MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 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, David Paul, Daniel McAnally, Jessica Workman and Cathy Freitag

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

3. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, 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

   8. New Business

   A. SPR-2017-036; D&G Industrial Building Phase 2
      
      Applicant: Nino DiDomenico, D&G Building Company
      Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, Inc.
      
      Request: Site Plan Approval
      Location: 11457 Hannan, Parcel #80-074-01-0147-301
      Project: Development of an 80,000-sq. ft. light industrial building

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

   B. 2017 Planning Commission Annual Report

      (Action Required: Accept the Annual Report and recommend submittal to the Mayor and City Council)

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

      A. SPR-2017-025; Hamdan Gas Station – solar panels and electric charging stations
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 McAnally supported by Roscoe approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on December 18, 2017 with further discussion.
      - Ms. Talon-Jemison noted that there was a portion of the minutes that stated that “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.” She suggested that more of the discussion be provided in the minutes and in particular she would like it noted that when she asked the applicant about the location of the charging ports in relation to the underground tank, the applicant didn’t really have a definite yes or no answer but that they would look into moving the underground tank to a different location. This notation was not added to the minutes and she would like to have it added.
      - Chairperson Freitag asked Ms. Talon-Jemison what page of the minutes that this should have noted on.
      - Ms. Talon-Jemison replied that it should be added to page 9 of 14; fifth bullet down.
      - Ms. Maise asked for clarification. She wondered if Ms. Talon-Jemison wanted more of the discussion between herself and the applicant regarding the items listed; the dumpster, charging ports, etc. and noted that Christina can add additional information to the minutes.
      - Ms. Talon-Jemison replied that more information was needed in regards to the charging stations in relation to the underground tanks. The applicant didn’t really give a definite answer to whether or not there could be some conflict if there was an overcharge, as opposed to that they would look into moving it to a different spot or moving it over. She believes that this is too important not to be put into the approved minutes.
      - Chairperson Freitag recalled the applicant discussing that.
      - Mr. McAnally stated that he remembered the applicant stating that they didn’t believe it would be a conflict because they run parallel and they are both shielded. He is concerned however that the applicant thought that it was answer enough and perhaps they needed to be prodded more for a definition since he feels that the applicant may think that they had answered the question.
      - Ms. Maise noted that this will be evaluated further during building review and she explained to Mr. McCraight that the applicant is putting in charging stations that are within close proximity to the tanks and Ms. Talon-Jemison has expressed some concern over this.
      - Mr. McCraight commented that this is something that will be caught when under review, particularly the electrical review. He noted that the amount of electrical current that goes through a charging station is less than the amount of electricity that is used in the pumps of the tanks. This is something that the inspectors are well aware of and will be addressed during building review.
      - Ms. Maise noted that having it explained in more detail in the minutes will be more helpful.
Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Roscoe, Workman, Zilka, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

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

6. Public Hearings – None.

7. Old Business – None.

8. New Business

A. SPR-2017-036; D&G Industrial Building Phase 2, 11457 Hannan, requesting site plan approval for the development of an 80,000-sq. ft. light industrial building with 41 parking spaces, 34 loading docks and 20 trailer storage spaces. DP# 80-074-01-0147-301.

Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, 13500 Reecck 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 commented that the applicant was before the commissioners in June of 2017 for the first phase of this project where they were approved for a 61,000-sq. ft. building which is currently under construction. The applicants would like to now develop the front portion of this property along Hannan Road with an 80,000-sq. ft. building. Construction will consist of a parking lot in front of the building with truck docks and trailer parking in the rear. The applicant is proposing the site be landscaped along Hannan and Northline as well.

- Mr. Brock also commented that they received the comments from ARC and acknowledge that some of the trailer parking might be seen from Northline and the applicants are willing to add some evergreens to screen that portion of the trailer parking from Northline Road.

- Mr. Brock noted that there was a comment from the Fire Department that the drive isles needed to be 26 feet instead of 24 feet and they are willing to bump that out another 2 feet to accommodate the Fire Chief’s requirement.

- Mr. Brock stated that the building will be serviced through sanitary sewer, which is currently installed along Hannan. They plan to loop a water main in the rear of the building between the parking lot and the current building to provide for a secondary loop around the building. The site is already serviced by a storm water detention system that was sized for this development; it’s actually oversized and the storm water was already taken into account.

- Chairperson Freitag commented that the applicant is developing a beautiful building. She asked Mr. Brock if the applicant received copies of the reports from ARC and if they are aware of the conditions and are comfortable with them.

- Mr. Brock replied yes.

- Mr. Paul noted that the Fire Department wanted more access on the north side of the building for truck circulation and compliance with the Fire Code. He asked Mr. Brock if that was the 24 feet or 26 feet.

- Mr. Brock replied that they have a 24-foot wide drive aisle and the Fire Department requested 26 feet and they have no problem bumping that out 2 more feet.

- Mr. Paul commented that the water main needed more detail on the plan and they didn’t show the signs.
• Mr. Brock stated that they have an 8-inch water main that was looped around the building that is under construction during the first phase. They are intending to add another section of water main behind the proposed building.
• Mr. Paul commented that he had seen a comment to move the hydrant.
• Mr. Brock replied that it was a recommendation by the Fire Chief.
• Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Brock if they have read the Planner’s notes and comments and had a chance to review the questions that they had, such as the dock door dimensions and the trailer parking dimensions.
• Mr. Brock replied that they had and the dock spaces will be consistent with the doors on the architectural elevations on the revised site plan that will be submitted to the Planning Department prior to submitting for engineering.
• Mr. McAnally commented that the width of the spaces are 9 feet on one building and 10 feet on the other; the requirement 10 feet by 50 feet.
• Mr. Brock replied that he believes that it pertains to the truck/trailer spaces. The trailer spaces in the truck dock are labeled 9 feet but they have 4 feet on each side and they can adjust that to match the ordinance and to line up with the truck wells on the architectural plans.
• Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Brock if they have identified snow storage areas.
• Mr. Brock agreed that there is plenty of room on the plans to identify that.
• Mr. Glotfelty noted that there was additional barrier free parking required.
• Mr. Brock replied yes, he believes there was one space that they needed and it will be added to the plans at the front of the building.
• Ms. Maise asked for clarification about widening the access drive out to 26 feet from 24 feet. There is a waiver required for the greenbelt requirement from 50 feet to 40 feet in one area and is the aisle widening also in that area.
• Mr. Brock commented that it will not be in the same area and pointed it out on the site plan. The widening is in a different location.
• Ms. Freitag asked for clarification regarding the conditional rezoning agreement and in particular, where it stated that the property is to be used for a single user. She noted that the agreement would need to be modified if additional uses other than air freight forwarding is intended.
• Ms. Maise commented that she discussed the conditional rezoning agreement with the city attorney, Steve Hitchcock. There is a provision in the agreement that the uses allowed will be limited and there is also a statement saying that the use was intended for a single use. Steve Hitchcock stated that it would require an amendment to the agreement and it is something that can be worked on administratively when the uses in the building are determined.
• Mr. Brock understood and stated that the use would still be the same.
• Ms. Maise noted that the change to the agreement would be needed since it will be a multi-tenant building and that because specific uses are not identified. Mr. Hitchcock thought it would be easier to amend the agreement because it would give the owner more flexibility.
• Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise that because the applicant doesn’t have a use for the building identified at this point, how would the applicant amended the agreement? He wondered if a different use would be allowed.
• Ms. Maise replied that this was a conditional rezoning so that the portion along the Hannan Road frontage would not be developed with the more intense M-2 uses on this particular property. There is this one statement in the agreement that says that development is restricted to a single use and so the use that’s been established on the property right now from the first building, pending a certificate of occupancy, is air freight forwarding. This will restrict the applicant to air freight forwarding for the other building. The city attorney thought, and the applicant will probably agree, they probably don’t want this hanging over their head with
every user that changes in there; if they become multi-tenant buildings, it’s easier just to strike that line from the agreement.

- Mr. McAnally commented that the commissioners don’t want to undo their original intent.
- Ms. Maise stated that Steve Hitchcock wrote the agreement and at the time it worked but now that we’re dealing with uses coming in it needs to be updated. There is not much difference between an air freight forwarder compared to a warehouse/logistics center. There are very appropriate uses that could be in either one those buildings. At the time there wasn’t the foresight to think about what uses could be there. M-1 uses, even though they are not the same use, is a restrictive statement.
- Ms. Maise asked the commissioners if they recall something different.
- Chairperson Freitag replied no but, at the time they were concentrating on one building. There was no consideration at the time of the second phase.
- Ms. Maise commented that the rezoning came in several years ago. She asked Mr. Brock if they showed a concept plan at that time.
- Mr. Brock replied no, there were different buildings.
- Chairperson Freitag noted that there was one building that had multiple uses.
- Ms. Maise stated that when the agreement was written there was not a thought about it.
- Mr. Brock recalled that when the agreement was written it was to restrict heavier M-2 uses, like a factory type with big smoke stacks and more like limiting it to distribution, light manufacturing type it would fit right in.
- Mr. McAnally agreed and commented that he wouldn’t want to see something heavy go into that area.
- Ms. Maise stated that is clearly the intent of the agreement.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that the agreement would just have to be amended and that the use wouldn’t be just all air freight forwarding to save the applicant further problems down the road.
- Ms. Maise agreed.

Motion by Paul supported by Glotfelty to approve SPR-2017-036; D&G Industrial Building – Phase 2 located at 11457 Hannan subject to:

1. Waivers to the following:
   a. Section 13.04 to allow payment in lieu of construction of sidewalk for a portion of the Northline frontage of Phase 2 in the amount of $11,675. Payment must be made to the Planning Department prior to issuance of any building permits; and

   b. Section 13.02(c) to modify the greenbelt width requirement from 50 feet to 40 feet for a small portion along Northline Road. Complete screening of the loading area and truck storage is required and therefore more trees and taller trees will need to be provided. Upon completion of the project, if the loading area or outdoor trailer storage is visible, additional screening will be required.

2. The Conditional Rezoning Agreement approved in 2014 will need to be modified if more than a single use is intended for the property.

3. Discussion with the applicant on proposed gateway improvements including signage, landscaping and easements for the greenbelt area at the corner of Hannan and Northline Roads.

4. A revised site plan must be provided prior to submittal of engineering plans to address the following:
a. The waiver request to reduce the greenbelt/setback from 50’ to 40’ along a portion of Northline Road must be included on the plan.
b. Supplemental plantings and increased plant sizes for complete screening of the loading/truck parking area must be shown on the Landscape Plan.
c. Corrections to the site data table on Sheet CE3.
d. Dock space dimensions must be clarified.
e. An additional barrier-free parking space is required.
f. Areas for snow storage must be identified.
g. A cost estimate for the landscaping must be provided.

5. Any other items identified by the ARC committee being addressed on a revised site plan and/or during engineering/building review.

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

B. 2017 Planning Commission Annual Report
- Ms. Maise commented that this annual report is something that the commissioners see every January and she highlighted the increased activity of the Planning Department and development within the city. She asked the commissioners if they had any questions, and if not, then it will be passed on to the Mayor and City Council.

Motion by Zilka supported by Workman to accept the 2017 Planning Commission Annual Report and recommend approval by the Mayor and City Council.

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

A. SPR-2017-025; Hamdan gas Station – solar panels and electric charging stations
- Ms. Maise commented that the commissioners may recall that this was a condition of approval last month for the Hamdan Gas Station, which will be back to City Council on Monday. The City Council approved the introduction and first reading along with the special land use for this and also the special land use for Paradise Gas Station. The Hamdan Gas Station will have to go back for second reading and adoption on Monday. She reminded the commissioners that they wanted to see more information regarding the electric charging stations and solar panels.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that they come in two different heights and length of cords are 18 and 23 inches and it’s not certain which of the two different models Mr. Hamdan is going to use.
- Mr. McAnally was curious what kind of ground fault that they have if someone backs into it and breaks it open. There would be exposed electrical and there has to be some sort of safety fault.
- Mr. McCreight commented that the installation of these are still relatively new but will be heavily regulated by the NEC and the city’s electrical department/inspector as well. What he has read on this and what is handy to know is that although it comes in English, Spanish and French it still doesn’t tell us what the voltage is. A better spec sheet before installation is
needed. He noted that they would need to know first and foremost, if it’s safe and what kind of parking protection it has over it.

- Chairperson Freitag stated that what Mr. Hamdan provided just didn’t give a whole lot of information.
- Ms. Maise responded that more detail will be part of building plan review.
- Chairperson Freitag noted that the back of the electrical charging station sheet provided shows some solar panels.
- Mr. Frederick commented that where he works they have four carts that are tool boxes and are being converted into charging stations for electric vehicles. These are just a plug in the wall and plug in the car. There really is not a lot of hazard involved.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that these are going to be free-standing units.
- Mr. Frederick agreed but commented that they will be no different than a light pole. The rest of the industry is really moving forward with electric cars now. Ferrari is supposed to build one and Ford is supposed to come up with a high performance sport utility, all electric that they are going to build in Corktown in Detroit.

10. Reports
A. Chairperson
   - Ms. Freitag reminded everyone to get their flu vaccinations since the flu is going around.
B. City Planner
   Planning Department Status Report
   - Ms. Maise informed the commissioners that there will be a February meeting. She reminded the commissioners about Welsh Romulus at Cogswell and Ecorse and commented that they didn’t build as expected and that they may see this project again soon.
   - Mr. Glotfelty commented that he recently drove by the jazz center. He noticed some activity and wondered what their status was.
   - Mr. McCraight replied that they secured permits and are performing the needed work on the building. They are working on the process. It’s a slow go but, they are trying to get through it.
   - Ms. Maise also informed the commissioners that Pritula and Ecorse Commons will be back in February as well.

11. Reports on Interest Designation
   - Ms. Roscoe announced upcoming city events.
   - Mr. Paul commented that he had the privilege of meeting with the Mayor and he wanted him to relay to the Planning Commission that those of us that couldn’t make the Mayor’s State of the City he plans to have another one especially for the boards and commissions.
   - Chairperson Freitag noted that it’s also on YouTube.

12. Communications – None.

13. Adjournment
Motion by Zilka supported by Roscoe to adjourn the meeting at 7:38 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Roscoe, Workman, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.