MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

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

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

   Excused: Daniel McAnally and Jessica Workman

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

3. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the amended agenda and hear old business before public hearings. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, and Freitag. Nays – none. Motion Carried.

   Agenda

   1. Pledge of Allegiance

   2. Roll Call

   3. Approval of Agenda

   4. Approval of Minutes

   5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items

   6. Old Business

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

         Applicant: William Pritula
         Matthew Diffin, Diffin-Umlor & Associates

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

         Location: 28034 Beverly

         Project: Expansion of trailer repair and storage facility

         (Action required: Approve, approve with conditions, postpone or deny site plan)

   7. Public Hearings

      A. **TA-2017-002; Text Amendment; Special Land Use; Article 3, Single-Family Residential Districts; Article 4, Multiple-Family Districts; Article 5, Residential Manufactured Home Districts; Article 6, Central Business District; Article 7, Business Districts; Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 9, Airport District; Article 11, Use Standards; Article 17, Site Plan Review Requirements and Procedures; and Article 18, Special Land Use Review Requirements and Procedures**

         (Action required: hold a public hearing then recommend approval, approval with conditions or denial of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment to the City Council)
8. New Business
   A. TA-2017-002; Text Amendment; Special Land Use; Article 3, Single-Family Residential Districts; Article 4, Multiple-Family Districts; Article 5, Residential Manufactured Home Districts; Article 6, Central Business District; Article 7, Business Districts; Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 9, Airport District; Article 11, Use Standards; Article 17, Site Plan Review Requirements and Procedures; and Article 18, Special Land Use Review Requirements and Procedures

   (Action required: hold a public hearing then recommend approval, approval with conditions or denial of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment to the City Council)

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

10. Reports
    A. Chairperson
    B. City Planner
       1) Planning Department Status Report

11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

4. Approval of Minutes

   A. Motion by Glotfelty supported by Roscoe to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission regular meeting on September 18, 2017.


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

6. Old Business


   Matt Diffin, Civil Engineer, Diffin-Umlor & Associates, 49287 West Rd., Wixom, MI stepped forward to speak on behalf of the petitioner. Also in attendance was William Pritula, property owner, and his attorney, Mark Chiesa, PC.

   • Chairperson Freitag gave a brief history of the site and stated that although the applicant has done work without approvals, he was asked to provide a detailed description of construction sequencing as part of the site plan review so that the Planning Commission can understand all that has been
done and what is proposed and a cost estimate. This will be reviewed by the city engineer to establish a cash bond for the completion of the project.

- Mr. Diffin presented the commissioners with a site plan and explained the different phases and scope of work proposed.
- Mr. Diffin also explained that they did receive extensions on the previous approval between 2006 and 2009, then the economy crashed and Mr. Pritula was unable to move forward with the project. The site has a stockpile of gravel between Phases 2 and 3 and with the moving of trailers, the stockpile got knocked down. Now that the economy is looking better, Mr. Pritula would like to continue with the project and bring the site into compliance with the original site plan and with the expansion as well.
- Mr. Diffin stated that they are asking for a waiver for the irrigation system since the existing building in the front does not currently have irrigation and while the two areas are separated between the Ecorse Creek, it would be difficult to accomplish this. They would be willing to put up a landscaping bond while the new landscaping is being established.
- Mr. Diffin commented that they were ok with all of the other conditions in the city planner’s report.

Chairperson Freitag closed the petitioner’s portion of the meeting and opened it up for questions and comments from the commissioners.

- Mr. Paul stated that he has several concerns about the project and explained his dismay for how the petitioner did all of the work on site without any approvals or permits. He noted that he met with the DPW and that they have concerns regarding the hydrants and activity on site. The hydrants are too low and there are big concrete slabs in front of them. The Fire Department is not able to get to the hydrants.
- Mr. Paul inquired about the culvert on site and asked Mr. Diffin what Mr. Pritula plans to do with it.
- Mr. Diffin stated that Mr. Pritula thought he could use it for the Ecorse Drain crossing however Wayne County will not allow it. He understands that it needs to be removed from the site but it is not junk and still valuable.
- Mr. Paul mentioned that the petitioner installed some water mains and didn’t have inspections performed on them at the time but has since received the proper approval. He also mentioned that the city is still looking for easements from the petitioner that should have been recorded and returned in 2007/2008.
- Mr. Diffin replied that Mr. Pritula signed the water main easements and right-of-way dedications and handed them over to the city for signatures. He stated that the city was to record them with Wayne County.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Diffin if he knew which department had them.
- Mr. Diffin was not sure.
- Mr. Diffin stated that they would re-execute the documents and add phases 3 and 4 and bring them back to the city.
- Mr. Paul questioned the retention at the rear of property. He understands that Mr. Pritula doesn’t own it but they intend to use it.
- Mr. Diffin replied yes but, they have an agreement with the neighboring property owner to use the retention and Wayne County has agreed to it.
- Mr. McNamara, city engineer, confirmed that.
- Mr. Paul commented that the project will require a cash bond up-front for any work going forward.
- Mr. Frederick questioned the storm maintenance responsibility comment on page 8 of the proposed site plan.
Mr. McNamara explained that the comment, which is a Wayne County requirement, gives the city the legal right to charge back to the property owner.

Mr. Paul asked Mr. McNamara if City Council approved this.

Mr. McNamara replied yes, the City Council agrees to a yearly blanket approval for DPW on storm water maintenance agreements.

Mr. Frederick noticed a 5 ft. height difference between the petitioner’s property and the neighboring property and asked the petitioner what materials are under the gravel of the trailer storage.

Mr. Diffin replied that it is concrete millings. Mr. Pritula owns a concrete company and he takes large pieces to a mill and has them crushed.

Mr. Frederick noted that there are a lot of chunks of debris at the neighboring property line.

Mr. Diffin explained that Mr. Pritula stock-piles the chunks until he has a big enough load to crush.

Mr. Frederick stated that there are tires, car parts, furniture, etc. on the western border of the property that appears to have been pushed to the property line and possibly on adjacent property.

Mr. Diffin explained that the engineer has the topo surveys for both the original submittal and now and that it really hasn’t changed.

Mr. Frederick disagreed and noted that Mr. Pritula’s property is significantly higher than his neighbor’s property.

Ms. Maise mentioned that no one reviewed the grading plan for Phases 2 and 3 in 2005 because it was a separate parcel at the time and not part of the application for Phase 1.

Mr. Diffin stated that they will make sure that any debris on site will get cleaned up.

Mr. Frederick asked the petitioner if the bio-swales will be higher than the neighboring property.

Mr. Diffin replied no. They will not be draining onto the neighboring property; he has the bio-swales set at the grade next to the fence line.

Mr. Frederick questioned the request for a waiver on the black vinyl coated fence.

Mr. Diffin stated that the existing fence is in good shape and that was the reasoning for the waiver request.

Mr. Glotfelty commented that Mr. Pritula has built some nice buildings in Romulus but he was very disappointed in the condition of this site. He also wants to see what is under the gravel and is suggesting that core samples to be taken.

Mr. Glotfelty inquired about the pipe for Ecorse Creek and asked if it was approved by the county.

Mr. Diffin replied yes.

Mr. Glotfelty asked to see the approvals from Wayne County. He also mentioned that the fire hydrants are way too low on the site and that they need to be addressed.

Chairperson Freitag asked Ms. Maise about the Phase 4 section of the property.

Ms. Maise replied that since the applicant does not want to do anything with that section at this time they must remove the gravel and restore it to grass or request approval for the improvements already made.

Mr. Diffin agreed since the applicant will require a permit from MDEQ for the floodplain and getting that permit could be a lengthy process.

Ms. Maise noted that the concern is that if Phase 4 is not restored it will turn into more truck storage. She also noted that since Phase 3 is being developed the greenbelt needs to be extended across the entire frontage.

Ms. Maise mentioned that the Planning Commission had not seen plans for Phases 2 and 3 that had grading on them. The petitioner expanded onto Phase 2 and 3 without approvals and she noted Mr. Frederick’s concerns regarding the grade elevations and deferred to Mr. McNamara on how to rectify the grading issues.

Mr. McNamara stated his concerns and explained how the grading would have to be overseen.
• Further discussion was had by the commissioners, Ms. Maise and Mr. McNamara regarding the grade elevations, site improvements and stipulations of what the commissioners wanted to see from the petitioner.

Motion by Paul supported by Glotfely to postpone **SPR-2017-011; Pritula Trailer Storage** until the next regular meeting in November.

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

7. Public Hearings

A. **TA-2017-002; Text Amendment;** Special Land Use; Article 3, Single-Family Residential Districts; Article 4, Multiple-Family Districts; Article 5, Residential Manufactured Home Districts; Article 6, Central Business District; Article 7, Business Districts; Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 9, Airport District; Article 11, Use Standards; Article 17, Site Plan Review Requirements and Procedures; and Article 18, Special Land Use Review Requirements and Procedures

Chairperson Freitag asked if anyone wishing to speak on this matter please step forward. Seeing no one, Chairperson Freitag closed the public speaking portion of the meeting and opened it up to questions and comments from the commissioners.

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

• Ms. Maise gave the commissioners a brief history of the prior amendment proposal for special land uses that was considered in 2011. When the amendment was previously considered it got complicated administratively since the former Planning Director was leaving the city. While the Planning Commission endorsed the procedural change, when the amendment went to City Council, the Council wasn’t comfortable with the proposed language so it was not amended. Like the prior proposal, the amendment is a change to the special land use review procedure to help streamline and shorten the development review process. As some of the Commissioners may recall, it was proposed that special land uses be broken into two categories – low intensity uses that the Planning Commission could review and approve and the higher intensity uses which were known as “super special land uses”, that would require City Council approval. The proposed amendment will modify and speed up the process for special land uses since lower intensity uses will require Planning Commission review after a public hearing and then be either approved or denied while the more intense land uses will require a recommendation from the Planning Commission with the City Council having approval authority.

• Ms. Maise noted that minor amendments to the zoning districts and use standards are also proposed for consistency with the procedural change.

• Ms. Maise commented that the proposed amendment would allow for a quicker approval for petitioners since the current process requires that after a public hearing, both the Planning Commission and City Council must review the request. She mentioned that over the last several years to help streamline the development review process, the city has looked at the districts several times, particularly the Industrial District and modified the ordinance from to make some uses permitted uses subject to special conditions as opposed to special land uses. This has helped tremendously and has fast-tracked some of the projects, particularly projects with outdoor storage. There just wasn’t a need for a public hearing with some outdoor storage in the industrial district.
• Ms. Maise stated that the city is looking at the ordinance amendment again as part of our compliance with the MEDC’s Redevelopment Ready Program. The City Council has endorsed our participation in the program and has adopted a resolution so that the City of Romulus will be Redevelopment Ready certified. The city has submitted a self-study to the MEDC and is now classified as engaged. The MEDC is currently looking at the city’s self-study and will most likely mark us down on the process for special land use review since many uses have to go to City Council which can delay the development review process. The city is making an attempt before getting our evaluation review back from the MEDC, to have it changed by the time MEDC scores us so that we can let them know that we have addressed it.

• Ms. Maise stated that the special land uses that are less intense, non-controversial will still go before the Planning Commission for a public hearing the commissioners will look at them on a case-by-case basis and have the option to place extra conditions upon these uses to make them more appropriate for the areas proposed. The more intense special land uses like waste disposal uses, substance abuse rehab centers, casinos, race tracks, large-scale churches and public assembly establishments, and long-term parking facilities should still go before City Council after a recommendation from Planning Commission.

• Ms. Maise asked the commissioners their thoughts on the amendments or if they thought there were any uses that should or should not go to City Council, or even require special land use at all.

• The commission supported the amendments as proposed.

8. New Business

A. **TA-2017-002; Text Amendment;** Special Land Use; Article 3, Single-Family Residential Districts; Article 4, Multiple-Family Districts; Article 5, Residential Manufactured Home Districts; Article 6, Central Business District; Article 7, Business Districts; Article 8, Industrial Districts; Article 9, Airport District; Article 11, Use Standards; Article 17, Site Plan Review Requirements and Procedures; and Article 18, Special Land Use Review Requirements and Procedure

Motion by Zilka supported by Paul to recommend approval to City Council for TA-2017-002; Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments listed on page 4 of the city planners report.

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

9. PC Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

• Ms. Freitag commented that she attended the annual Blue Sky Trunk-or-Treat and that she was happy to see so many Romulus families, Romulus Chamber of Commerce, Romulus Fire Department and city staff attend. She also commented that Blue Sky does so much for the Romulus Community and they are appreciated.

B. City Planner

Planning Department Status Report

• Ms. Maise informed the commissioners that there will most likely be a meeting in November.

11. Reports on Interest Designation
13. Adjournment

Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Roscoe, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

"cw"

David Paul, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission