waivers to the following:
   a. A waiver from the requirements of Section 14.02(b)(2) for curbs between Phase 3 and 4 conditioned upon a time constraint of 5 years on the construction of Phase 4 and a cash bond in the amount of $17,440 for the cost of the improvements. These conditions must be noted on the waiver request on the site plan.
   b. A waiver to Section 13.02(m)(3) to waive the irrigation requirement for all landscaped areas.

7. Screening of the trailer storage as determined during a site inspection upon completion of the improvements. Additional screening shall be required if the trailers are visible from the road.

8. Installation of plantings on the existing berm.

9. Restoration of all areas of Phase 4 not being utilized.

10. All additional items as required by staff and consultants, including inspection and approval of the culvert by Wayne County.

11. Submittal of engineering plans within 30 days of conditional approval by the Planning Commission.

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

8. New Business

A. SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons, requesting site plan approval for the development of a 416,000-sq. ft. cross dock warehouse distribution center and trailer parking. DP# 80-024-99-0005-703.

Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, 13500 Reeck Road, Southgate, MI 48195 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the petitioner. Also in attendance were Nino and Vince DiDomenico, D&G Building Company, 30735 Cypress, Suite 600 Romulus, MI 48174

- Mr. Brock presented the commissioners with a power point presentation of the proposed project. He explained that the parcel is 65 acres on the north side of Ecorse between Wayne and Cogswell and was the former site of the General Motors Tech Center and a part of the General Motors Powertrain campus. The site housed a parking lot and building, which was demolished years ago. General Motors was forced to liquidate this portion of their property during bankruptcy and in doing so created a lot of restrictions on this property. They disconnected all of the utilities, along with the sanitary, water main and storm sewer. The storm sewer used to run to the General Motors detention basin and they disconnected that entire system.
- Mr. Brock continued to explain that one of the restrictions placed on the property is that the new owner would have to disconnect the access drive that goes around the property. They would have to physically disconnect that drive from General Motors. There is a fence that runs
along the drive that separates the two properties but, as part of the restrictions we are going to have to remove concrete.

- Mr. Brock explained that there is a county drain that runs along the west side of the property that has a MDEQ regulated floodway and they do not plan to build into or modify that in any way.

- Mr. Brock stated that the proposed plan has a 416,000-sq. ft. warehouse/distribution center with truck docks at the north and south of the building. Vehicle parking would be on the east and west of the property with trailer parking on the north and south. They plan to bring in new utilities, including sanitary sewer from Ecorse road and a new water main that will loop the property that will service a future development to the rear of the property. They are going to install a new storm system with a detention basin at the rear of the property as well. The existing storm system along the loop will be tied into the new system.

- Mr. Brock explained that as part of the restrictions from GM they have to provide their own access to the property. They are proposing 2 accesses off of Ecorse Road. They have sent Wayne County Planning Department and the Building Department the proposed site plans. They have suggested that they extend the right turn lane that is on the north side of Ecorse and extend the passing lane on the south side of Ecorse Road. Wayne County has reviewed and approved the site plans, geometrics and the passing lane and right turn lane. They are currently in for a second review and hopefully ready to get a permit from the county.

- Mr. Brock stated that he understands that the eastern most drive is not in compliance with the city’s ordinance and a little too close to the General Motors drive than what the city’s ordinance requires but, they are requesting a waiver for that situation. The county likes the drive to line up across the street but, they are fine with the configuration the way that it is.

- Mr. Brock showed the commissioners some views of the existing right-of-way and noted that a lot of the trees will remain and supplement with new landscaping as needed.

- Mr. Brock stated that they are proposing a condominium in the future but, now they don’t have a tenant or any kind of use for the rear property but, when they do get a user and tenant and they submit they will include condominium documentation at that time. They have no intention of splitting the property.

