MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2015

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

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

   Excused: Dave Paul & Mike Prybyla

   Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner; Tim Keyes, Economic Development Director; Marcus McNamara, OHM, City Engineer

3. Welcome to Commissioners Frederick and Talon-Jamison

4. Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Frederick, Zilka, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, and 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, December 15, 2014.

5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items

6. Public Hearings

   A. PC-2015-002/003; Pro K-9 Acres, 15750 Merriman, requesting Special Land Use and Site Plan approval for a dog training facility and commercial kennel located on the west side of Merriman south of Eureka Road. Parcel #82-80-136-99-0004-000. Zoning: M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on SLU to City Council and action on site plan.)

7. Old Business

8. New Business

   A. PC-2015-001; Sunoco Logistics, requesting 1-foot of barbed wire to be installed on the existing 8-foot high fence along the perimeter of property located on Ecorse Road west of Inkster. Zoning: M-T, Industrial Transportation. (Action required: action on waiver request.)


9. Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission

10. Reports
A. Chairperson

B. City Planner

1. Planning Commission Annual Report
2. Planning Department Status Report
3. Planning and Zoning Training Workshops

11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Election of Secretary

13. Communications

A. Building and Safety Department letter regarding PC-2013-015; Aero Realty.

14. Adjournment

5. Motion by Zilka supported by Roscoe to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, December 15, 2014. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Roscoe, Frederick, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Abstain – Glotfelty. Motion carried.

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

7. Public Hearings

A. PC-2015-002/003; Pro K-9 Acres, 15750 Merriman, requesting Special Land Use and Site Plan approval for a dog training facility and commercial kennel located on the west side of Merriman south of Eureka Road. Parcel #82-80-136-99-0004-000. Zoning: M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on SLU to City Council and action on site plan.)

- Jen Guthrie; owner Pro K-9, and Joe Demski; architect came forward representing the petitioner.
- Ms. Guthrie and Mr. Demski gave a presentation on the proposed dog training facility and commercial kennel.
- Ms. Freitag commented that just looking at the plans she thought it was a very impressive and had a very nice layout. She also asked if this is phase I and if that is what the commission would be currently approving or if they’d be approving all three phases.
- Ms. Maise commented that all three phases would were being approved and explained the following steps the applicant would need to take after approval.

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.
- Ms. Freitag asked if Ms. Maise had anything she would like to add before she turned the discussion over to the commissioners.
- Ms. Maise explained that as reported there are a few waivers that are needed including: gravel parking, to eliminate the on-site dumpster, payment in lieu of construction of sidewalks and a waiver on building materials.
- 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. Glotfelty questioned the probable septic area that was proposed.
Mr. Demski replied that it needs to be sized and positioned on that side of the property.

Mr. Glotfelty asked if they were just waiting on calculations where to put it.

Mr. Demski replied yes, from Wayne County.

Mr. McAnally inquired if more than twenty (20) animals were planned on being serviced on site at one time. He restated, and asked how many dogs would be on the premises at one time.

Ms. Guthrie replied that once the boarding facility is build it could accommodate up to twenty (20) dogs, but other than that, training classes generally run with a maximum of six (6) to eight (8) dogs per class at any given time.

Mr. McAnally asked if the primary customer is the public with new animals or who is being targeted with this project.

Ms. Guthrie explained that previous customers provide a good majority of their current focus but essentially any dog owners in southeastern Michigan will be target customer base. The facility is designed to give a safe and comfortable place to care for their dogs.

Mr. McAnally clarified that the facility was not for training hunting dogs.

Ms. Guthrie replied that not generally, they have agility equipment and may have clinics to get customers used to learning how to use the facility and could be thought of as a gym membership for dogs and their owners.

Ms. Freitag asked if Ms. Guthrie was thinking of forming a club.

Ms. Guthrie replied, not a club, but more of a membership to familiarize the facility with the dogs and their owners and requiring an annual registration process to ensure the animals are up to date on shots and other necessities.

Ms. Freitag questioned besides training, kenneling and other services offered, if one was to become a member, could they come at any time to use the facilities.

Ms. Guthrie agreed that is what the fenced in areas are for.

Ms. Freitag confirmed she has been providing these services privately since 2001.

Ms. Guthrie agreed.

Mr. Demski stated that there are bathrooms in phase I that allow anyone using the facility to gain key card entry into a lobby area that has a men’s and women’s restroom.

Ms. Freitag asked if the pole barn would be moved.

Mr. Demski stated it is shifting the poles which will be cut and moved slightly to avoid the power lines that go through the property.

Ms. Freitag asked if the cell tower was on Ms. Guthrie’s property.

Ms. Guthrie replied yes, it is an easement.

Ms. Freitag clarified that she would be fencing in areas as she moved through the different phases of production of the facility.

Ms. Guthrie agreed.

Ms. Freitag asked Marcus McNamara of OHM engineering services for his input on the gravel parking.

Mr. McNamara replied that since the facility is such a low intensity use and Merriman Road is currently and will be for quite some time gravel, it wasn’t quite functional to recommend pavement seeing as much of the road could be tracked onto the pavement anyways.

Ms. Zilka questioned if in fact the waiver is granted for the gravel driveway and parking area, would chloride be applied to keep the dust down as Merriman Road is maintained using chloride for dust control.

Ms. Guthrie replied that they will provide any maintenance the city may require in regards to the gravel driveway.

Ms. Freitag clarified that it is being requested to use metal siding and decorative concrete block in lieu of brick for all phases.

Ms. Guthrie replied yes.

Ms. Freitag questioned the waste being placed at the side of the road.
• Ms. Guthrie explained yes, that they do not anticipate a lot of waste coming from this facility due to minimal use.
• Ms. Freitag asked as the facility grows in phases will a dumpster be used.
• Ms. Guthrie responded in the initial phases it should not be needed but once boarding is implemented there may be a use for the dumpster.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to recommend to the Romulus City Council special land use approval for a commercial kennel, **PC-2015-002, Pro K-9 Acres** at 15750 Merriman based upon the finding that the proposed commercial kennel is consistent with the Master Plan, for the most part compliant with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and compatible with adjacent land uses; and the proposed use will not negatively impact the environment, traffic or public services. The approval is conditioned upon the following waivers:

1. Section 14.02(b)(1) and (2) to allow gravel parking and driveway areas in lieu of hard surface curbing;
2. Section 13.06 to allow curbside waste removal instead of a dumpster with enclosure;
3. Section 13.04 to allow payment in lieu of construction of sidewalks in an amount of $4,125.00; and
4. Section 13.01(f) to allow the use of metal siding and decorative concrete block in lieu of 50% brick.

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

Motion by McAnally supported by Roscoe to approve the site plan for **PC-2015-003; Pro K-9 Acres** at 15750 Merriman subject to:

1. Special land use approval by the City Council;
2. Issuance of a kennel license through the City’s Clerk’s Office and approved by Animal Control prior to issuance of any certificates of occupancy.

• Ms. Freitag questioned whether there was a limit as to how many dogs could be allowed on the premises at one time.
• Ms. Maise responded that it was based on the area and twenty (20) dogs was the maximum number for this project.
• Ms. Freitag clarified that was for kennel use not in regards to general use of the training facilities.
• Ms. Maise responded that was correct.

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

8. Old Business – None.

9. New Business –

A. **PC-2015-001; Sunoco Logistics**, requesting 1-foot of barbed wire to be installed on the existing 8-foot high fence along the perimeter of property located on Ecorse Road west of Inkster. Zoning: M-T, Industrial Transportation. (Action required: action on waiver request.)

• Dave Bonamy came forward representing the petitioner and gave a presentation regarding the request for barbed wire installation on an existing 8-foot high fence.
• Ms. Maise added that she spoke with Mr. Bonamy regarding the vegetation and the berm and using vegetation to screen the barbed wire.
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.

Motion by Roscoe supported by McAnally to approve a waiver to allow barbed wire fencing for PARC-2015-001; Sunoco Logistics subject to:

1. A variance being granted by the BZA to allow a 9-foot high fence;
2. A landscape plan for the front greenbelt being provided for administrative review and approval.

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


- Kelvin Antill and Salem Lahood of Paragon Outlets, and Colleen Marnell of Kimley-Horn came forward representing the petitioner.
- Mr. Antill and Mr. Lahood gave a Power Point presentation regarding the proposed Outlets of Michigan.
- Ms. Freitag asked if Paragon already had tenants in the leasing process.
- Mr. Antill responded that there are perspective tenants.
- Ms. Freitag asked if Mr. Maise had any information she would like to share.
- Ms. Maise responded that they expect a revised site plan to come in when the variances are heard.
- Mr. McAnally responded to the slide which said “Why Romulus?” He stated 25 years ago when his mother was mayor she said the same thing. She thought if she could get the intersection and infrastructure in that they would come and after her diligence, they did. He stated that she may not have witnessed it in her lifetime, but he is grateful to see this project coming.
- Mr. Zilka shared his concern for handicapped parking. He feels that thirty-six (36) spaces are not enough due to the size of the development.
- Mr. La Hood responded that Paragon will meet all of the ADA and State requirements.
- Mr. Zilka asked if he thought it would hurt to go a few over in number. He stated his concern in regards to more people being handicapped at a younger age and less spots.
- Mr. La Hood replied that Colleen (Kimley Horn Engineers) had pointed out, thirty (30) is the required number per ADA and they are showing thirty-six (36). He further stated the property has limited entry points instead of scattering the spots around the site, they will be focused at the entry points of the mall. There are six (6) entry points that feed the building, but certainly they will look at the number if the need presents itself. He stated they want their customer to feel comfortable coming to the property.
- Mr. Zilka stated he is glad to hear it. He said some business establishments who do not have enough. He sees people struggling to get to the store. He stated that the layout is beautiful, he wishes them luck in their project and appreciates their noting his concern.
- Mr. McAnally questioned the snow in Minnesota compared to our location noting the heated sidewalks at some of their locations provided easier snow removal. He wondered whether those may be implemented in our area due to the frigid winters.
- Mr. La Hood said they will look into that and they had done research in Minnesota and were advised by both their structural engineers and construction crew against it not because it doesn’t function but because of the differential of putting the pavers next to an adjoining material that doesn’t have the heat creates a situation. What was done there and what likely will be done in this
situation is creating a five (5) foot concrete walk with a frost wall that goes down stabilizing the areas where the doors open up. The concourses are thirty five (35) feet wide, if we take twenty five (25) feet and we put a really thick sand bed down and put the pavers in we can manage the individual brick type pavers if one shifts we can easily go in and fix the problem.

- Mr. McAnally stated then you are going to have to incur the cost of maintenance, cleaning the salt and repairing the pavers.
- Mr. La Hood noted that if you look at the pictures from Eagon, most of the concourses are covered with pavilion roofing. Where the pavilion roofing is not covering the pavement, the store fronts will have awnings or some other method of protective covering. If for example, it were raining you could move from the pavilion to an awning for coverage and have a path of travel that is somewhat protected from the elements.
- Mr. McAnally was in agreement with Mr. La Hood’s response.
- Mr. Frederick asked what the hours of operation would be.
- Mr. La Hood answered that hours can vary, but typically hours of operation are 10 am to 9 pm weekdays and 10 am to 6 pm Sundays.
- Mr. Frederick asked if all stores would share the same hours of operation.
- Mr. La Hood responded that they enforce the same hours so that the center is completely open for operation.
- Mr. Antill added they include an operation covenant ensuring all shops are operated at the same time.
- Mr. Zilka asked if their own security is provided.
- Mr. La Hood stated they will have security. New England Properties will be managing the security of the site. They sometimes have security on staff and other times they may outsource but there will be security.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked about the reduction in lighting and whether they felt this was safe in all seasons including winter hours when daylight is shortened darkening around 5:00 pm.
- Mr. La Hood responded that they are asking for a one (1) foot candle minimum in some areas opposed to the required three (3) foot candles. He stated the circumference of the light will still provide adequate lighting in proper areas and that the illumination will actually exceed normal retail lighting. The perimeter will have five (5) foot candles and at entrances there may be eight (8) foot candles used.
- Mr. Antill added that Ms. Talon-Jemison may be referring to the height of the pole as well.
- Mr. La Hood stated that the height of the pole actually provides better dispersion of light and still meets FAA standards being so close to the airport.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked about the size of the parking spaces being nine (9) foot wide as opposed to (10) feet and how that might affect cars incurring damaging dings.
- Mr. La Hood stated that the nine (9) foot by eighteen (18) foot spaces with the twenty four (24) foot drive aisle is the standard in retail design. Research was done regarding other communities such as: Inkster, Westland, Canton, Huron Twp. and the outlet center at Birch Run. These communities all have comparable sizing to the nine (9) feet by eighteen (18) foot spaces with the twenty four (24) foot drive aisle.
- Mr. Antill added that based on experience nine (9) feet by eighteen (18) feet is the standard and previously being part of General Council he would hear any liability claims and he has not known parking space size to be an issue.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked if any sustainable or green products have been thought to be added to the project.
- Mr. La Hood stated they use best practice, a white roof for reflect-ability and proper waste management procedures. A number of other “LEED points” are being provided in the project. People are known to use and chase the point system. They attempt to incorporate what they can but do not chase the points.
Mr. Antill added several tenants are doing their own LEEDS for marketing purposes, but they do accommodate whatever their needs may be. For instance if they were to need bike racks they will be provided and parking spaces for low emission vehicles.

Mr. Glotfelty asked what would be provided for standby power.

Mr. La Hood stated there would more than likely be one and it would be used for emergency purposes only.

Mr. Glotfelty stated that he was concerned with screening and location, but is glad they will have it.

Mr. McAnally clarified through Ms. Maise that as build-out occurs and inspections are done, site plans and building plans will be reviewed administratively with regard to sewer tie-ins and the rest of the information. He clarified that as discussed, those reviews will not come back to the Planning Commission but he wanted to make sure they will receive status updates and reports to follow along with any progress being made to ensure that they are aware and learning from the process.

Ms. Maise was in agreement.

Ms. Freitag stated with the magnitude of the project ahead, they will be relying on administration and consultants to make some of the decisions for the board when the time arises.

Ms. Maise ensured that they would be kept abreast of any issues and if needed protocol will be followed in regards to plans being brought before the commission.

Mr. La Hood added that they will prepare construction drawings and apply for permits; they are reviewed online with the appropriate departments on several occasions. The review is for the shell and a limited amount of landlord work scope that is incorporated in the spaces. Each tenant is responsible to submit individual plans for their tenant improvements on their space.

Ms. Freitag clarified that each tenant is then responsible for the construction of their individual space.

Mr. La Hood agreed with her statement.

Ms. Freitag stated they have had to rely on the administration to make decisions on their behalf, and a bad decision has not been made and they put all of their faith in them. In regards to the waivers they are asking for a waiver from 75% brick, using 25% brick, 45% architectural precast, and 27% stucco. She asked if the majority of the brick will be on the exterior of the facility.

Mr. La Hood stated they attempt to use accent material where it makes the most sense. It's going to be in those key feature elements that will identify together with the main entrance façade elements. When you come into a plaza there will be a main focal point that will be brick, as you come into an intersection of two pedestrian concourses those corner elements will be brick and the one at the end will be brick.

Ms. Freitag stated that to her it doesn't seem logical to install all brick.

Mr. La Hood stated that with three thousand (3,000) linear foot of perimeter it may seem monotonous if you did install completely brick.

Ms. Freitag was in agreement.

Mr. La Hood stated that you would want to use a rich material as an accent material to focus on key elements.

Ms. Freitag noted that based on the plans that were provided it's a very beautiful structure. She commented the board doesn't have a problem with the islands. She added that they were requesting a sidewalk waiver for Vining Rd. because there was no foot traffic anticipated.

Mr. La Hood added that there is primarily the one section from the entrance ramp to I-94.

Ms. Freitag clarified that there will be an entrance ramp into the mall from Vining Road with exits on Wick Road only. She asked that traffic will not be able to exit onto Vining Road.

Mr. La Hood responded that is correct.

Ms. Freitag asked if the City had plans for Wick Road.

Mr. Keyes replied that the City recognizes that the infrastructure on Wick is old and needs an upgrade. The city is not only looking at the proposed project by New England/Paragon, but all
the future build-out. OHM is working with the City to come up with recommendations for Wick and Vining Roads. They plan on having the recommendations complete and starting the project at the same time the mall is being developed so that it is complete when it opens.

- Ms. Freitag noted that they anticipate with the current development more development will come to surrounding vacant land in that area.
- Mr. Antill explained that they will stick to what they do, but for instance in Eagan, Minnesota by the time they grand opened, there was a residential project adjacent to them and a hotel project being developed.
- Ms. Freitag said that they are putting all of their faith and confidence in them that they will build them a beautiful mall that they can be proud of that we can be proud of.
- Mr. Antill replied that they think they build the nicest outlet in the industry.
- Ms. Freitag mentioned that she is very familiar with the outlet they have in Las Vegas, and the fact that the proposed mall is interior reminds her of how that location is set up with the high end stores and kiosks. She stated she does not like the way Birch Run is set up at all.
- Mr. Antill responded that Birch Run is a project that was created by multiple developers for multiple years. They were eventually combined and consolidated, they actually were over the project and that it had been worse before.
- Mr. La Hood noted that is the old concept. The racetrack and what Ms. Freitag is referring to in Las Vegas is the new industry standard with the developers who have been in the business a while. He said it is pedestrian oriented so you don’t have to drive from store to store, but it also creates a good balance of circulation. The stores feel like once someone gets on the race track after a full loop one location over the other doesn’t have a disadvantage.
- Mr. Zilka asked to make a request. He requested that instead of it being named the Outlets of Michigan, could it be named the Outlets of Romulus, Michigan
- Ms. Freitag stated Michigan is fine.
- Mr. Zilka said we love this town.
- Ms. Freitag suggested it could be Outlets of Michigan at Romulus
- Mr. Antill responded that Romulus will somehow be featured. He also added that unfortunately they are not allowed to name the project.
- Mr. La Hood noted that the project was named by New England Development and in terms of leasing the project you want to present it as a much larger demographic.
- Mr. Antill commented that the trend used to be “outlets at....” He stated that the trend now is to not use a specific name because for example, if you are living in London and you’re going to be in the Michigan area, you don’t exactly know where Romulus is and it facilitates an international market. Being so close to the border, Canadians probably do know where Romulus is, but they are thinking larger picture these days.
- Mr. Zilka stated he couldn’t pass the request up.
- Mr. Antill said they hear that request frequently.
- Mr. McAnally noted with the Airport being a prime location maybe they consider shuttles from the airport to the facility. If people are sitting for six (6) hours waiting for a plane, might as well have them shop.
- Mr. Antill stated that New England is looking into that option.
- Ms. Freitag added that hotels may also have an interest in providing shuttles to the site.
- Mr. Antill replied yes, and they would like to take advantage of ways to get new customers to the mall.
- Ms. Freitag noted she could see people picking up passengers from the airport going to the mall before hand or sticking around afterwards to go through the mall. She thinks they picked a great location.
- Ms. Maise asked if they considered ground sheet advertising on the roofs. She asked if it was the Minnesota location that had one.
Mr. La Hood replied that the Minnesota location is also in the flight path so they had done that. They are looking into it and they would use a white TPO roof and it would be very easy to stencil on the location and that anyone flying over might be able to see it.

Ms. Freitag said that would be nice because anytime you’re flying over you only see tops of buildings and a bunch of mechanical equipment on top. She asked if they plan on the first shovel being in the ground in July.

Mr. Antill stated yes, this summer, late summer.

Motion by McAnally supported by Roscoe to approve the site plan for PC-2015-004; Outlets of Michigan, subject to:

1. Waivers of the following:
   a. Building materials – Section 13.01(e) to allow less than 75% brick.
   b. Parking lot island width – Section 13.03 (h)(6) to allow 9 foot wide islands.
   c. Sidewalk – Section 13.04(i) to allow payment in lieu of construction of sidewalk construction along a portion of Vining Road in the amount of $11,375.00.

2. Variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals for impervious lot coverage, parking space requirements, parking space dimensions, light pole height and light illumination.

3. Submission of a revised site plan that addresses the outstanding items identified in this report and in those of other departments.

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

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

11. Reports

A. Chairperson

Ms. Freitag wished to acknowledge the two former board members who were no longer with the commission that were replaced by Mrs. Talon-Jemison and Mr. Frederick, Mr. Byron Butler and Ms. Diane Banks-Lambert. In regards to Mr. Butler, he realized his work schedule conflicted with the Planning Commission meetings and he was not as effective as a commissioner as he would have liked. She stated that they did appreciate the time he was with them as he was an asset who brought a lot of insight to the Planning Commission. Ms. Diane Banks-Lambert will be missed she was an excellent commissioner who was concerned with the growth of the City and she brought a lot to the table.

Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfety to recognize Mr. Byron Butler and Mrs. Diane Banks-Lambert for their years of service with the Planning Commission.

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

B. City Planner

Ms. Maise updated everyone in regards to the Planning Commission Annual Report. She stated that it does require action be taken and brought to City Council. She noted the chart of
development projects and commented that this year we have already had fourteen (14) site plans submitted and last year we had a total of fourteen (14).

- Ms. Freitag added that we are moving forward, showing us that we have a great administration moving us forward. She added that under membership Mr. Prybyla is listed as secretary. For this period it should be Mr. McNally.
- Ms. Maise stated that it will be changed.

Motion by Roscoe, supported by McNally to accept the Planner’s report as written and recommend that it be submitted to the Mayor and City Council.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Roscoe, McAleary, Zilka, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Glotfelt & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

- Ms. Maise asked if they were ready for her status report.
- Ms. Freitag recognized that she had actually consolidated a bit.
- Ms. Maise stated she did, she has gotten rid of a lot of things that were ongoing. She has been working very closely with the Building Department and getting C of O’s. In fact a bit later on the agenda Aero Realty will be coming up. She referenced the letter from the Building Department explaining the status. They have contacted the property owner to schedule the C of O inspections, and they will have thirty (30) days and if Bob had not heard anything from them he would then take legal action.
- Ms. Maise mentioned that there will be a meeting in March; two (2) public hearings, a conditional rezoning and a site plan for a trucking company on Northline Road that was discussed last fall. It will be located between Middlebelt and Harrison on the North side of the road. It is the vacant ten (10) acre parcel. DTE Solar facility on I-94 and Middlebelt, will also be coming in addition to an industrial building addition that because of the size of the building also requires a special land use. The property is located on Northline, the Aerosol building.
- Ms. Maise continued by telling the Planning Commission about an interesting plan which had an ARC meeting on today called ZZZ Crash Pad on Merriman. We attempted to get that on the March agenda, but some issues with Wayne County need to be resolved and rather than rushing it they will be waiting until April, so it is likely a meeting will be held in April as well. Some other exciting news is the Master Plan since we were due for the five (5) year update last year. The Envision Romulus started last year providing some information that we are going use in the Master Plan. We are getting recommendations from LSL and going to budget next week, we will see if we can do what we would like to accomplish and get that started.
- Ms. Freitag asked about item three (3), the training workshops.
- Ms. Maise stated that Ms. Talon-Jemison and Mr. Frederick were interested in attending the February 26th training session: Planning & Zoning Essentials in Ann Arbor. Also, Ms. Roscoe, Mr. McNally and Ms. Talon-Jemison were interested in Site Plan Review in Lansing on March 5th. If anyone else is interested please let her know so she can get everyone registered. She also stated they may be bringing in LSL and the city Attorney Steve Hitchcock to possibly do some in house training and to update them on new legislation and other things going on. The big MAP conference is in October in Detroit this year; being that it is local she will try to work it into the budget.
- Ms. Freitag stated that she and Mr. McNally are interested in training towards their Citizen Planner certifications to keep that current. She asked that it was pretty basic stuff.
- Ms. Maise responded that it is basic, but it does qualify for credits towards Citizen Planner certification.
- Ms. Freitag clarified that it doesn’t give us the credit we need.
- Ms. Maise stated that if you’ve already had the course, but it does give you four (4) credits towards the Citizen Planner certification. Ms. Maise discussed the fact that a lot of municipalities are bringing in their own consultants for in house training and we are fortunate to have excellent
counsel and planners. She asked Mr. McNamara if engineering standards will be updated this year.

- Mr. McNamara stated that is the plan, they attempt to look at the engineering standards manual every 5 (five) years to keep pace with changing zoning laws, Roberto in the DPW is going to incorporate that into the upcoming budget to ensure that they are up to date with any zoning ordinances and the Master Plan.

12. Election of Secretary

- Ms. Freitag stated since Ms. Banks-Lambert was vice-chair, according to bi-laws, Mr. McAnally who was Secretary steps into that position and a new Secretary needs to be elected. Since there are two people absent, it is proposed that nominations are postponed until they are in attendance.

Motion by Zilka, supported by Mr. McAnally to postpone election of secretary until next meeting held March 16, 2015.

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

13. Communications –

A. Building and Safety Department letter regarding PC-2013-015; Aero Realty.

- This item was mentioned above.
- Ms. Maise added that last meeting a resolution to the family of Mr. Junior Block in his memory was approved and she received a phone call from Mrs. Block, thanking the commission for their kindness.

14. Adjournment

Motion by Glotfelty supported by McAnally to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Glotfelty, McAnally, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, Zilka, Roscoe and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

Michael Prybyla, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission