MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015

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

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

Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner and Bobbie Marecell, Secretary.

3. Motion by Prybyla supported by Zilka to approve the amended agenda which moves item 8; New Business between items 5 and 6. Roll Call Vote: Ayes-Prybyla, Zilka, Roscoe, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty & Freitag. Nays – none. Motion Carried.

Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, May 18, 2015.

5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items

6. Public Hearings
   A. PC-2015-017; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 3.06(c), Commercial Vehicles
   B. PC-2015-018; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article 8, Industrial Districts; Section 11.16, Oil and Gas Wells; Section 11.07, Vehicle and Truck Repair, Service and Parking
   C. PC-2015-019; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 21.02, Enforcement

7. Old Business

8. New Business

9. Planning Commission Election of Officers

10. PC-Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission

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

13. Communications

14. Adjournment

4. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, May 18, 2015. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, McAnally, Roscoe, Prybyla & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion carried.

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

   Ms. Freitag asked for any comments from the public, seeing no one, closed that portion of the meeting.

6. New Business


Derek Walker 11629 Grandville Ave., South Jordan Utah; stepped forward as petitioner on behalf of Storage of America. Mr. Walker’s Engineer, Alan Sawalha was also in attendance on behalf of the petitioner.

   - Ms. Freitag asked if he had received a copy of their report.
   - Mr. Walker responded yes.
   - Ms. Freitag asked Ms. Maise if she had something.
   - Ms. Maise stated that he has some pictures that he would like to share, but with him getting in so late he wasn’t able to pull them off of his device so we are going to wing it. Because there are so many waivers and questions we’ll let him do his presentation and maybe get some of those things answered.
   - Mr. Walker gave a brief presentation regarding the unmanned facility Storage of America, proposed to be located on Middlebelt Rd.
   - Ms. Maise stated that the questions in the report, the outstanding items that are in need of more direction some of which are just notes that need to be indicated on the plans. If you look at number 4 it talks about the submission of plans many of those things are just notes. Parking calculations for example, this is a different type of facility, as he mentioned this is an unmanned facility but the ordinance still has parking requirements. The parking spaces will be seen at the buildings so we will expect to see that on a revised plan you can decide on some of these things if you want to see it again, I think once we get through some of these items that maybe need resolution we can get a better idea maybe it’s something on the plan that may need to come back for your review or something you’re comfortable with happening administratively.
   - Ms. Maise asked Mr. Walker to explain the items particularly where the waiver requests are and that should be very helpful.
   - Mr. Walker noted that on the plan it shows they were not going to have a dumpster this was something they had hoped they could pull off with it being an unmanned site, after working through it with their management they realized that is probably not realistic and do plan on including a dumpster on the revised plans. In terms of landscaping, he understands it is important to have the site screened from Middlebelt and adjoining properties, they are very flexible with that. In terms
of the building they are very flexible with the arrangement of the buildings if they need to trim them or move them.

- Ms. Maise elaborated on his point. She had talked to the Fire Chief in regards to circulation and one of the comments that came back on their revised plan, while they do have a circulation plan in here, you probably saw it on page C-2, it is very tight and in one spot appears to clip the building a little bit, they had commented back to the Fire Chief’s comment that they would handle it in final engineering and she spoke with Mr. Walker in the afternoon and mentioned that it was a comment and they agreed that they would be willing to tweak things and shorten up the building a little bit to make sure that circulation worked to the Fire Chief’s satisfaction. You may have noticed it is a little tight and there will be cars out there occasionally, but being an unmanned site it is not like a regular development where you have a bunch of employees or outdoor storage or anything like that. We are pretty comfortable based on their response that they will be able to satisfy the Fire Chief’s requirements for having that open fire lane.

- Mr. Walker stated that one of the items he intended to print was a more detailed rendering of the elevations. On one of the sheets you can kind of see a façade and that is what we plan on doing on the end caps of the buildings. Everything that is facing the road would be that, the end caps of the buildings will be a brick façade. We do an earth tone, tan type of steel for the units.

- Mr. Prybyla asked if this is the type of brick they will be using.

- Mr. Walker stated yes, give or take. On some of the pictures of the other sites that is an idea of the color the brick will be, but a little more auburn.

- Ms. Maise asked if it were real brick or face brick.

- Mr. Walker stated that they generally use mortarless Nova brick. It is actual brick but just without the mortar, it stacks.

- Ms. Freitag asked if it were like the brick panels or they are individual.

- Mr. Walker responded that they are individual but they slide into each other.

- Ms. Maise asked if everyone was clear on the difference between the waivers and the variances. The new ordinances that we just adopted which will actually come into effect Thursday talked about setbacks and a half for certain uses and this happens to be one of the uses that because of the nature of the use, the requirement is to increase the setbacks and the greenbelts and the buffers by 50% both in area, your distance, and the amount of plant material. We’ve also put in that ordinance that unless you in these cases provide that masonry wall all the way around or dense solid landscaping. In this particular case, over in the north side where it is only fifteen (15) feet, because there is a residence there, we’ve done some research on that residence and it doesn’t look like a very active residence she didn’t know if anyone had went out and looked at it but the multiple times she had been out there it didn’t appear to be lived in, the water is on, but the taxes have not been paid, it doesn’t seem like someone has much vested there, but really don’t know. We sort of talked about it and said that the requirement would be fifty (50) feet and another half, so seventy five (75) feet which would be the literal ordinance unless they put a wall up or solid landscape screening. Because they are going down from seventy five (75) feet to fifteen (15) feet which is in essence the setback and a half if it were next to industrial which is what the property is zoned, we felt if you are willing to consider it that, that would be a fair compromise to meet the setback requirement for the buffer from industrial to industrial with some additional landscaping. When I talked to the city Engineer about the proposed landscaping on the south side which is very nice because there is a nice big drain there and as you probably saw it’s very heavily vegetated and that’s just going to stay so the south side is going to be great, but they are proposing some trees along there that Marcus had actually recommended moving those to the north side to help with some screening that we really didn’t think were necessary down there and he really didn’t think it was such a good idea to plant trees in a drain easement anyway particularly when there is already vegetation. So we wanted you all to discuss that and obviously the concern is a possibility of some residential activity is
certainly in that area is two-fold. The concern we have is the view from Middlebelt coming down Middlebelt and looking in and seeing that side view and also the view for that resident if there is going to be a resident there.

- Ms. Freitag clarified that it is currently non-conforming.
- Ms. Maise replied that it is currently non-conforming but because there is no evidence that it is not being used as a residence, the water is on, and the Attorneys have told us that is the best thing to use, if the water is off for twenty four (24) months consecutively then it reverts to its zoning which is industrial, but because there was some residential activity and because we don’t know when it changed, we know the property changed ownership relatively recently but taxes have not been paid, there is no C of O on the property, we don’t know, the only thing we know about the property is that there is water in there, so the water is on.
- Ms. Freitag asked that it is being paid.
- Ms. Maise stated the water is yeah. Nothing else. That will actually have to go to the BZA because it is being reduced, that is a shell as opposed to the planning department may wave.
- Mr. McAnally commented that it is a different property owner there something could happen there, we do have that short distance setback there, I’d like to see the idea of moving the trees around there for additional screening, I don’t know how the rest of the board feels but it seems like a good idea and the least costly of it.
- Ms. Maise questioned that it will doors on that side as opposed to the back of the building.
- Mr. Walker commented yeah.
- Ms. Maise stated so those will be doors and that is the other thing, we wanted to make sure those doors are screened.
- Ms. Freitag clarified that they are saying there will be more vegetation on the north side where the house is.
- Ms. Maise agreed, right. What we probably want to do is, I added a comment in here about doing it as you know some of the stuff we look at as part of a site inspection is once the building goes up and once we look when we’re actually on Middlebelt Road is to look and see how far back, maybe it’s half the length of the building that we’ve got to put some vegetation back in there just to obscure that view a little bit, actually a lot.
- Ms. Freitag asked, so basically what you’re saying is that we want to see landscaping there but it will be determined once a building is in place.
- Ms. Maise responded we could, what I would certainly recommend is to have them come back with a plan and again, BZA will deal with this and likely will put a condition on that there be screening and by that point they can have this plan revised, we can look at it, let the BZA look at it and even reinforce it by putting a condition on it.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked if there would be a dumpster pad put in now as it typically would be for a commercial building.
- Ms. Maise responded yes.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned whether they would have their own waste company with a code or key to get in there to empty it.
- Mr. Walker agreed.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he assumed the Fire Department would have their own code or key to gain access as well.
- Mr. Walker agreed.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned if the dumpster would be located in the back near the retention pond.
- Mr. Walker said yes, most likely tucked away in a corner where it will be least visible.
- Mr. Glotfelty responded that they are trying to get an idea where they are going to put it because they will need some place to push their snow.
• Mr. Walker’s Architect stepped forward and added that the dumpster would be in the back of the property in a corner allowing space for other uses.
• Ms. Freitag asked that the dumpster would be enclosed, that it does have to be enclosed or no.
• Ms. Maise responded three (3) sides on an enclosure.
• Mr. Paul stated that he was disappointed that they do not have any building elevations. He said that they say it will be red brick, but we have nothing to indicate that without proper building elevations. He knows he was delayed, but usually they come with the plans submitted and there is nothing there. I know the last sentence in the letter that was provided by Ms. Maise was more detailed building elevations must be provided to the Planning Commission. Number one. Number two, have you checked with Wayne County, you’re going to be tying into Middlebelt, into the Sexton-Kilfoil drain, have you talked to the county on these.
• Mr. Sawalha responded that he had.
• Mr. Paul stated so you are aware of their.
• Mr. Sawalha stated Storm Sewer Management Standards.
• Mr. Paul asked about the sanitary sewer, that there is nothing on the plans.
• Mr. Sawalha stated that there is no office or sewer.
• Mr. Paul questioned so you’re only having the water for fire protection.
• Mr. Sawalha agreed water for fire protection and storm sewer out letting the drain on the south.
• Mr. Paul stated that he sees that he just wanted to make sure that he had spoken to the county because they can get a little sticky on that sometimes.
• Mr. Sawalha stated that he had showed them the general concept and they were ok verbally. Once we have engineering plans we will submit those to them.
• Mr. Paul stated he is sure the engineer will double check everything and work with the county too.
• Mr. McAnally asked if the kiosk goes down due to a power failure or just malfunctions, what is the backup.
• Mr. Walker stated that everything is routed through a call center as well.
• Mr. McAnally clarified, so there is a number they can call to get help if they needed to.
• Mr. Walker stated yes.
• Mr. McAnally was just considering how people can get irritated if things do not work.
• Mr. Walker agreed.
• Mr. Zilka stated the name of the drain on the plans is mismarked, instead of saxton it should say sexton.
• Mr. Sawalha stated that he will correct it.
• Mr. Zilka explained that he assumed while he was making other changes he may as well change that as well.
• Ms. Freitag asked if money is ever deposited in the kiosk.
• Mr. Walker stated no, it is cashless.
• Ms. Maise stated that there was one other thing she wanted to ask about the pedestrian circulation, number 7 on page 5, the sidewalk asking for a payment in lieu of the sidewalk. We are actually recommending that the sidewalk be installed because it is up to the north and down to the south.
• Ms. Freitag added that they are also close to the restaurants.
• Ms. Maise responded right. When we do have areas that it is existing we like to see it go in when possible. So that is why that comment is there.
• Ms. Freitag asked if they would have any problem with that.
• Mr. Walker stated no.
• Ms. Freitag asked that they were just starting to come east now.
• Mr. Walker stated that most of their sites are in the Midwest. We have one that is open in Novi and a handful in Indianapolis. One in Cleveland and a handful more under development.
Mr. Zilka asked if they had talked to Wayne County about the drive approach.

Mr. Sawalha stated that he had showed them the plan as it is, the general lay out and the storm sewer and the site plan, I met with Mr. Ali Jawad at the permit office and he overlooked it and did not see anything alarming, but he did not do a full review that they normally do on final engineering plans. He did tell me he did not see anything that would be a road block.

Mr. Paul asked if they have the kiosk in Novi.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Mr. Paul asked if it seems to be working pretty well then.

Mr. Walker stated yes, they have actually been using them for about ten (10) years. It is just within the past year that they have the capability to do the two way video chat and the ability to sign leases. This is why we are moving from manned sites to unmanned.

Mr. Paul clarified that Novi does have this type of kiosk.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Mr. Paul asked so you do have experience with it.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Ms. Freitag asked if they have someone who drives through there periodically to check for debris and things.

Mr. Walker stated that they will have a couple maintenance people based in Michigan who will drive by daily for maintenance and cleaning.

Mr. McAnally asked that they would hire out snowplowing.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Ms. Freitag stated that there are just so many waivers listed, she is trying to go through them to make sure they are all covered.

Ms. Freitag clarified that if Wayne County requests any changes that they are aware that they will have to submit a new site plan.

Mr. Sawalha stated that they feel they are very limited on the placement of the driveway, it is almost at the center of the property and there are no other drives across from it where we are across from the airport.

Ms. Freitag explained that she just wanted to inform them that if there were any changes a new site plan would need to be submitted. Looking at the site and what you have said, you’re right there really is no other place you can put the driveway.

Ms. Maise reviewed the waivers and said they are getting rid of the dumpster waiver so G comes out, the payment in lieu of sidewalk which wasn’t put as a waiver because it was recommended to be installed. The waivers because of the standards that were recently beefed up in the ordinance, the two variances and asked for a little bit more information on the fence. The plans are a little inconsistent with the fence and I was assuming that the one where it says chain link, you’re actually going with more of a decorative fence.

Mr. Walker stated yes.

Ms. Maise said good, we like the decorative one.

Ms. Freitag asked if it would be around the whole of the property.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Mr. Prybyla stated that he didn’t see it, may have missed how many units would be in the project.

Mr. Walker explained they are still nailing down the final numbers but they are estimating about three hundred fifty (350).

Mr. Prybyla clarified three hundred fifty (350) doors.

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Ms. Freitag responded that they have eight buildings.
Ms. Maise explained that is why there are so many screening requirements. That is why this is a little unusual.

Mr. Frederick asked if vehicle storage would be allowed there.

Mr. Walker responded no.

Mr. Frederick responded that he hadn’t seen it noted anywhere.

Mr. Walker stated that their lease agreement is pretty strict against hazardous materials which include cars and things like that.

Mr. McAnally stated that he is trying to understand what the meaning of clear vision is.

Ms. Maise responded that on the landscape plan it is basically the area where you are pulling out of the property the plantings are low in order to keep a clear view. The way the plans are drawn it looks like it is drawn from the curb to the right of way line where are requirements are from the curb line to the right of way line. Where are requirements are from the right of way line into the driveway. It is just shifted in. So that area is clear.

Ms. Freitag clarified so instead of starting at the curb, you bring it into the right of way line.

Mr. Sawalha asked so it will actually be smaller than we show it then.

Ms. Maise stated yes, you drew it at the taper so when you come down like a triangle, it actually looks like it is pretty close.

Ms. Maise responded that you don’t want a big tree there when you are pulling out into traffic.

Ms. Freitag discussed the waivers listed which needed their approval.

Ms. Maise explained that it would be conditioned upon the variances from the BZA, the installation of the sidewalk on Middlebelt Road and then the re-submittal of the revised plans.

Ms. Freitag commented that she thinks it is a great spot for that and it will do good there.

Mr. Walker replied thank you.

Mr. Prybyla verified that they were in agreement with that.

Mr. Walker stated yes.

Ms. Freitag stated that she thinks the main thing is the landscaping.

Mr. McAnally commented and the dumpster.

Mr. Walker agreed.

Ms. Freitag said and the sidewalk.

Mr. Paul added and the building elevations.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to approve the site plan for PC-2015-016; Storage of America at 11285 Middlebelt subject to the following:

1. Waivers to the following:
   a. Section 14.06(e) to waive the driveway spacing requirements. If any modifications to the site plan are required as a result of the Wayne County driveway approval, a revised site plan in accordance with Section 17.06 must be provided.
   b. Section 11.12(a)(3) to allow the existing vegetation along the south property line to satisfy the buffer requirements of Section 13.02.
   c. Section 11.12(a)(3) to modify the buffer requirements along the north property line conditioned upon appropriate screening as determined during a site inspection after construction completion by the Planning and Building Departments.
   d. Section 11.12(a)(3) to allow a reduction in the setback and buffer requirements along the east side of the property.
   e. Section 11.12(a)(4) to allow the spacing between the buildings to be reduced to 25 feet.
   f. Section 11.12(a)(10) to allow overhead doors to face a nonconforming residential use conditioned upon screening to be determined by the Planning and Building Departments.

2. Variance to the front setback and setback from residential requirements.
3. Installation of the sidewalk along Middlebelt Road.
4. Submission of ten (10) sets of a complete revised site plan to be reviewed administratively addressing the following:
   a. All requested waivers and variances must be noted on the site plan.
   b. Parking calculations must be provided and the general area of the proposed spaces and any pavement markings must be shown.
   c. Parking space dimensions must comply with ordinance requirements or a variance from the BZA is required.
   d. The clear vision area must be corrected.
   e. Comments pertaining to the fencing must be addressed.
   f. Revisions to the landscape buffer on the north side of the property.
   g. Parking lot landscaping must be provided.
   h. More detailed building elevations must be provided.

Ms. Freitag asked for discussion from the commissioners on the motion.

- Mr. Paul asked to make sure that the motion states building elevations will be provided to Planning Commission or Administrative Review Committee for approval. He is uneasy with not being provided building elevations and not knowing what the building will look like.
- Mr. McAnally stated that we will just ask that all building elevations be reviewed administratively.
- Ms. Maise responded that the BZA will also have a chance to review the elevations as well. They can be requested to be brought back before the Planning Commission in a packet for your review.
- Mr. Paul stated that he would like to review them because he is uneasy with not knowing what the building will look like. We don’t want to problem we had with the dollar store.
- Ms. Freitag agreed.
- Ms. Maise stated that we are sensitive about our building elevations and materials.
- Mr. Paul stated that real brick ought to be used.
- Mr. McAnally concurred.
- Ms. Freitag asked Mr. Zilka if he agreed.
- Mr. Zilka said he agreed.


7. Public Hearings

    A. PC-2015-017; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 3.06(c), Commercial Vehicles
    B. PC-2015-018; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article 8, Industrial Districts; Section 11.16, Oil and Gas Wells; Section 11.07, Vehicle and Truck Repair, Service and Parking
    C. PC-2015-019; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 21.02, Enforcement

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

Chairperson Freitag opened the public hearing up to comments from the public and asked if anyone wished to speak on this matter. No one came forward.

Chairperson Freitag closed the public comments portion of the meeting and opened the meeting up to comments from the City Planner and questions from the commissioners.
Mr. Prybyla asked if anyone had come to a conclusion on the height of a vehicle in the subdivision or residential area.

Ms. Maise stated that indicated by the different colors, E & F which are red and were discussed last month and the blue, based on your comments last month, the height mentioned in D was changed from seven (7) to ten (10). That was based on input from Mr. Frederick last month on what seems to be the industry standard. That is where that number came from if you’re comfortable with it. The other issue that came up was some concern with these vehicles being in the front yard so we added provision E, the vehicle shall not be located in the front yard or the road right of way there is a comment about the street as well. Under the definition of commercial vehicles we added a couple things; food trucks, motor vehicles designed to carry 16 or more passengers, including the driver. That was found in several other ordinances and is a good way to describe it as well. Back to your question about the height, that was the information we compiled unless anyone found any additional information.

Mr. Prybyla asked Mr. Frederick, he thought that last week he had said it was more than ten (10) feet.

Mr. Frederick responded that Ford Motor Company makes a van that is nine (9) foot six (6) inches. That is the tallest vehicle they make. Those vans are designed for anything that would be outside of a vehicle; pipes, conduit, ladders all goes inside.

Mr. Prybyla clarified and that would be ten (10) foot.

Mr. Frederick responded yes, nine (9) foot six (6) inches. So ten (10) would more than cover it even if it had a strobe on top.

Mr. Prybyla responded ok I’m satisfied.

Mr. Zilka asked Mr. Frederick, if that van itself is nine (9) foot six (6) inches, what if they put ladders on top.

Mr. Frederick responded that it is designed for them to be put inside of the vehicle.

Mr. Zilka stated that a twenty four (24) foot extension ladder wouldn’t fit inside.

Mr. Frederick stated that he would not be able to say. He knows the whole industry is shifting into these vans to replace what we used to know as a van but everyone was modifying them with fiberglass tops and extending the rear back. Now the whole van is as big as everyone has been making them.

Mr. Zilka said he sees several vans a day go by his house and sometimes have quite a few ladders on them. Maybe we should make it ten (10) feet plus if they have ladders or something that they may have to carry on top of that van. I don’t think that six (6) inches is enough.

Mr. McAnally asked aren’t we trying to prevent commercial vehicles with that kind of equipment from parking in the City’s right of way. The whole purpose of this is any van without things on top could be considered a passenger van but if you have that additional equipment that is going to break that height limitation then it is violating the ordinance and that is kind of what the purpose of the ordinance is.

Mr. Zilka stated that he is sure there are people out there who work for a company that they drive that van home and are we going to tell them they can’t do that just because there vehicle is three (3) or four (4) inches over that limit.

Mr. Paul stated what the ordinance says, or will say, will be it.

Ms. Freitag stated that most of the vans out there are seven (7) foot with things on top, this is 9.6 which accommodates them inside or maybe along the side even.

Mr. McAnally stated that they can still park that vehicle in their driveway, just not on the city street.

Mr. Frederick asked, looking at the ten (10) foot restriction over the seven (7) foot, is this city looking forward instead of looking backward at what was because things are changing in the motor vehicle industry. All of the companies are going to have almost the same thing in order to compete against each other. The segment of full size passenger vans for families is pretty much gone.

Ms. Freitag asked if each ordinance should be voted on separately or if they could all be voted on as one.
Ms. Maise stated because they are different subjects and are being recommended to City Council, it is best to vote on them individually.

Motion by Prybyla, supported by Paul to recommend to City Council Approval of PC-2015-017; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 3.06(c), Commercial Vehicles.


Chairperson Freitag asked for discussion regarding PC-2015-018; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article 8, Industrial Districts; Section 11.16, Oil and Gas Wells; Section 11.07, Vehicle and Truck Repair, Service and Parking.

- Mr. Paul asked why the oil wells, gas wells and hydraulic fracking are not considered special approval.
- Ms. Maise stated that it is a question to ponder, the recommendation came from the city attorney and in his research he believed that is what he found in other communities; they were listed as permitted uses subject to all of these things. If you would like to see it as a special land use, that is a valid point and we can definitely change that and make that recommendation to city council. It is whatever you are more comfortable with.
- Ms. Freitag asked if he were talking about the fracking.
- Mr. Paul commented yes, the fracking and the gas and oil wells. When you have these great big rigs coming in.
- Ms. Freitag asked if he’d rather it read special land use.
- Mr. Paul agreed.
- Ms. Maise added that you then get a public hearing out of it which is great because you let the resident know what’s going on. She agreed that it was a good change.
- Mr. Paul stated that if we don’t we will be sure to hear about it after.
- Ms. Freitag stated that our recommendation for fracking, oil and gas wells to be special land use.
- Ms. Maise commented that it was a great suggestion and stated that one of the things that I should also add is the reason that the vehicle dismantling, wrecking, recycling and part sales; we addressed that last time but it is sort of hidden and once I let things settle and I talked to the city attorney about it, it looked like we could get away with it in the ordinance that we just recently adopted but I prefer it to be a little clearer since it is a very popular request that we get. They tend to get combined, you’ll get a used car dealer, you’ll get vehicle repair and they will also want to do, as they are repairing vehicles and dismantling them they are selling the parts. Again, that is a use that we have right now that we see, this way since we are amending this section of the ordinance again anyway I thought we could pull it out again and make it a little clearer.
- Ms. Freitag asked to make it special land use or to make it permitted.
- Ms. Maise responded that right now it is again proposed as permitted, we do have a lot of them in the city but that is again up for your discussion. The standards which are on page four, again these are standards that are currently in the ordinance. This outdoor storage area greater than two hundred (200) sq. ft. with scrap metals and cars and things like that, that today in the ordinance, is a junk yard. Junk yards are special land uses. So this again a lot of it is for clarity purposes that if you are doing the parts part, and doing it totally within a closed building, not storing the left over stuff you are kind of more on the repair side. It’s when it gets into that over two hundred (200) sq. ft. and outdoors then it’s literally a scrap yard or junk yard that is indeed a special land use. It is a different use.
- Ms. Freitag clarified and the difference would be because they have to do it indoors.
- Ms. Maise added and they are not having that outdoor storage. The outdoor storage is a junk yard and that is a special land use. And only in the M-T district.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he meant to look it up but forgot to. He asked what hazardous waste wells considered under.
• Ms. Maise responded that they are regulated by the state of Michigan.
• Mr. McAnally clarified that we still don’t have any city ordinance right on that.
• Ms. Maise stated on our current ordinance we do distinguish between hazardous and non-hazardous, EQ is sometimes where we have seen it and that is even more complicated because that is non-conforming in an M-2 district as opposed to an MT so that one really gets complicated but any of the hazardous anywhere in the state is regulated by the State of Michigan.
• Ms. Freitag asked if they could go ahead and recommend that those items be changed to special land use.
• Ms. Maise said sure.

Motion by Paul supported by McAnally to recommend to City Council, the approval of amended item PC-2015-018; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article 8, Industrial Districts; Section 11.16, Oil and Gas Wells as Special Land Uses; Section 11.07, Vehicle and Truck Repair, Service and Parking.


Chairperson Freitag opened up discussion regarding PC-2015-019; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 21.02, Enforcement.

• Ms. Freitag clarified that this is pretty much the same exact thing as last meeting with the exception of a few word changes.
• Ms. Maise agreed. The word “shall” in item b. was something that the code enforcement sub-committee discussed. In some cases they (the Ordinance Department or Building Department) like to notify property owners ahead of time when there is a violation, however there are some occasions that there may be safety related circumstances where issuing that violation or that citation right away is necessary. Again the intent of this amendment is to allow the Ordinance department and some other people the ability to enforce the Zoning Ordinance and to write tickets, and the change of “shall” to “may” in terms of how it is done. These are the only changes.
• Ms. Freitag liked that they are expanding the pool of enforcement officers.
• Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Ms. Maise and noted that she wasn’t sure if it was an issue for the Planning Commission or not, but her question was b. states “if the enforcement officer finds...” how do they find it, do they wait for someone to call or do they actually have enforcement officers like in Canton where the officers drive around and look for violation issues. She wondered how it works in Romulus
• Ms. Maise replied that she thought it is pretty much complaint based however the goal is to have enough staff. She noted that she believes the Building Department’s inspectors are assigned quadrants of the city and when they are out and about they can catch violations that way as well. It is a function of staffing and resources. The visioning study indicated that code enforcement came out high on the list of issues. Right now communication on enforcement issues tends to come from our residents and businesses and they do tell us in and we certainly encourage that if there are things that are out of line, particularly safety related things, that they notify the City.

Motion by McAnally supported by Prybyla to recommend to City Council, the approval of PC-2015-019; Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Section 21.02, Enforcement.


8. Old Business
Mr. Frederick commented that he would like to clarify a remark he made at the last meeting. When he made a reference to Tobine Road to Ecorse Road, it should actually have been Shook Road. Tobine goes off on an angle where Shook parallels the railroad tracks, that is the road that he intended to mention.

Mr. Paul asked about the building at 12731 Huron River Drive that was discussed last meeting. With it being boarded up and the windows being painted black he wanted to know if anyone had determined what was going on at the property.

Ms. Maise responded that the Building Department is on alert, they have been out there and it is in the system.

Mr. Paul stated that he had not seen any tags on it yet.

Ms. Maise stated that she believed there were two permits active, an electrical and a mechanical. And every time they stop by they say they are getting ready to occupy.

Mr. Paul asked that it had been empty a long time so would have to come back to the Planning Commission correct.

Ms. Maise responded that it depends on the change of use. If it is a use that Bob determines is the same as the previous use, then it’s just a reoccupancy. If the use is more intense or a special land use, then the Planning Commission.

Mr. Paul questioned, archery.

Ms. Maise responded they are not sure what the use will be.

Mr. Paul commented that it was an archery and then it became something we weren’t sure what it was.

Ms. Freitag stated that it was a hardware store.

Mr. Paul commented it was a hardware store originally. Then it was an archery for quite a few years and it’s been empty for at least two or three years.

Ms. Freitag added between that time they had a flea market.

Mr. Paul responded yes they did.

Mr. Zilka commented that he sees a vehicle parked there on the weekends.

Ms. Freitag stated that they park at night in that fenced in area.

Mr. Zilka stated not all the time, but once in a while.

Mr. Paul stated that is what has him concerned.

Ms. Freitag commented that even the upstairs windows are blacked out.

Mr. Paul stated that it is living quarters upstairs, or at least it was.

Mr. Frederick responded that since the last discussion they held regarding the property, he has seen a significant reduction in the number of vehicles that are at the location, but there is a blue F-150 that comes and goes. There used to be a barbeque out there and that is gone. A burn pit that has been dismantled. He says maybe they had paid attention to the last meeting. We still don’t know what is going on in there.

Mr. Paul stated that when they black all of the windows in it causes some concern.

Mr. Frederick stated his concern is the Fire Department.

Mr. Paul and Ms. Frietag agreed.

Ms. Maise stated she would follow up on the issue and bring something official for the next meeting.

9. Planning Commission Election of Officers

Mr. Zilka suggested the current positions be retained.

Mr. Paul and Ms. Frietag asked if everyone would accept.

Mr. Prybyla stated he would accept.
• Mr. McAnally also agreed he would accept.

Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to retain the current officers for a term of one (1) year.


10. PC-Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission

11. Reports

A. Chairperson

• Ms. Freitag thanked the commissioners for entrusting her to chair the meetings for another year.

B. City Planner - Planning Department Status Report

• Ms. Maise stated that the department is continuing to be very busy particularly with smaller projects that required administrative review and approval. A lot of temporary use permits for firework tents for example. Depending on what is submitted for next month, there may or may not be a meeting. LSL is continuing to work on the Master Plan update.
• Ms. Freitag asked why we hadn’t formed any committees for the Master Plan.
• Ms. Maise responded that based on the structure the proposal she didn’t believe that it will be necessary. Being that it is an update with focus being on certain areas, they are pretty confident we can get through it at this level. If something does come up that really needs sub-committee level input, that could be considered but right now everything looks pretty straight forward.
• Ms. Freitag commented that she thinks it really got cleaned up in the last few discussions.

12. Reports on Interest Designation

• Ms. Roscoe reported on upcoming events in Romulus such as the fireworks, summer recreation programs, a flea market being held at the Romulus Historical Park and Sounds of Downtown. She also commented on new trash cans being distributed by Waste Management. Ms. Roscoe also informed the public of the upcoming Farmer’s Market.
• Mr. Prybyla asked if old recycling bins will be removed when the new trash bins are delivered.
• Ms. Roscoe explained that at the presentation given to City Council, they were informed that residents may keep the old recycling bins if they choose to use as a secondary bin.
• Mr. Prybyla clarified that they will not be collecting them.
• Ms. Rosco verified, they will not be collecting them. They are for residents to keep and use. Also someone asked what to do with the old trash cans and she suggested putting a yard waste sticker on them and using them for yard waste. Residents will not be issued yard waste cans. Brown paper bags and cans will still be used. She has been informed that if the can fits in the bin they will dump it and take it.
• Ms. Talon-Jemison stated that the Beautification committee is going to be starting an annual neighborhood competition for residents and if you have a neighbor or know of someone who does an exceptional job of landscaping their flowers and plantings, recommend them and awards will be given out and there will be a ceremony. More details to follow.
• Mr. Zilka suggested to Ms. Roscoe that maybe a one-time pick up of old cans may be possible.
• Ms. Roscoe stated that she would ask but was not sure what they were going to do about that.
- Mr. Zilka stated that it would be little work to take care of the extra cans all at once.
- Ms. Roscoe stated that if there is any additional waste that does not fit in the can Waste Management can be called and they will pick it up at no charge as long as it is not reoccurring.
- Ms. Maise referred back to the question regarding code enforcement and since she is not exactly familiar with the workings of the other two departments, she would ask to clarify the questions regarding enforcement. She will provide follow up so that she doesn’t misspeak if she is totally off base.

13. Communications – None.

14. Adjournment

Motion by Zilka supported by Roscoe to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Roscoe, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

Michael Prybyla, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission
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