- Mr. Brock described the proposed 43 ft. high building to the commissioners and showed them some colored renderings. He explained that there could possibly be multiple tenants in the building. The goal is to have one tenant but they have the possibility of bracing it up for more than one tenant.

- Mr. Brock showed the commissioners a quick video of the proposed site and layout.

- Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Brock if the tenant that they had previously had backed out.

- Mr. Brock replied yes. Back in the summer they were before the commissioners with a conditional rezoning to MT and it was tenant specific to the future rear building and they are no longer moving forward. There could be a similar user in the future but, as of now they don’t have a tenant for that portion.

- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he had drove back to the rear of the property and the loop road was water logged and ice covered.

- Mr. Brock agreed and stated that Mr. Glotfelty had a good point. That is because General Motors disconnected the storm system from their detention basin so, the storm water doesn’t currently drain anywhere.

- Mr. Glotfelty commented that if 2 trucks have to pass on the loop road, it is going to be quite challenging.

- Mr. Brock disagreed and commented that General Motors used it and there weren’t any problems. He added that in the summertime he was out there and noticed that the road is in
really good shape, there are no cracks and no ASR, which can be a big problem. It is a little over grown but, can easily be cleaned up.

- Mr. Glotfety asked Mr. Brock if the property goes along the McCullough Drain.
- Mr. Brock replied yes. The drain is on the property.
- Mr. Glotfety noted that the drain was overflowing when he was out there.
- Mr. Brock noted that explains why there is a floodway associated with the site.
- Mr. Glotfety stated that he hopes that Wayne County will clean the drain.
- Mr. Brock commented that their site will be disconnected from the drain, therefore there will be no backwater coming into the site from the drain. The property is long and they would be pumping the water back at a very slow rate since they are below the drain.
- Mr. Glotfety asked Mr. Brock about the comments from the Building Department and asked if they could meet the conditions regarding parking requirements.
- Mr. Brock stated yes and they added more parking spaces.
- Mr. Glotfety asked Mr. Brock about GM suggesting that they unhook the access road because it would be nice for access of our fire trucks.
- Mr. Brock stated that it would be nice to use the signalized intersection and road but, it’s just not possible.
- Mr. Frederick commented that he was concerned about MKSK’s review and comments about the 2 entrances. He stated that he agreed that there needs to be further discussion regarding the 2 drives and the safety concerns.
- Ms. Maise noted that Marcus McNamara and Steve Deering from OHM was present and could discuss his concerns about the 2 driveways as well.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Brock to explain why the petitioner’s justification for the 2 driveways since it is not in our ordinance.
- Mr. Brock commented gave a brief background on how the 2 drives on site came into play. He stated that the drain to the west has a large amount of floodway associated with the drain and by pushing the western most driveway entrance to the west any further would encroach into that floodway, which MDEQ wouldn’t let you do that. The western approach is limited to that location. The eastern approach, which is located between the western approach and the General Motors drive, the spacing is just not there for the second driveway. Most industrial site have 2 driveways. It is going to be very necessary to have the 2 approaches, especially with the future rear development. It helps with marketability and traffic flow, as well.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Brock if the development could be built without the 2 driveways.
- Mr. Brock replied that the building could be built but, they really need the 2 driveways.

Tim Melvin, Gillette Associates, 32969 Hamilton Court, Farmington Hills, MI 48334 the architect on the development of Ecorse Commons stepped forward to speak to the commissioners.

- Mr. Melvin stated that he does a lot of work for different industrial developments and when there is logistics facilities they are requesting 2 drives out because they are worried about accidents with just-in-time delivery. This has become standard process in the industry. If there is an accident, they need to be able to contractually abide by the time and be able to get out of the site.
- Mr. McAnally noted that Ecorse Road is going to become incredibly busy with the Amazon development. When you have 3 driveways stacked up right in a row he believes that there will be more accidents. He asked Mr. Melvin if he had read the traffic reports from OHM and MKSK.
- Mr. Melvin replied that he had read them.
- Ms. Maise commented that they need to find a resolve.
Steven Estes, Dykema, 39577 Woodward Ave #300, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304 stepped forward to address the commissioners.

- Mr. Estes stated that he was here tonight with the applicant and he was the one who wrote the letter for the request for the waiver to the standards under the ordinance.
- Mr. Estes elaborated that the site is challenging principally because of the Racer property relative to the closure of the one drive but, also because of the county drain. This compresses the frontage of the property but, they also have some practical difficulties because they believe that if they move the drive further west it will no longer align with the drive across the road and they already have Wayne County approval because of the alignment of the 2 drives. They feel that if they move it they will not get Wayne County approval, which will eliminate their ability to get 2 drives. This is important because from a marketability standpoint, they have broker that they are working with, CBRE and they have been advised that the site will not be marketable with just one drive.
- Mr. Estes commented that they are in a little bit of a box and he cited similar distribution facility site that are here in Romulus; A123 Ecorse and Archway on Cogswell. He also commented that there are other sites in southeast Michigan with 2 driveways. Under the 14.06 criteria the commissioners do have the authority to waive this if the applicant meets certain standards. One of the standards is that the Wayne County Road Commission has approved their drive and that it is aligned with the drive across Ecorse Road. He believes that they can meet the criteria and understands that it is critically important for this site to move forward. He understands also that it’s challenging and while there may be technical reason that they may hear from the city’s consultants on how it could be moved, given the spacing, he thinks it will be practically difficult for the applicant to get further approvals that are necessary to construct the drives, which could result in the project not being built.
- Mr. Estes expressed that they believe that this is important to the site and respectfully ask that the commissioner consider the waiver on behalf of the applicant.

Steven Deering, OHM Senior Traffic Engineer, 34000 Plymouth Rd., Livonia, MI 48150 stepped forward to speak to the commissioners

- Mr. Deering stated that he has worked very closely with Brad Strader from MKSK and has a great deal of respect for his judgement and in this particular instance their judgements are the same. He commented that there are a number of reasons why they feel that the property owners have not justified having 2 driveways, especially the one that is located to the east most frontage of the property. Although he is understanding and sympathetic to the concerns of the applicants in regard to the marketability with just one point of access and he doesn’t want to minimize their concerns but, on the other hand, his focus is on traffic safety. When it comes to issues like crashes, there is a potential for injuries to occur.
- Mr. Deering noted that the access management standards that the city has in place, the city should be commended for having this, this reflects a growing realization among safety professionals of how important it is to control and access. This has proven to be a great way of minimizing the risk of crashes and injuries on the roads within the community.
- Mr. Deering commented that if it was just an issue of just spacing between the driveways the east most proposed driveway violates the standard but becomes more of particular concern for him because the GM drive is signalized. Now you are talking about an ancillary drive, which their own traffic study shows that is not being highly used under normal events. In the immediate impact area of that signal every time that the signal cycles to serve traffic coming out of GM traffic will be queuing up on Ecorse. Within seconds it is going to que up on that driveway and will become particularly onerous to use the driveway to make left hand turns in
and out of the property. It’s not just the proximity and violation of the dimensional standards between the driveways, it’s the violation of the dimensional standards to a signal.

- Mr. Deering acknowledged that the applicant has conducted a traffic study which shows what kind of travel movements that they anticipate traffic will be coming in and out of the properties, especially at peak times when Ecorse is at its busiest. Their study shows that they assume that 80% of all the traffic will be using the western drive and that the western drive works just fine. Extrapolating if you were to put 100% of their anticipating traffic on that western drive. They haven’t demonstrated a traffic safety or operational need for that second driveway.

- Mr. Deering commented that the applicant has expressed a second building at the rear of the property but, that is an “if come” situation. That still doesn’t demonstrate the need for the second driveway at this time. With any future development of the balance of the site he hoped that the city would require an updated traffic study of the site to reflect the new use and a second driveway can be reviewed at that time. Even if a second driveway it shown to be needed, this is still a lousy location for it because of its proximity to the traffic signal. If they still needed a second driveway and if Wayne County were to suggest that this is still the right location, they haven’t demonstrated that a driveway at that location needs to be full access. It could be simply a right in and out only and that would minimize the crash potential, especially exiting traffic at that traffic signal and the queuing from it as it cycles thorough the day.

- Mr. Deering offered that another way to have a second access is at the far western one and make it a boulevard entrance so, if half of it is blocked because of a crash or incident, the other half is still available. Boulevarded entrances for commercial properties is not that uncommon and can be seen all over the region. It give them the redundancy if half of the entrance is blocked so that they can still move vehicles.

- Mr. Deering stated that what he was really trying to point out is that the applicant hasn’t really thought it all through, they haven’t demonstrated a compelling need for a second point of access at this time and they haven’t addressed any of the safety concerns with the access at this location so close to a traffic signal.

- Mr. Glotfelty thanked Mr. Deering for his comments and he likes the idea of the right in and right out but, at this time the commissioners do not have any dimensions of this driveway. He noted that Mr. Deering cleared up some things for him and asked Mr. Brock if a larger, wider driveway or boulevard work for the applicant.

- Mr. Brock replied a second access point is really key, like Mr. Melvin had stated, the marketability and access to and from the site, in the vent of one of the drives being blocked, they really need to have that second driveway location. Even the brokers dealing with this site have stressed that the second location is key. He noted that they have built locations here before, on Hannan Road, with driveways closer, or a possibly a shared approach, than what they are proposing now and there haven’t been any kind of issues.

- Mr. McAnally commented that it was irrelevant. He asked Mr. Brock what relevance that had to Ecorse Road where there is a lot more traffic than that of Hannan Road. He asked what the though was about the idea of right turn only.

- Mr. Brock commented that it is something that they can entertain but, they would need to talk about it with the applicant.

- Mr. McAnally stated that he does believe that the commissioners should be designing their property at a Planning Commission meeting. He will definitely not support dual access left and right out of both driveways. It would have to be 1 driveway or some other conclusion.

- Chairperson Freitag commented that they do have the choice of the property owner assuming the responsibility if there are any accidents at that intersection.
• Mr. McAnally commented that while that is monetarily interesting, if his sons were killed in a car accident because of this he could care less what the city makes off of it. That being said, there is no way in the world that he would vote for this.

• Mr. Frederick commented that maybe a second entrance only with no exit. No exit would prevent the traffic from wanting to turn left wanting to go eastbound and the stack of traffic from the light heading back west not allowing a left turn out of the site onto Ecorse Road so, entrance only. He referenced on how similar Lear on Eureka is with 2 buildings, 4 tenants and 1 drive near the light and railroad tracks. The applicant’s example of Hannan is not similar because there is no traffic signal at that location.

• The commissioners and Mr. Brock had more discussion on how traffic could or couldn’t flow onto and exiting the site from both driveways.

• Mr. McAnally wondered what the applicant and the City Planner was looking for from the commissioners.

• Ms. Maise commented that the city was looking to have a meeting with the applicant and the traffic engineers and they decided that they wanted to come before Planning Commission.

• Mr. Estes stated that he was just speaking to the applicants and wondered if they could compromise with a right in and right out only and make this a restricted drive and is something that the applicant can live with. They still believe that it could be marketable, although it’s not ideal it would be devastating to just have a single drive for this development, if it ever got blocked he couldn’t imagine the impact it could have on the business. He understands that there are some technical concerns but, they are willing to compromise with a right in and right out, if acceptable to the Planning Commission.

• Mr. Glotflely asked Mr. Brock where they were with an acceleration and deceleration lane because it is very important to him.

• Mr. Brock commented yes, that they are both in the plans. They are planning on extending the right turn lane from the GM drive through the western approach and they are also extending the passing lane through the western approach, as well. This was the direction of Wayne County, as part of their requirements.

• Mr. Brock asked the commissioners if they could get conditional approval with administrative review to change the plans to reflect the restriction of no left turn in or out and finish through engineering.

• Ms. Maise commented that she would not be comfortable with that since there are still items that haven’t been discussed, there was some concern of the orientation of the loading docks and the overhead doors on the front. She understands that they showed a video but, she wanted to hear the concerns and comments from the commissioners. She also spoke with the city attorney again on the form of ownership to make sure that there are not going to be problems later if the road ever does become a road and the condominium is committed to. The city attorney wanted some more information on this. There also needs to be some resolution on the driveway. She asked the commissioners if they were comfortable granting a waiver on this. There have been some options thrown out but, no resolution.

• Mr. Deering commented that there are some alternatives to the site that can be considered. He commented that his first preference is that there be one point of access orientated to the west as far away from the traffic signal as possible. His second order of preference is that there be a boulevard entrance on the western portion of the site. The third preference would be a right in, right out at the location shown for the eastern driveway. He’s sure that working with the applicants engineer they can make sure that the geometry forces the right turns out. He has seen far too many channelized drives that are child’s play to make a left turn out of where you are forcing a right turn out, it’s just a laziness of design and we can make it a design where they are going to turn right, they would have to go to extraordinary measures to make a left
turn out in violation of what is required of them, as a last choice and he would endorse it over the plan that they have now. What he cannot speak for is Brad Strader but, he would be more than happy to discuss this with Brad if the Planning Commission so desires.

- Chairperson Freitag noted that Mr. Strader commented in his review letter that he was in agreement with what Mr. Deering had to say about the traffic study.
- Ms. Maise asked Mr. Deering if he had discussed the boulevard with Brad Strader or Tim Keyes.
- Mr. Deering replied no. He also noted that they need direction from the Planning Commission but, he would be happy to meet with the applicant, Brad Strader and Ms. Maise to discuss options for this site.
- Mr. McCraight commented that there was a statement made that the approach cannot be moved further west because of the floodway issue. You can develop into the floodway but, you cannot put a structure there but, you can put a road or flatwork there so that there can be some site modifications here to move the approaches further west away from the intersection. He is not going to get into the habit of designing the job like this but, it can be done.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that it would be move advantageous to move the approach further west as not to interfere with the traffic from the City Event Center.
- Mr. Brock stated that he looked at moving the approach further west but, through the floodway and the drain of the property once you get further west the drain goes down quite a bit and in order to move the drive further west we would have to bring in a lot of fill and the MDEQ doesn’t allow you to fill in the floodway. If the drive was lower and the floodway was able to flow over the drive someway, then that would be allowed. With the right-of-way being a high point it would be a substantial amount of fill that would prohibit them from doing that.
- Ms. Maise commented that this was the kind of information that she was hoping could have been gone over with all of the experts prior to coming before the commissioners. It does sound like we have narrowed things down and a lot more information has come out tonight so, maybe we can get a meeting scheduled in the very near future, work it administratively and get something back to the Planning Commission at the next meeting. It does sound like there is some resolution and it just needs to be cleaned up.
- Mr. Glotfeltly commented that Wayne County would need to agree on the boulevard if that is what was decided by all parties.
- The commissioners agreed that they have come to the conclusion that there still needs to be further discussion on the traffic and the second driveway so, they will postpone until such time that the applicant can provide additional information and everyone can come to an agreement.

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfeltly to postpone SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons until such time that all the information has been collected.

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

B. SPR-2018-003; Romulus Airport Logistics Center, 6999 Cogswell, requesting site plan approval for the development of a 311,500-sq. ft. warehouse/distribution facility. DP #80-024-99-0004-702.

