MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2018

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

2. Roll Call Showing: Jerry Frederick, Mike Glotfelty, Daniel McAnally, Celeste Roscoe, Melvin Zilka, and Jessica Workman

   Excused: David Paul, Cathy Freitag and Edna Talon-Jemison

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

3. Motion by Glotfelty supported by Workman to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Workman, Roscoe, Zilka, Glotfelty, Frederick, and McAnally. 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. A. SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons

   Applicant: Steve Kalabat, Ecorse Commons, LLC
   Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, Inc.
   Request: Site plan approval
   Location: 37350 Ecorse, #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)

8. New Business

A. SPR-2018-005; ProTrans Michigan

   Applicant: Anders Samuelson, Exxcel Project Management
   Michael L. Priest & Associated, Inc.
   Request: Site plan approval
   Location: 37631 Van Born (Parcel #’s 80-021-99-0002-000, 80-021-99-0003-000, 80-021-99-0004-000 and 80-021-99-0005-000)
   Project: Development of a new 150,000-sq. ft. distribution facility and outdoor trailer storage
(Action required: Approval, approval with conditions or denial of the site plan or postpone action)

B. SPR-2018-008; M & K Truck

Applicant: Steve Barber, 28101 Ecorse Road LLC
           Matt Cole, Paradigm Design
Request: Site plan approval
Location: 29275 Citrin Drive (Parcel # 80-047-99-0024-704)
Project: Development of a 49,672-sq. ft. semi-trailer truck sales and service facility with associated parking

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

C. SPR-2018-010; John Johnson Company

Applicant: Mark Flood, John Johnson Company
Request: Site Plan Approval
Location: 15500 Oakwood (Parcel #80-125-01-0012-301)
Project: Construction of a 10,060-sq. ft. building addition for the manufacturing of canvas products for industry and the military

(Assignment 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 – Development Status Report

11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on February 21, 2018.

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

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

6. Public Hearings – None.

7. Old Business –

A. SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons – Phase 1, 37350 Ecorse, requesting site plan approval for the construction of a 416,000 sq. ft. cross dock warehouse distribution center and trailer parking. DP #80-024-99-0005-703.
Ms. Maise commented that the commissioners have her report and she wanted to add that Brad Strader, Steve Deering and Marcus McNamara worked together on the traffic issues and Marcus’s comments are in the packet.

Steven Estey, Dykema, 39577 Woodward Ave, Bloomfield Hills, MI, 48304 and Michael Brock, Hennessey Engineers, 13500 Reek Road, Southgate, MI 48195 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Estey commented that they were previously before the Planning Commission on February 21, 2018. He reminded the commissioners that one of the issues that was keeping them from receiving approval last month was because they have 2 drives and the second drive didn’t meet the separation distance from the drive to the east on the GM property.

Mr. Estey noted that they were seeking a waiver on the driveway spacing and it was not accepted by the commissioners so, they went back and reworked the plan with Ms. Maise and her team. They brought the drive in conformity with the ordinance and now all of the separation distances are met. It was much more difficult from a construction standpoint but, it was the preference of the city and is something that they can do with a little effort. They have revised the plan to show that both drives are in conformity with the ordinance.

Mr. Estey also commented that they have reviewed Ms. Maise’s report and are in agreement with all of the items that she has recommended. He noted that there is some vegetation that they intend to leave to screen the dock doors and if further landscape is needed they are ok with that as well.

Mr. Estey stated that they had requested a waiver of the sidewalk or in lieu of that a payment of $30,000 to the city, which is something that he is aware that the commissioners have done before. They will comply with whatever the commissioners would like for them to do, they just don’t want to delay the project any further. He commented that there are some challenges with the site and Mr. Brock will explain in his PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Brock ran through the presentation briefly and noted the changes made to the revised site plan and asked the commissioners if they had any questions.

Mr. Brock also presented a video presentation of the proposed site.

Mr. Estey commented that they are excited to bring this project to Romulus and noted that the commissioners will see the amount of screening along Ecorse with the supplemental plantings and the existing vegetation. He noted that if the commissioners are not happy with the amount of screening to the dock doors they will work with administration to ensure that the dock doors are screened with additional plantings if needed.

Mr. Brock commented that there was not a lot of pedestrian traffic that travels Ecorse due to lack of retail. He mentioned that the drain crossing has significant floodway associated with it and to build something to cross the road would be quite difficult to construct. These are the reasons for requesting payment in-lieu of construction of sidewalks.

Mr. McAnally opened the meeting to questions and comments from the commissioners.

Mr. Glotfelty commented that he was happy to see the applicant’s willingness to work on the changes to satisfy the city and the ordinance. He mentioned that more and more people are walking, especially during lunchtime and he hopes that someday there will be more retail on Ecorse. He also commented that he is sure that the dock doors will be visible from the road and that more planting will be needed. He is very interested in seeing some sidewalks and welcomes Ecorse Commons to Romulus.

Mr. McAnally stated that the commissioners have regretted their decision to allow payment in-lieu of sidewalk in the past and he understands that there are challenges to build a bridge or
sidewalk on Ecorse but, he would still like to see an effort to try and make it happen because he feels it is important to tie the sidewalks together. He also wondered if the applicant would be open to having the administration perform an inspection after construction was complete to see if additional screening was needed.

- Mr. Brock replied that they were open to that and commented that there is a note on the site plan mentioning that they would work with administration to install additional screening.
- Mr. McAnally stated that the commissioners were pleased to see the applicant working with staff and the consultants to clean up the site plan and make it work and the amount of effort put into this site.
- Mr. Zilka asked Mr. Brock if they have discussed the sidewalk with Wayne County.
- Mr. Brock replied that they have not.
- Mr. Zilka suggested that they do so to see what it would take to accomplish a sidewalk. He seemed to think that Wayne County may allow a good size tile so that the sidewalk could go across. He agreed with Mr. Glotfety and McAnally that more and more people are walking and it would be of great interest to reach out to Wayne County.
- Mr. Brock replied that they will.
- Ms. Maise commented that although she would like to see retail and sidewalks on as well on Ecorse but, pointed out that a lot of people use the sidewalks to get to and from work. With the residential down the road from this location, having that link for the employment centers is something that the city is very much after.

Motion by Glotfety supported by Zilka approve SPR-2017-022; Ecorse Commons – Phase 1 subject to:

1. Upon completion of construction, if the overhead doors, trucks and trailers are visible from Ecorse Road, additional plantings will be required.
2. Sidewalk installation required along Ecorse Road.
3. Any future development on the site must be developed either as a single user or an integrated complex per Section 12.02 of the Zoning Ordinance or as a condominium (not a site condominium) in accordance with the requirements of Article 16, Condominiums.
4. A revised site plan must be submitted for administrative review that addresses the following:
   a. The Site Data table must be updated to include all proposed dimensions.
   b. The parking lot aisle on the west side must be widened to 26 feet per the Fire Code. Dimensional adjustments to setbacks and other parking standards must be modified in the Site Data table.
   c. The width of the access drive must be noted on the site plan.
   d. Sheet LP-4 must be updated since it appears that the “Notes for Existing Trees” pertain to a different community.
   e. The revised dates on the cover sheet must be changed to 2-7-18, 2-12-18 and 3-5-18.
5. Any other items identified by the ARC committee being addressed on a revised plan or during engineering/building review as applicable.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes - Glotfety, Zilka, Frederick, Workman, Roscoe, & McAnally. Nays - None. Motion Carried.

8. New Business
A. SPR-2018-005; Pro Trans Michigan, 37631 Van Born, requesting site plan approval for the development of a new 150,000-sq. ft. distribution facility and outdoor trailer storage. DPh’s 80-021-99-0002-000, 80-021-9-0003-000, 80-021-99-0004-000 and 80-021-99-0005-000.

Cliff Aiken, Exxcel Project Management, 328 Civic Center Drive, Columbus, OH 43215 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the petitioner. Also in attendance were Andes Samuelson and Glen Soerens, Exxcel Project Management team

- Mr. Aiken stated that Pro Trans is a third party logistics group out of Indianapolis, IN. and are currently relocating to Romulus from Browns town. Pro Trans is doubling their facility at 150,000-sq. ft. expandable to 250,000-sq. ft. and bringing a minimum of 45 new jobs.
- Mr. Aiken noted that the facility is across the street from General Motors and will share an access at the existing traffic light. They plan to improve the light and make some road improvements, which the preliminary drawings have been approved by Wayne County.
- Mr. Aiken commented that the site has 4 narrow parcels and they will be combining them to make 2 parcels. The site will have around 57 acres once combined and their project will consume about 22 acres. The 2 parcels will share the same access point.
- Mr. Aikens presented the commissioners with a PowerPoint presentation of the site. He commented that one of the access roads cuts in at the traffic light and crosses an existing gas pipeline. He noted that the employee parking faces Van Born Road with truck and trailer parking on the east and west. The Van Born side will include a large landscaped berm and a detention pond with landscaping surrounding that as well.
- Mr. Aiken stated that they are purchasing the front portion of the property and optioning the back portion for future tenants.
- Mr. Aikens pointed out that the road is the way it is because if wetlands on the property and the location of the gas pipeline. They will require waivers and variances. They will need a waiver to allow the detention pond to encroach into the front setback and a waiver to allow payment in-lieu of construction of sidewalk on Van Born. He noted that there are currently no sidewalks on either side of their property. The variances needed are: creating a lot that does not meet the 4:1 ratio requirement and a front yard setback.
- Mr. Aikens also noted that there is a 60-ft. setback behind the private road and in order to avoid the wetlands at the back of the property it is creating the need for the second variance.
- Ms. Maise commented that Marcus McNamara, OHM and Robert McCraight, Building & Safety Department are present to answer any questions the commissioners may have.
- Mr. Glotfelty welcomed Pro Trans to Romulus and asked Mr. Aiken to explain their business to him. He read that they have 20 employees on the morning shift and roughly 25 on the afternoon shift. He noted that it would be 45 cars in their parking lot and they only have 40 proposed.
- Mr. Aikens commented that they figured 40 would be enough with the crossover of shifts. They did increase it with staff’s recommendations but, future parking will allow up to 80 spaces.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Aiken if they could possibly expand the parking more to accommodate the employees and for a place to push snow.
- Mr. Aiken replied that they do not have a problem with adding 5 parking spaces.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Aiken if they read the comments from the ARC staff and if they have any issues with any of the comments.
- Mr. Aikens commented that he has responded to all of the questions and comments from ARC and they have no issues with any of them.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Aiken if they have to coordinate the traffic light with Wayne County.
• Mr. Aiken replied yes, it is a four-way light and they have preliminary approvals and the deceleration and acceleration lanes will be expanded a little bit.

• Mr. Zilka asked Mr. Aiken if they have discussed the water retention basins with Wayne County.

• Mr. replied that they submitted a preliminary concept sketch to Wayne County showing the layout and what they were proposing at the same time they did the road geometry to get preliminary comments. Wayne County didn’t have any problem with the access or the location of the basins.

• Mr. McNamara stated that the applicant did a good job of explaining the reasons for the waivers and variances. He also stated that they agree with the land division because it is a challenging site with the pipelines and the wetlands. Because the applicant is providing a private road and access to the remaining site it was his opinion that it was justified. The same logic goes for the paring into the setback. One thing that was not mentioned was that the applicant will need to provide a private road maintenance agreement for the city, attorney and OHM’s review as part of the next phase.

• Ms. Workman wondered if the commissioners were in agreement with the payment in-lieu of sidewalk since there are currently no sidewalks.

• Mr. McAnally stated that he is in agreement with it because of the fact that there are not abutting sidewalks on either side of the property.

• Mr. Frederick commented that page A-3 of the site plan elevations are mislabeled. He also thought that the applicant did a good job of configuring the site with all of the challenges that are present.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Workman to approve SPR-2018-005; Pro Trans Michigan at 37631 Van Born. Approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. Waivers to the following:
   a. Section 8.04(b)(1) to allow the detention ponds within the front yard setback.
   b. Section 13.04(b)(2) to allow payment in-lieu of construction of sidewalk along Van Born Road in the amount of $13,100.

2. Variances Being granted for :
   a. Lot depth to width requirement of 4 to 1.
   b. Front yard parking setback; note that the amount of variance may need to be increased to accommodate the 26-foot wide fire lane required.

3. The construction of the land banked parking will require City review and approval.

4. If any trucks or trailers are visible upon final inspection of the property, supplemental landscaping will be required.

5. A copy of the private road maintenance agreement will be required as part of engineering review.

6. Any other items identified by ARC committee being addressed on a revised site plan or during engineering/building review as applicable.

7. The submittal of 12 copies of a revised site plan for administrative review that addresses the following:
a. The “Waivers Required” note must be updated since the front yard setback and lot width to depth requirements are variance, not waivers.

b. Parking and trailer storage setbacks must be added to the Site Data chart.

c. Loading docks must be dimensioned.

d. Complete parking space dimensions must be added to the plan.

e. A cross-section detail of the proposed split face enclosure including the gates is required.

f. A note must be added to the lighting plan that states that all lighting will be directed downward, away from roadways and adjacent properties.

g. The parking lot landscape calculations must be updated since additional parking spaces have been included.

h. Clarification on the landscape plan between the trees to be preserved and those to be added.

i. The building elevation sides must be corrected (north/south and east/west).

j. The height of the building must be noted on the elevations.

k. A note must be added to the elevations regarding the use of any roof-top mechanical equipment and proposed screening.

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

B. SPR-2018-008; M&K Truck, 29275 Citrin Drive, requesting site plan approval for the development of a 49,672-sq. ft. semi-trailer truck sales and service facility with associated parking. DP #80-047-99-0024-704.

John Walsh, Paradigm Design, 550 3 Mile Rd NW B, Grand Rapids, MI 49544 stepped forward to speak on behalf of the applicant.

- Mr. Walsh stated that they were excited to bring the proposed project to Romulus. He and his team have been working with city staff on this project since the fall. The applicant currently has a facility on Ecorse Road and operating for about a year. They have outgrown this location and plan on building an approximate 50,000-sq. t. building.

- Mr. Walsh explained that M&K Truck have a couple of different uses. One is truck sales from the parking lot, parts warehouse in about 10,000-sq. ft. of the building, 10 service bays for maintaining trucks that are sold and leased and a two-story office on the northeast corner of the building.

- Mr. Walsh also explained that they are looking to have around 80 spaces for car parking at the east end of the facility. The property is along I-94 and the building will face the expressway. The site will be accessible from Citrin Drive.

- Mr. Walsh described the project and presented the commissioners with a PDF PowerPoint presentation of the proposed project.

- Mr. Walsh commented that they have read all of the reports from ARC and generally agree with all comments but, they will be asking for some waivers and variances. They intend to move forward with construction documents if conditions are favorable for the variances and waivers.

- Mr. Walsh noted that they are looking for a waiver for a slight reduction in the dumpster enclosure and the building material for the façade along I-94. They will commit to providing a dumpster enclosure so that they are not asking for too many waivers.

- Mr. Walsh stated that there was a fence in the front yard that was going to provide some security with barbed wire but, they will utilize the existing fence that is on MDOTS right-of-way. So, they are pulling the barbed wire fence off the table.
Mr. Walsh explained that since the bulk of the traffic will be coming from Citrin, they shifted the majority of the landscaping to that area. They dressed up along the service canopy on the front side of the building. They really tried to cluster the landscaping so that it is in the public area.

Mr. Walsh stated that the auto parking was in compliance with the ordinance. He mentioned that they will provide low shrubs in the service entry area and they are trying to pull some landscaping along the north parking curb line. The reason for this is to better display the trucks along I-94 for better visibility and to avoid a couple of gas pipelines that run through the property. One is located at the 20-foot easement on the north property line.

Mr. Walsh explained that the building materials used for this industrial use is a pre-engineered metal building. What they tried to do for the public side of the building is incorporate a lot of glass on the east side and northeast corner with some white metal panels that come up a little on either side. This is going to be a Volvo tractor dealership and there are some requirements, being a Volvo dealer. They are trying to implement some masonry around the office area, not trying to ignore the ordinance. The metal siding will be a tan, gray, earth tone with a white metal panel on either side, which is a requirement of Volvo. This is what they call a brand wall.

Mr. Walsh conclude that all-in-all he believes that as you drive along I-94 you will see a sharp looking building with a lot of landscape as you drive into the site. He noted that they can work with city staff on some of the building colors if needed.

Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Walsh for clarification of the fence along I-94.

Mr. Walsh stated that they believe that the existing fence should suffice and they will remove the barbed wire fence from the site plan.

Mr. Glotfelty wondered about the rest of the site.

Mr. Walsh replied that they will still need to fence it for security purposes.

Ms. Maise clarified that the fence in the front yard was a variance and the barbed wire was a waiver. She asked Mr. Walsh if they were going to replace the MDOT fence.

Mr. Walsh replied that they were going to build a new fence along the existing fence. They decided not to build the barbed wire fence along the front but will continue with the remainder of new barbed wire fencing around the property.

Ms. Maise wondered if the fencing will be behind the building or if a variance is still needed for the connection of the fence in the front of the building.

Mr. Walsh confirmed that the fence will be connecting to the front.

Mr. Glotfelty stated that he would like to see a little masonry along I-94 and that the painted panels are really not working for him.

Mr. Walsh explained that besides the 2 panels that are required, the rest will have the masonry look all along where the service bays are located and introducing it to the office portion but, trying to mix masonry above the overhead doors will be difficult. Therefore, they focused the masonry at the two-story office area, the eye catcher.

Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Walsh if they brought any materials to show the commissioners.

Mr. Walsh replied that they did not bring any with them but showed them a facility in Kalamazoo, Michigan to compare how the new facility on Citrin will look. He reiterated that they are looking to move forward and would be happy to put a sample board together for the commissioners to view at a later date.

Mr. Glotfelty commented that he would like to see some masonry on the garage area. It looks like a pole barn to him. It should be a nice looking building along I-9 that says “welcome to Romulus”.

Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Walsh why they cannot meet the city’s ordinance with the building materials. These are not their personal requirements but, it’s the city’s ordinance.
Mr. Walsh commented that a lot of it is because of the utilitarian overhead doors. These are service bay doors and that does dominate what the site looks like. From an architectural standpoint you are looking at service doors and the masonry around it doesn’t necessarily fit with maintenance, cleaning and function of what they are looking to do there but, they will dress up the office area to the fullest extent possible.

Ms. Maise suggested that they put some landscaping into the parking lot. She understands that they have some challenges up at the front and they are asking for all of the waivers there but, wondered if they could do some planting islands that could obscure the overhead doors. She certainly understands that they want to show off the trucks but, if they did some islands with canopy trees in clusters it could work.

Mr. Walsh commented that it is a fair concern but, the way that they look at it is if you drive I-94 it could obscure the balance of the service bays and those wouldn’t be visible. They wanted to look at the taller aspect of the building, where the office is and dress that up. They would be open to more landscaping where the tractors are located and are willing to entertain that. They would however, like to keep the visibility of the service bays.

Ron Meyering, owner of M&K, 8800 Byron Commerce Dr., Byron Center, MI 49315 stepped forward to speak

Mr. Meyering stated that the concern with putting islands in front of the service bays is that they run into maneuverability problems when tractors and trailers are connected together. Sometimes when car haulers are loaded we can’t drop those trailers. If a tractor has to be serviced we have to bring them through as a complete unit and that’s when they start running into maneuverability issues.

Ms. Maise deferred to the Planning Commission. The city sees a lot of trucking facilities and the goal is to screen all of the trucks. This is something that the city is very sensitive about and are hoping that there could be some pockets of landscaping or something to obscure.

Mr. Meyering commented that in a perfect world, if this site didn’t have all of the easements surrounding it, he would flip that building and run it the other way so that the doors are not facing the highway but, there is absolutely no other way to make this site work.

Mr. Meyering reiterated that if he has to obscure the overhead doors he doesn’t know how he could make the site work.

Ms. Maise commented that they are not expecting complete screening but, even with a couple of clusters o break it up a little.

Mr. Walsh commented that by adding shrubbery to the frontage will have that look of landscaping. If they put together a sightline drawing you just won’t see the overhead doors. I-94 sits about 5 feet below the site and they will have to bring fill dirt into the site and the sightline takes you right over the service bay. They can provide a sightline drawing to staff and add some landscaping so that you will get a nice look without obscuring the overhead doors.

Mr. Frederick noted that they are seeing the canopy outside of the building on the site plan and that it will help to screen the doors going westbound.

Mr. Walsh commented that it might but again, it’s a line of sight view.

Mr. Frederick commented that he doesn’t think it will be as bad as the commissioners are making it sound.

Mr. Walsh noted that this will be M&K’s 18th facility, they have been Volvo dealer of the year more than a few times and this is based not just on sales but, the look and quality of the facilities.

Mr. Frederick wondered if Ms. Maise as looking for landscaping along I-94 as some car dealers do along freeways with rock and low shrubs with a vehicle display.
Ms. Maise commented that the review was done by OHM and they pulled the landscape architect in. She doesn’t have this skill, she just knows what the ordinance and Master Plan says.

Mr. Frederick referred to the look of the new Ford dealer on I-75 at Birch Run and the whole thing is visible to the freeway. It seems like it’s about pushing the brand new product.

Ms. Workman suggested that the applicant supply samples of the other existing locations and thinks it might help with the commissioners to understand. Especially since you already have one that sits on I-94.

Mr. McAnally wondered if Ms. Workman was suggesting that the project be tabled.

Ms. Workman agreed.

Mr. McAnally commented that there seems to be a lot of information missing from the site plan.

Mr. Walsh stated that they were looking to get at least a conditional approval so that they could move forward and get to a May 2nd BZA meeting for variances needed.

Discussion between the commissioners, Ms. Maise and the applicants was had regarding what was needed for approval and whether it was best to postpone or grant a conditional approval for the project.

Mr. Meyering commented that one of the reasons they are pushing for at least a conditional approval was because they have to raise the site and bring in about 75,000 yards of fill. The frost laws should be lifted by early April and they would like to start working with the excavator as they start to move dirt and establish that they are the place to go with it. If conditional approval was granted they would come right back with an earth moving permit and start raising the site and make the commitment to accept the fill dirt from other sites. This may make the difference in getting the construction started this season vs. next season.

Mr. McCraight commented that they can help work through this process concurrently to take advantage of the frost laws being lifted and dirt being moved. They can issue an earth moving permit, without a foundation permit, until the waivers and variances are settled.

Ms. Roscoe commented that she believes that it makes sense.

Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Meyering if tabling the project until next month would be acceptable if they were able to secure an earth moving permit.

Mr. Meyering stated that he didn’t think he could start spending the money to bring fill in if he doesn’t have site plan approval. He doesn’t see making that commitment. He also stated that they put five pounds in a five pound sack when they moved in on Ecorse Road and they have ten pounds in that five pound sack now.

Ms. Maise commented that the city certainly understand their situation. The city doesn’t have a preliminary and a final, a lot of communities do and you get that comfort level when you walk out with a preliminary. She also commented that based on what she believes that the applicant is hearing here tonight is that we needed some direction and she thinks that we got it. The applicant came up with some modifications and she would constitute what they are hearing tonight as a preliminary approval. The commissioners want to see some more and they understand that there are options to resolve these other issues and some need to be resolved before going to BZA because they will have to vote on them as well. Mr. Zilka is the liaison for BZA and he will need some level of comfort going forward. These are very resolvable issues and some are minor but, it’s this front yard and she thinks that the commissioners just want some assurances that you are giving it the best that you can, in terms of coming close to our requirements and acknowledging that it is our I-94 frontage, our gateway into our community and noted that M&K will be a great addition.

Mr. McAnally added that there isn’t anyone that doesn’t want their business to succeed but, there are some things that they need to see happen up front. Had there been more time it would
have happened before it came before the Planning Commission however, there is a lot of missing information in the plans at this point.

- Ms. Workman agreed with Mr. McAnally. She noted that the location is very important, especially with the amount of people that travel to the airport. They would hate to grant an approval and regret it later.
- Mr. Meyering was wondering if there was a way to grant a conditional approval and they would get the information to the commissioners in short order.
- Mr. McAnally commented that since the ARC review was fast tracked they aren’t sure what all of the conditions are.
- Mr. Walsh stated that they do appreciate getting on the agenda and that the site plan is complete from a submittal standpoint. He believes that what they need is a 3D view from I-94 to help with this visually. He doesn’t want to walk through this until they have clear direction. He believes that the site line will be over the service bays and assuming that is the case and they prove that and it’s to a scale and the commissioners buy into it, can we say that masonry is not an issue with overhead doors and service bays that are shielded by trucks. Second story office is of high quality masonry with some metal panels with the Volvo brand and pending those conditions that starts to make more sense with some additional landscaping along the I-94 frontage.
- Ms. Maise commented that it is exactly what they are talking about.
- Mr. McAnally commented that perhaps they bring some samples along with them to the next meeting.
- Ms. Maise stated that staff acknowledged the issues with the masonry on the overhead door area. That’s why we were looking for a little bit of mitigation all of it together.
- Mr. Meyering commented that he appreciates the staff meeting with them and getting them on the agenda and understands that it may feel rushed to the Planning Commissioners because they really haven’t had long to review the site plan but, they are here because they are looking to move this project forward as quickly as they can. With contractors being as busy as they are, it’s going to be tough if they delay it much to get it done this year.
- Mr. Zilka understands what the applicant is looking for to get some kind of approval and he feels that once the project is complete ARC should look at it and if something is further necessary than they can handle it. He is sympathetic to the need for the applicant to want to show the front of the building since they will be selling vehicles there. They want a beautiful front for all to see. He understands their needs and that they don’t want to spend a lot of money and be stuck with this property if you can’t see it from the freeway. He has seen this happen in a couple of case over the years.
- Mr. Zilka was wondering what Mr. McNamara’s thoughts were on this matter.
- Mr. McNamara commented that from an engineering standpoint there are a lot of challenges for this site with water and sewer and those can all be worked out. The screening is more zoning compliance and he really didn’t view that piece of the puzzle but, the site can work from an engineering standpoint.
- Ms. Maise point out that Arc can certainly handle many of the issues but, they don’t have the authority to grant waivers to landscaping, nor the variance. This is why they need a little bit more from the Planning Commission.
- Mr. Walsh appreciated Mr. Zilka’s comments and stated that they would be willing to put in a 3-foot hedgerow along the front yard and the dumpster enclosure. He asked if they can have approval with condition that the sight line will shield the service bays, and they will certainly provide that to staff. Staff has the trigger to say no and then it comes back to us. They will be happy to provide samples and they will come back before the commissioners and present them.
and talk about them. They want to show some willingness to bend if they can move forward with a conditional approval.

- Mr. Frederick noticed that there is no reference to an FAA approval.
- Ms. Maise commented that the applicant will be required to get that. Since they turned this in about 48 hours and with the help of OHM, some of the standard comments are not in the report.
- Mr. Walsh noted that they do have airport approval for the detention pond already.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he hasn’t met an applicant yet that doesn’t think that they need to get their project done immediately but, we represent the citizens of this community and we are put up here to try to do the best that we can and make the best decisions on these kinds of projects. His opinion was that this project should be gone through and brought back but, after hearing the opinions of some of the other commissioners, he will leave it as is and if there is a motion to be made then one of the commissioners can make it.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he was looking for some direction from Ms. Maise.
- Ms. Maise stated that she wished that she could direct them but, again the ARC doesn’t have the authority to grant landscape waives.
- Mr. Glotfelty is happy that they are willing to work with the city on the landscaping but, he doesn’t like that they can’t meet the ordinance standards.
- Ms. Maise asked the commissioners if they would be comfortable if the applicant can’t come back with any solution. The applicant certainly has practical difficulty and she has no problem defending that for variances. It’s the reduced landscaping that is required in the front greenbelt and the building materials that are the main issues
- Mr. McAnally asked for clarification of the hedgerow.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he was looking for more masonry at the office area, not split faced.
- Ms. Maise asked Mr. Meyering what the color of the doors will be.
- Mr. Meyering replied that they are typically white but, if the commissioners would like them to match the building they can do so. They have control over that, not Volvo.
- Mr. McAnally commented that it may help and it wouldn’t be as stark. He doesn’t expect the applicant to screen the doors, it’s just not possible but, they can make it look like they belong there. He wondered what else the applicant can do to make it nice along the front.
- Ms. Maise suggested that the applicant park only new trucks along the front, nothing used. She also suggested that the BZA place conditions on the applicant so that if something needs to be caught once they see what the applicant comes up with. If the commissioners are comfortable with granting the waivers and giving the conditions to the BZA and letting it get worked out with them then if BZA accepts it.
- Mr. McAnally asked that they work out what they can control with waivers and mitigation on building materials, etc. He was also concerned about the lights near the freeway.
- Mr. Meyering stated that they have other facilities on the freeway and thy have not had any issues with lighting.
- Ms. Maise reiterated that the key issues are landscaping along the frontage.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that the applicants are willing to work with the city and the city wants an attractive building and he is willing to grant conditional approval.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Zilka to approve SPR-2018-008, M&K Truck located at 29275 Citrin Drive conditioned upon the following:

1. Approval of the following waivers:
a. Section 13.02(c), to reduce the greenbelt requirement along I-94 subject to the applicant working with City administration to get the landscaping into compliance to the greatest extent possible and addressing all items that the landscape architect mentioned in the OHM report in addition to all comments from Planning Commission to mitigate or offset waivers and work with ARC to maximize the landscape on the property;
b. Section 13.01(f), to reduce the required building elevation materials requirements subject to color contrasting the doors to match the trim; and
c. Section 13.03(c), to allow the use of barbed wire fencing.

2. Variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals for:
   a. Section 8.04(a) to allow a reduction in the front yard parking setback;
   b. Section 13.03 to allow a fence in the front yard; and
   c. Section 13.05 to allow the lighting intensity to exceed 3 footcandles along the front property line.

3. A copy of the private road maintenance agreement to be provided as part of engineering review.

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

5. The submittal of 12 copies of a revised site plan for administrative review that addresses all outstanding items noted in the ARC report and those as identified by the Planning Commission.

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

C. SPR-2018-010; John Johnson Company, 15500 Oakwood, requesting site plan approval for construction of a 10,060-sq. ft. building addition for the manufacturing of canvas products for industry and the military.

Mark Flood, John Johnson Company, 274 Waterman St, Detroit, MI 48209 and Joe Guido, Guido Architects, 23419 Ford Rd, Dearborn, MI 48128 stepped forward to speak:

• Mr. Flood stated that the John Johnson Company has been in business for 135 years in Detroit and the fifth oldest company in Detroit and are going to leave Detroit.

• Mr. Flood also stated that the Gordy Howe Bridge is going to land on their building and the State of Michigan has bought the building and taken it from them. They have until July to get out if the building. They commenced to finding another building and with the way that the economy is going it’s hard to find some good buildings. The State gave them some 40,000-50,000-sq. ft. buildings to look at and the back walls were gone or they haven’t been occupied in 7-8 years. In their search for a new building they stumbled upon a college that owns the Detroit Tarp Company and is going through some financial problems and their building became available for sale. With them being in the same type of business, it worked for us to be able to do what we wanted to do. Currently they occupy 54,000-sq. ft. and the building that they just purchased has 34,000-sq. ft. but, has a couple of acres on the side. The previous tenant drew up plans to expand the building by 10,000-sq. ft. along the lines of what they are proposing in their site plan before the commissioners tonight.

• Mr. Flood commented that they followed along the same lines and want to add 10,000-sq. ft. to allow for shop space to build their military tarps for hummers, body bags and things of that
nature for the military. They also do a lot of automotive racking and shelving and various shop items across the country.

- Mr. Flood mentioned that they are in a hurry to get approvals because the State of Michigan has put them in that position. They are working from a brownfield site and not starting from the ground up. They will be adding three walls with some dock doors and will get them up to 40,000-sq. ft. and will still be shy about 14,000-sq. ft. from where they are now but, they decided to move their awning company to the other side of the city to Roseville, MI.

- Mr. Flood noted that about 30-50 jobs will come to Romulus.

- Mr. Flood stated that they went through ARC and don’t see any issues that can’t be worked out. He knows that the commissioners didn’t get a lighting plan with the site plan. They have those now and Joe Guido can explain the site plan to the commissioners and answer any questions they might have.

- Mr. Guido stated that he is the project architect and reiterated that the plan was pretty straightforward. They will be adding 10,000-sq. ft. to the north side of the building. It’s basically a high bay warehouse and shop addition with about 1,800-sq. ft. of new office space I the existing mezzanine. They will match the existing building materials, which are split faced block with the side painted plain block. They will create a 30-foot drive on the north side that will wrap around the west side of the building and connect to an existing parking lot on the south side of the building for fire truck access.

- Mr. Guido stated that they are requesting a waiver for the separation to the driveway adjacent to the north, which is a parking lot.

- Mr. Guido mentioned that they brought an amended site plan with them based on comments from ARC to approach the requirement for pervious surface on the site. He explained that what they did was pulled the paving back on the north side to a 30-foot wide drive that leaves a 20-foot landscape area along the north property line. They also pulled the paving back to a 10-foot setback line on the west side of the property and an additional 20-feet where the parking is and that will be land banked at 22 parking spaces. They are able to achieve now with the existing paving and the propose paving the required amount of pervious surface on the site with the amended site plan.

- Mr. Guido commented that he has smaller site plans to pass out to the commissioners and a photometric plan as well, which was not with the original submittal. They plan to illuminate the driveway to the north and the west side of the building with wall mounted LED down lights that will have no more than a half of a foot candle at the north and west property lines. He mentioned that he calculated an error with the landscaping, based on a 100-foot lot, not the existing lot. So, when the plan was reviewed by OHM they looked at the entire 277-feet of property, which includes 177-feet of the existing property. He based the new landscaping and shrubbery on the 100-feet that they are working with for this project. They would be more than happy to add some additional shrubbery. He noted that there are 5 existing trees in front of the building that will be maintained. If it is required by the commission, they can add a small berm in the front where they have a 40-ft. setback. They are not encroaching in the front setback at all.

- Mr. Guido summed up by saying that the only waiver that they are asking for is the distance between the two (2) approaches.

- Mr. Glotfelty mentioned that he was at the site today and welcomed John Johnson Company to Romulus. He noted that they have some clean-up of the site. He also mentioned that they are wanting to paint the block and wondered if there is a way to match the existing block.

- Mr. Guido replied that he believes that they could match it with pre-colored block on the east side of the building to match the front.
Mr. Glotfelty commented that the city has had some bad luck with the painted block and it just doesn’t seem to hold up, especially with the moisture.

Mr. Flood commented that they have to see what they can get. He doesn’t think it will be a problem for the front but, wasn’t sure about the sides. He’s not sure if it was painted over pre-colored block. They are trying to match it up.

Mr. Glotfelty asked Mr. Flood and Mr. Guido if the dock side will have one (1) or two (2) dock doors.

They both replied that the side will have two (2) dock doors.

Mr. Glotfelty wondered what was on the south side of the building that struts out a little.

Mr. Flood replied that is two (2) docks with a ground level door. He noted that there would be a one-way access for the trucks. He stated that they don’t have a lot of truck traffic but, what they have come in and out will have heavy military grade items that are on pallets that they ship out and they are very large. They will average around 5-6 shipments per week.

Mr. McAnally asked Mr. McNamara if he had any concern with the driveway waiver that the applicant is asking for.

Mr. McNamara replied that it is quite close but, they are asking for confirmation that the turning movement would work. Once confirmed they would have a low speed limit there. The site is pie shaped and essentially has limited frontage and existing drives so, there is really no other way to meet the Fire Department requirements than to have the second drive and it is an appropriate location.

Mr. McAnally wanted clarification that what the applicant brought was revised plans that the ARC has not reviewed.

Mr. Guido confirmed that they brought with them a revised plan based on comments from ARC.

Mr. Zilka commented that he didn’t notice anything on the plans but, it appears that the parking needs to be striped.

Mr. Flood confirmed that they will restripe the parking lot. He also commented that the company is very particular about the appearance of their site and building. He mentioned that the Danci family has owned the company for 130 years. The owner’s grandfather built the seats for the Model-T Ford because he was 2 blocks from Henry Ford’s garage, which they still have the materials in possession.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Workman to approve SPR-2018-010; John Johnson Company located at 15500 Oakwood subject to:

1. Waiver to Section 14.06, for the proposed driveway location;

2. Any other items identified by the ARC committee being addressed on a revised site plan; and

3. The submittal of 12 copies of a revised site plan for administrative review that addresses all outstanding items noted in the ARC report and those as identified by the Planning Commission.

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

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

10. Reports
A. Chairperson

B. City Planner

1. Planning Department Status Report –
   
   • Ms. Maise reminded the commissioners about the April 16th meeting for Medline.
   
   • Ms. Maise also reminded the commissioners about the MAP workshop on March 12th.

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

12. Communications – None.

13. Adjournment

   Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to adjourn the meeting at 8:46 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Roscoe, Workman, Frederick and McAnally. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

   David Paul, Secretary
   City of Romulus Planning Commission