Mike Motte, PEA Consultants, 2430 Rochester Ct., Suite 100, Troy, MI 48083 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the applicant.

- Mr. Motte stated that he was there to represent Wildamere Capital Management for approval to develop a new warehouse/distribution center.
Mr. Motte presented the commissioners with a power point presentation of the development and explained that the site plan would include a 311,500-sq. ft. distribution center at the corner of Ecorse Road and Cogswell with 56 loading docks, 112 truck parking spaces and 209 vehicular parking spaces.

Michael Serduik, NSA Architects, 23761 Research Dr., Farmington Hills, MI 48335 came forward to speak.

- Mr. Serduik explained the materials that will be used for the building. He noted that they will be precast concrete panels and that they were anticipating up to 4 tenant spaces although, they were hoping for 1 tenant.
- Mr. Serduik stated that they tried to make the front of the building attractive to views from both Cogswell and Ecorse Roads.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Serduik if the building will say “Romulus” on the front as depicted on the color renderings.
- Mr. Serduik replied that it is being called “Romulus Airport Logistics Center” but there is space for signage for whomever the tenant will be. There will also be a ground sign in front of the building depicting the tenants.
- Mr. Serduik pointed out that there will be truck docks at the rear and a large landscaped berm at the front to screen the trucks that will be dropped down but they are not going to be sitting in wells. He showed the commissioners elevation renderings and asked if they had any questions.

John Crow, Wildamere Capital Management, 4171 Eagles Nest Drive, Waterford, MI 48329 stepped forward to speak

- Mr. Crow commented that there is high interest in the building and they have a lot of potential tenants stepping away because the building won’t be done before May. They are going to have some obligation depending on the lender and they are marketing the building. He asked the commissioners if they have any questions.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he had visited the site and wondered if the Buckeye Pipeline runs along the property.
- Mr. Motte replied that the pipeline runs through the property.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Motte if there would be any conflicts between the detention basin and the pipeline.
- Mr. Motte replied that the Sunoco and Buckeye Pipelines are both there and they run diagonally through the site and development will be outside of that. This is one of the reasons for pushing the building where they did so that it would be outside of the pipeline easement.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked if they will have outside storage.
- Mr. Motte replied that besides trailers there will be no outside storage.
- Mr. Motte commented that they will be asking for a couple of waivers on the driveway because the intersection at Ecorse and Cogswell is a signalized intersection. After speaking with Wayne County they have reduced the entrance for employees coming off of Ecorse so it’s only a right in and they will not be able to bring left turns in due to the proximity to the intersection. The waiver they will need is for the distance between the restricted employee entrance and the truck drive. It doesn’t meet the 350 ft. spacing requirements and with that there is an entrance to the east of us and our truck drive entrance and that they don’t meet the 350 ft. requirements there as well.
- Mr. Motte noted that on Cogswell there is another site that has 2 driveways coming into their facility, they lined their driveway with theirs and the other is within the distance as well.
• Ms. Workman asked Chairperson Freitag if with the requests for waivers, should a traffic study be requested since there is going to be a lot of traffic on Ecorse Road with all of the development that is coming and since it abuts residential.

• Mr. McNamara commented that as of now the user is speculative. They did provide some anticipated trip generation numbers but those can be refined once they have tenant. The advantage of having two entrances is to separate the trucks and the vehicles and this is what justifies the spacing waiver because they could meet it if they had one entrance that accommodates both cars and trucks, however this would result in other issues. This is a little different than the previous case (Ecorse Commons) but certainly the city could ask for a traffic study once users are identified.

• Chairperson Freitag commented that in the planner’s summary they are requiring a traffic study.

• Ms. Maise added that once they know who the users are they will require the traffic study. With all new development on Ecorse Road, traffic studies will likely be needed because of the volume increase in traffic.

• Mr. Glotfelty asked Ms. Maise if they could approve the site plan without Wayne County approval.

• Ms. Maise asked Mr. Motte where they were with the county.

• Mr. Motte replied that they sent it to Wayne County Planning and they are going to review the full configuration of the restricted left in and make sure that it tapers in and the turn lanes are what they really want to see. They know that it’s coming but they wanted to get through site plan approval to make sure there weren’t any adjustments that were needed before they submit engineering.

• Mr. McAnally wondered which access points are restricted.

• Mr. Motte pointed them out on the site plan and noted that it is the employee driveway. They will have an island and signs properly posted.

• Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Motte if they would be willing to add additional landscaping if after the final inspection it is discovered more is needed for screening.

• Mr. Motte replied that they did discuss this at the ARC meeting and agreed to do so.

• Ms. Maise commented that they strategically added more landscaping to the plan but they always like the option of being able to request more if needed.

• Chairperson Freitag wondered if she had seen a fence on the proposed plan.

• Mr. Motte commented that they are not proposing a fence.

• Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Motte if they are required to get a variance for the detention pond being that it is so close to the road.

• Mr. Motte replied no. They are setback enough and connecting to the existing system but, they will be submitting to the FAA for the wet pond but it will be over 1,600 feet from any runway.

• Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Mr. Motte how they control the truck-only entrance.

• Mr. Motte replied that at this point it’s only going to be signage and he noted that normally the employees are not going to want to be mixed in with the trucks and the truck entrance will be far from where the employees will be parking. He believes that the employees will be going into the nearest drive that will get them to their parking spaces the quickest. Without having a person sitting there to enforce it, all you can do is sign for it and hope that they don’t mingle.

• Ms. Talon-Jemison asked if they will have that as part of the traffic study.

• Mr. Motte replied that they will adjust the trip generations based on the trucks and where the cars are going so, they will look at that. They do have to maintain a connection point so that they have a circulation going around the building for emergency vehicles.

• Mr. Crow commented that Detroit Thermal Systems employees park on one side of the building and the truck distribution is on the other side. The employees are not allowed to be
in that lot and they will get written up if they do so and even fired. Dawn Foods has an employee lot in the front for liability and the tenant drives that and enforces this with marked lots for trucks and employees. The tenant will enforce it more than they would.

- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Mr. Crow if they can guarantee that the tenant will enforce this.
- Mr. Crow replied that it is to their advantage to do so because they don’t want the employees mixing with the trucks.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Workman to approve SPR-2018-003; **Romulus Airport Logistics Center** located at 6999 Cogswell subject to:

1. Waivers from *Section 14.06* as follows:
   a. Driveway spacing between new driveways on Ecorse Road; 350 feet required, 254.55 feet proposed;
   b. Driveway spacing between new driveway and existing driveway on Ecorse Road; 350 feet required, 194.96 feet proposed; and
   c. Driveway spacing between opposing driveways on Cogswell; 150 feet required, 130.95 feet proposed.
2. A traffic study shall be provided prior to any occupancy to verify that traffic operations will remain acceptable. If any users or combination of users result in truck traffic that will generate more than the threshold established in *Section 23.02(a)(3)*, a traffic impact analysis must be submitted as part of reoccupancy review;
3. If the loading area or trailer storage is visible from the road, supplemental landscaping must be provided for screening as determined during a site inspection prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy; and
4. A variance on the light pole height must be granted by the BZA

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

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

10. Reports
    A. Chairperson
    B. City Planner
       1. MAP Planning & Zoning Essential Workshop March 20, 2018
       2. Planning Department Status Report

11. Reports on Interest Designation
    - Ms. Roscoe announced upcoming city events.

12. Communications
    A. WCAA – Runway Reconstruction
    B. Van Buren Township Notice of Master Plan Amendment
    C. Planning & Zoning News – Solar Energy
13. Adjournment

Motion by Glotfelty supported by McAnally to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Glotfelty, McAnally, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, Workman, Zilka & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

[Signature]
David Paul, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission