

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING
COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 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, Jerry Frederick, Mike Glotfelty, and Cathy Freitag.

Excused: Dave Paul, Mike Prybyla and Edna Talon-Jemison.

Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner; Marcus McNamara, OHM, City Engineer; Bobbie Marcell, Secretary.

3. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, McAnally, Frederick, Glotfelty, 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, February 18, 2015.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
6. Public Hearings
 - A. PC-2015-005/006; **28275 Northline Building Addition**, requesting special land use and site plan approval for a 71,500-sq. ft. building addition and pavement expansion for Aerostar Manufacturing located on the south side of Northline Road between Harrison and Inkster Roads. Parcel #82-80-097-99-0004-703. Zoning: M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on SLU to City Council and action on site plan.)
 - B. PC-2015-009/010; **Northfield Trucking**, requesting a condition rezoning from M-1, Light Industrial to M-2, General Industrial and site plan approval for a 30,000-sq. ft. trucking facility with 30 trailer storage spaces located on the north side of Northline Road between Middlebelt and Harrison Roads. Parcels #80-095-99-0026-000 and #80-095-99-0027-000. Zoning M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on conditional rezoning to City Council and action of site plan.)
7. Old Business
8. New Business
 - A. PC-2015-011; **DTE Solar**, requesting site plan approval for a 750 kilowatt solar photovoltaic facility located on 4.1 acres on Citrin Drive, south of I-94 and east of Middlebelt. Parcel# 80-047-99-0024-704, Zoning: M-T, Industrial Transportation. (Action required: Action on site plan.)

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. Election of Secretary
13. Communications
14. Adjournment
4. Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, February 18, 2015. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Frederick, Zilka and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion carried.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items – None.
6. Public Hearings
 - A. PC-2015-005/006; **28275 Northline Building Addition**, requesting special land use and site plan approval for a 71,500-sq. ft. building addition and pavement expansion for Aerostar Manufacturing located on the south side of Northline Road between Harrison and Inkster Roads. Parcel #82-80-097-99-0004-703. Zoning: M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on SLU to City Council and action on site plan.)

Michael Brock with Hennessey Engineers and Vince DiDomencio owner of 28275 Northline stepped forward as petitioners.

- Mr. Brock presented the proposed site plan. The site is on the south side of Northline just east of Harrison. A 71,500-sq. ft. building addition attached to the existing 50,000-sq. ft. building is proposed. There is a 7-ft. wide concrete sidewalk that goes around the north and east side of the addition that is adjacent to the parking. The parking lot in the front and the rear will be connected to the existing parking lots to make a vehicular loop around the building. There is a storm sewer in the parking lot from the front along the east side of the building that will drain into a storm water filtration unit that empties into an underground retention that is in the rear of the property under the parking lot to an outlet control center where the storm water will be released into the drain system at a controlled rate to the drain in the rear. A fire hydrant is being added on the east side of the building for additional fire coverage along that side. Part of the plan is to extend the drive approach at the northeast corner of the property for the adjacent parcel and include a shared driveway to keep the number of curb cuts down along Northline Road. It will be a shared access drive. The property right now has a sixty (60) foot wide ingress and egress easement along the east side of the property which will be reduced to thirty (30) feet. This provides an easement for the property in the rear should that ever be developed. The sixty (60) foot easement is large and it

will encroach into the parking on the proposed plans. There is a sidewalk on Northline Road that will be extended along the frontage of the new building addition. There is a drain easement in the rear that will be recorded with Wayne County. The plans have been submitted to the Wayne County permit office and the Wayne County Department of Environment for soil erosion review. They may hear something back this week.

- Ms. Freitag asked if Ms. Maise had any comments.
- Ms. Maise stated that as her report shows the waivers are all listed and they will need a variance which has been applied for and will be heard April 1.

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

Ms. Freitag requested any person wishing to speak on this matter come forward.

Frank Sall, Impact Environmental, 28171 Northline Rd. stepped forward to speak on the petition.

- Mr. Sall, property owner to the east, reported that they spoke with Vince (D&G Construction) and they went over the proposed shared drive approach. He would like to verify that the property to the west has a curb that goes all the way to the sidewalk and he needs to know where the proposed curb would start and stop on the eastside. He stated there will be a five (5) foot variance for the hydrant and existing utility lines. They do not have a problem with the project; he only needs to clarify the information.
- Mr. Brock asked if he was referring to the curb along the east side.
- Mr. Sall and Mr. Brock discussed the plans in front of them.
- Mr. Sall noted their only concern is that they would have to have it come to the corner of their building because it is a natural drain and they have been maintaining it for ten (10) years; as long as they keep the easement he guessed they'd have to make sure where the last gutter comes over the corner, they're going to have to have a five (5) foot easement for the hydrant, just as long as they have that. A truck well is their only source of drainage. He stated as long as they can get it etched somewhere to make sure they can bring the curb within the five (5) foot easement to make sure it butts up with theirs, to leave that open for a natural swale.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they have already discussed it between themselves.
- Mr. Sall replied yes.
- Ms. Freitag recommended that they meet with the city engineer in regards to the issue.
- Mr. Sall said that he would just like it documented and that is their only concern.
- Mr. Brock stated that shouldn't be a problem.

Ms. Freitag closed the public comment portion and opened the meeting to discussion by the board members.

- Mr. Glotfelty asked about the outdoor storage.
- Mr. Brock responded that it is located in the rear and that the building addition will accommodate most of the outdoor storage and right now they are considering doing some minor outdoor storage in the designated area at the rear of the existing property.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned if it would be stoned.
- Mr. Brock responded that it would be asphalt.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that that is better yet and he thanked Mr. Brock.
- Ms. Freitag reiterated that the driveway will go all the way around the building.
- Mr. Brock responded yes.
- Ms. Freitag asked what was going to be done with all of the junk at the rear of the building.

- Mr. Brock replied it is why they denoted the outdoor storage on the plan.
- Ms. Freitag questioned what is going to be left there.
- Mr. Brock was unsure as to what was going in the building and what would be stored outdoors.
- Ms. Freitag noted that it looks really bad since the dumpster is over flowing with trash bags and she hopes this will be taken care of.
- Ms. Freitag further asked if the driveway will go all around the building since right now there is a driveway that doesn't go all the way around.
- Mr. Brock explained there is currently a driveway that comes into the west side of the building and there is a parking area with a turn around. The new plan will have full circulation around the building.
- Ms. Freitag was concerned that the debris that is at the rear of the building will impede circulation.
- Mr. Brock noted that the racks are part of their operation and they denoted an area where they are going to be kept.
- Ms. Freitag commented that the racks are not the problem but rather the junk.
- Ms. Maise stated they may need a bigger dumpster enclosure area.
- Ms. Freitag responded she did not believe the dumpster area was enclosed.
- Ms. Maise stated it is not, and they are adding an enclosure.
- Ms. Freitag asked what was outdoor storage and what was garbage; the outdoor storage of garbage was a concern.
- Ms. Maise noted that the outdoor storage of supplies, materials, etc. is typical.
- Mr. Zilka added that there looks to be some sort of oil spill in the back of the building which could get into the sewer.
- Mr. Brock stated he didn't see that when he was back there.
- Ms. Maise noted that they are requesting a variance for lot coverage because they are exceeding what is allowed. She suggested that Mr. Brock try to remedy this before the petition for the variance for lot coverage goes to the BZA on April 1, 2015. Mr. Zilka is the Planning Commission liaison to the BZA and this will likely get brought up if the rear yard is not cleaned up.
- Mr. Brock responded that he didn't think there would be a problem cleaning it up a little bit back there.
- Ms. Maise responded that it could become a condition of the variance.
- Mr. McAnally asked if the building addition is warehouse space.
- Mr. Brock referred to the floor plan and answered there will be some offices up in the front, but a good portion of it will be storage and warehousing.
- Mr. McAnally concluded then that a good portion of stuff will be stored in the building and there won't be much outdoor storage.
- Mr. Brock replied he thinks that is a good portion of the reasoning for the need for more space; to use some of the new space to get rid of some of the outdoor storage.
- Ms. Freitag commented that they need to clean up what is out there now.

Ms. Freitag closed the commenting portion of the meeting and requested a motion for recommendation to City Council on the special land use.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to recommend to the Romulus City Council special land use approval for a manufacturing facility greater than 80,000 sq. ft., PC-2015-005: **28275 Northline Building Addition**, based upon the finding that the proposed manufacturing facility 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. This approval is subject to the following:

1. Site plan approval by the Planning Commission.
2. Waivers to the following:
 - Section 11.10(a)(4) to reduce the front yard parking setback to 11.4 feet so that it is consistent with the existing parking setback.
 - Section 11.10(a)(4) to reduce the side yard parking setback to 5 feet to accommodate the shared access drive.
 - Section 14.02(b)(2) to waive the requirement for 10-inch curbs per the city engineer.

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

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Zilka to approve the site plan for PC-2015-006; 28275 Northline Building Addition subject to:

1. Approval of the special land use by the City Council.
2. A waiver to Section 11.17(b)(3) for the screen wall requirement based on the surrounding industrial land uses and outdoor storage location behind the building.
3. Variances for building coverage and total impervious coverage being granted by the BZA.
4. The outdoor storage shall not exceed 20 feet in height without city approval.
5. Sheet CE3 of the site plan being revised to reflect the action of the BZA and to note the side yard setback waiver and storage height condition.
6. A shared access easement agreement between the property owner and the adjacent property owner must be signed and recorded and a copy provided to the city prior to issuance of any building permits.
7. The outdoor storage and waste behind the building must be cleaned up and contained in the area as designated on the site plan.

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

B. PC-2015-009/010; **Northfield Trucking**, requesting a condition rezoning from M-1, Light Industrial to M-2, General Industrial and site plan approval for a 30,000-sq. ft. trucking facility with 30 trailer storage spaces located on the north side of Northline Road between Middlebelt and Harrison Roads. Parcels #80-095-99-0026-000 and #80-095-99-0027-000. Zoning M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on conditional rezoning to City Council and action of site plan.)

Leigh Ann Frederick, Owner of Northfield Trucking Company and Exclusive Truck and Trailer Repair, Michael Rea, Project Architect, Damien Frederick Director of Customer Relations and Joe Persiconni, owner of 28758 Northline stepped forward as petitioners.

- Ms. Freitag asked if they had received a copy of the Planning Commission reports.
- Mr. Rea responded that they had.
- Mr. Rea gave a brief overview of the project stating that the property itself is a little over ten (10) acres. The plan is to develop around four (4) acres of it, leaving the remainder of the site as is and in the front area providing new landscaping in accordance with the ordinance. The proposal is for a 30,000-sq. ft. building. The front approximate 4,000 sq. ft. will be used as a corporate office,

for both Northfield Trucking and Exclusive. The remaining 26,000 sq. ft. of the building will be used for the service maintenance and body shop repair of trailers. The building is proposed to be a masonry building and along the front, brick. He showed a sample of the brick. The rear of the building will be masonry block and all the trim will be black and bronze. In terms of parking there is 48 spaces as well as 30 spaces in the rear; the north side of the lot is for trailer parking. When a truck is being used, the car pulls in and parks its car there and then removes the trailer. That will be how the additional parking for employees will be handled. An irrigation system will be installed. On the west side of the site there will be underground detention.

Ms. Frederick presented a Power Point presentation to the Planning Commission about the operations of Northfield Trucking and Exclusive Truck and Trailer Repair.

- Ms. Freitag asked if Ms. Maise had anything she would like to add.
- Ms. Maise stated that there are several outstanding items as noted in the review letter.
- Ms. Freitag asked if she should hold the public hearing first.
- Ms. Maise responded yes.

Ms. Freitag opened up the meeting to comments from the public, noting that a Affidavit of First Class Mail was on file

Brian Kluba, Owner of Euclid Machine located adjacent to subject property at 29030 Northline came forward.

- Mr. Kluba stated that he is opposed to the rezoning because he has been there thirty five (35) years and he has seen a lot of things go on. His father owns the company but asked him to come on his behalf. He has seen the area develop over time and then kind of deteriorate. He mentioned the airport expansion that was supposed to come through and then did not and he noted his concerns about the extra excessive trucking. He mentioned that Middlebelt is messed up, Ecorse is messed up, Inkster is messed up, and there is a lot of trucking right around the facility so he is concerned about the brand new road (Northline). He also noted that there are several houses along Northline as well. He expressed concern about truck exhaust and excessive noise.
- Mr. Kluba explained that they are an inside facility at Euclid Machine and they've been there for thirty five (35) years. They do precision machining. He's sure Northfield will have a great facility and they are looking forward to it, but he's not feeling this is the place for it because of the excessiveness that is around there now and he knows how bad the roads really are and how they keep getting worse. He stated there are just a lot of little things that are just beating apart the community. He would love to have the trucking facility in the city, just not right there.

Kevin Kinny, Driver, Northfield Trucking addressed the Commission.

- Mr. Kinny stated that he has worked with Northfield Trucking for seven (7) years and he didn't have anything to say until Mr. Kluba came forward and would like to defend the company after hearing his concerns. He doesn't feel that anything is going to interfere with the routes or the roads. He has been in the transportation industry for eighteen (18) years and the facility that he is at currently in Taylor is not far from the proposed location they would like to move to. Northline is a main road that they currently go down, and the traffic that is going to go there isn't going to be anything that is added. They use Northline to get to I-75, I-94, and everything around that area. He doesn't feel that the traffic impact will be any at all. Northline Road over the years has been developed into a four lane plus a turn lane road, so it's big enough, it's wide enough to

associate and control the traffic that flows down that road. That is why Wayne County did it. He knows Northline is a Wayne County maintained road, so are the other streets in that area that Mr. Kluba has some concern with. He believes personally and says maybe he's wrong but he may think that the facility may encroach or take business away from him, but it is a totally different industry. He did some research on him as well and he knows that the equipment he uses in his facility is a lot more heavy industrial than what they have in their facility. Anything they use is mainly hand tools, he knows that he has CNC machines and other things that are a lot more heavy industrial as opposed to the equipment they use in their facility.

Ms. Freitag closed the public comment portion and opened the meeting to discussion by the board members.

- Ms. Freitag asked if they have a trucking facility and also a repair facility.
- Ms. Frederick replied yes.
- Ms. Freitag questioned if both operations would now be run out of the Romulus office.
- Ms. Frederick responded yes.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they would be completely shutting down the Taylor office.
- Ms. Frederick replied yes; that is the purpose so that she can run the operations more efficiently.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they do any manufacturing.
- Ms. Frederick answered that they do not manufacture; they repair trucks and trailers and would dispatch out of that office. Half of her fleet runs over the road. Those trucks are repaired twice a month.
- Ms. Freitag clarified and asked if it's more of a repair facility.
- Ms. Frederick responded correct.
- Ms. Maise asked if the repair of the truck and trailer would be for their own trucks or would they service others.
- Ms. Frederick responded both; they will bring competitors and colleagues in as well as their own.
- Ms. Maise referenced the LSL letter which discussed the conditional rezoning agreement and noted that the planners were of the understanding that the repair was of their own trucks. This is something that will need to be look since in the agreement, the repair of truck trailers as for the applicant's trucks. Truck repair as a principal use is an M-T use not permitted in an M-2 district.
- Ms. Freitag stated that truck repair is not permitted in the M-2 District.
- Ms. Maise confirmed truck repair as a principal use is not permitted in the M-2 District. A conditional rezoning to M-2 was offered because the M-1 District does not allow the amount of outdoor storage of the trucks that the trucking company needs. The ancillary repair of your own vehicles is allowed in the M-1 District but truck repair of trucks and trailers that are not your own is an M-T use and therefore this is a proposed conditional rezoning to M-2.
- Ms. Maise asked if they had noticed that in the conditional rezoning agreement only the repair of their own trucks was allowed.
- Mr. Rea stated that is why all along, even from the beginning, he thinks when they first met informally, he was proposing a change to the M-T. That was the reason for that.
- Ms. Maise asked that they had understood the conditions of the conditional rezoning agreement.
- Mr. Rea stated that he didn't see where anything else was changed, again when the review was sent back and it was saying update this to an M-2 and he noted that he obviously saw it

said M-2, but he said he clearly was under the impression that was what the City deemed was the appropriate rezoning and classification.

- Ms. Maise read from page 2 of the conditional rezoning agreement document that says the project definition is “The developer agrees to construct a project on the property that would be a principal permitted use as a trucking business under the City’s zoning ordinance under M-2 zoning which would include the storage of truck tractors and trailers at the site, dispatching trucks, and repair of the developer’s owned or leased truck trailers and tractors.” That’s the key thing right there which would allow it to be an M-2 as opposed to an M-T.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they were to recommend a conditional rezoning to M-2, would they be able to repair other people’s trucks.
- Ms. Maise responded that to repair other people’s trucks and trailers, the M-T zoning designation is required.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they needed to request an M-T rezoning as opposed to M-2.
- Mr. McAnally asked to clarify, as part of the conditional rezoning, the applicant put additional requirements against themselves, so does that zoning stay with the property if they leave.
- Ms. Maise recalled a previous conditional rezoning for D & G where there are provisions in the agreement that if construction plans aren’t submitted and if a building permit is not issued, then the zoning reverts back. She referred to section 3 on page 5 of the agreement.
- Mr. McAnally confirmed that it reverts back. He suggest that this request should be tabled to let staff go back and look at this administratively again and come back with it.
- Ms. Maise responded staff was under a much different understanding of the use based on the information in the conditional rezoning agreement.
- Ms. Freitag noted to approve it tonight they would not be able to repair other companies vehicles in the facility and asked that it was probably a big part of Ms. Frederick’s business.
- Ms. Frederick responded yes.
- Ms. Freitag noted that there are a few questions on the site plan before they table it.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he has seen that they promote that the company has about seventy (70) trailers and forty (40) tractors and if they have that many pieces of equipment, it will not all fit at that site.
- Ms. Frederick replied that their equipment isn’t all home every night since half of their fleet runs over the road, so seventy (70) trailers would never be on her site. They have drop trailers at facilities that are her customers. They haul for Mastronardi produce in Livonia and they have ten (10) to fifteen (15) trailers dropped there every day. Pro-Transit International out of Belleville, has twenty (20) trailers over there. They have to stage and pre-load trailers, so they would never exceed the thirty (30) trailers that they have allotted for their customers.
- Mr. Glotfelty said he welcomed the applicant to Romulus but these plans are minimal at best, very minimal. He asked if they have any diesel fuel on site.
- Ms. Frederick responded, no.
- Mr. Glotfelty observed mechanics working on site but he doesn’t see any grease traps on the prints unless he missed them.
- Ms. Frederick replied that they do have mechanics on site and they collect that and she asked Bruce Lampton, her father who runs the diesel bay if he’d speak on her behalf on how the diesel fuel and grease is collected and disposed of.
- Mr. Lampton reported that anything they have for storage they have containments which is certified through the oil companies, which is furnished. They’re working with Corrigan Oil and they give them certified tanks and it comes in and the oil that they have in house is all contained in a container and they come and pump it out. So it’s all self contained and it has traps made so that if there were an oil spill that it’s all self contained in a container that has walls around it that’s built up.

- Mr. Glotfelty asked with truck companies they typically have steam cleaners and power washers and will there be any type of sediment retention basin that when it goes into that trap it can be pumped out and separated so that it doesn't go into our sewers.
- Mr. Rea stated that he spoke briefly with Carol about this. There were some comments about this from the engineer and he's not here tonight, but he gave him the comments. The plans that were submitted had preliminary engineering schematics, because this is obviously a preliminary stage of this project, but even he knows on that preliminary engineering sheet that was turned in they did show an interceptor on there. Again, in terms of any electrical, mechanical, plumbing on these plans, they're certainly not going to be present because these are part of the preliminary process, preliminary plans.
- Mr. Glotfelty said he understands but he has a standard as well and if he can't see it, he can't vote on it and sometimes he likes to see it.
- Ms. Freitag responded that is basically our plan.
- Mr. Rea responded that there is the interceptor shown on the engineering plan.
- Mr. Glotfelty noted that the plan is very minimal.
- Mr. Rea restated he knows but he's just saying it's there.
- Ms. Freitag reviewed the Commission's options to possibly approve the conditional rezoning as M-2 or table it and let the applicant come back and ask for M-T.
- Ms. Maise noted that she can understand the confusion in that when the attorney drafted the agreement, the reference to truck and trailer repair was for the applicant's own trucks. The word "exclusive" in the use statement on the site plan is all in capital letters and it's not pulled out as a separate company. It says Northfield Trucking Company, which is what is on all the applications, and exclusive truck and trailer repair. It may have been interpreted as it's exclusive to Northfield Trucking. When the conditional rezoning agreement was drafted by the attorney, the repair of the developer's owned or leased trucks was stipulated.
- Ms. Freitag agreed that the wording is confusing.
- Ms. Maise looked at the rezoning application and asked what is the official name of the truck repair company since its not identified in the application..
- Ms. Frederick stated it's Exclusive Truck and Trailer Repair, LLC.
- Ms. Frederick said that she was told by Planning Department staff to change the rezoning application to M-2 rather than M-T.
- Ms. Maise responded, yes, for consistency with the conditional rezoning agreement.
- Ms. Frederick restated I was told to change that, and we did have M-T on their application
- Ms. Maise reported that the city had a template for a conditional rezoning agreement from a previous request. Typically it is the applicant that provides the development agreement however our attorney drafted the language based on the applications and site plan provided. There was nothing submitted to indicate that the project involved two different companies. It was likely interpreted as it was exclusive to, the trucking use. The Zoning Ordinance references accessory repair for those the business's vehicles only. That is how we distinguish between some of the M-1, M-2 uses and the MT uses. The repair of other people's trucks is a M-T use. We need to go back and consider some of the analysis that this commission did last fall in terms of the area in general and consistency with the master plan. As you may recall a little more intensity with regard to trucking use in this area was discussed. We are looking at the industrial districts overall and direction is needed as to where truck and trailer repair that is not exclusive or accessory to the principal use goes.
- Ms. Freitag stated that she feels they need a little more clarification before they can vote on it.
- Mr. McAnally suggested that since they are missing three commissioners and the rezoning agreement will need to be rewritten, perhaps the request should be tabled and so it could come back to a full commission.

- Ms. Maise asked that the site plan be reviewed since there are several outstanding items and Marcus is here to explain some of the more technical things. The issue with the wetlands for example, are they regulated or aren't they. Since they may need a variance on that, we need to get that process going. Marcus may want to talk further about some of the information he didn't see on the plans and as Mr. Glotfelty brought up, if there is anything else that needs to be provided on the site plan from an engineering standpoint.
- Ms. Freitag said we'll turn it over to Marcus.
- Mr. McNamara responded that there were a couple things noted in their letter including that the existing water and sewer were not shown. The applicant was provided a plan of Northline Rd. and both are on the south side of the road, so he wanted to make sure they were aware of that.
- Mr. Rea reiterated that the engineer that is working on the project has that drawing and unfortunately there was a problem with the drawings that he had submitted for the revisions based on what the city had asked for, but he is aware of that.
- Mr. McNamara stated he wanted to express that there is a big difference between the water being on your side of the street or the other as far as cost. He wanted to make sure that the applicant was aware of that.
- Mr. McNamara explained that the wetlands by definition appear to be regulated because of the proximity to the drain. From going out there they don't look like they are very high quality, so the City has a twenty five (25) foot buffer requirement, but you can get a variance from that. So it would be your responsibility to make the argument but from what he has seen out there he thinks it would be supported. We're talking about a swale essentially. Because it is contiguous with the wetlands in the rear of the property and the proximity to the drain that that's required. Last two things, I know you had requested as wide of a drive as you could get essentially, it appears to me that a forty (40) foot drive width would work based on the turning templates that's pretty typical. In our previous letter we said you could go up to forty five (45) feet, which is what you're proposing, it just doesn't seem necessary especially having the four (4) foot paving behind the backer curb so that if any trucks do top the curb so they won't destroy landscaping. A minor comment but he thinks a forty (40) foot drive would be sufficient. The last item was, which I know you said the engineer was working on, but just want to take another look at the elevation of the proposed site, the truck well and the storm sewer in Northline Rd. which is proposed as your outlet, and the reason for that it doesn't appear to me, I think the storm sewer is five (5) foot deep, so that it wouldn't have gravity outlet from a truck well. That could impact whether you need a pump station. I don't think you want that, there's obviously a capital cost but there's an ongoing maintenance headache that you probably don't want. Because you're going with underground detention it wouldn't impact the site layout but you may want to look at a discharge to the drain if there is more fall there, again that is something that can be figured out later, but if you were proposing a pumped outlet then you're going to have some above ground equipment where shown now it would be in the front of the site so if that is the direction you're going, we need to know that and then you'll have to screen it appropriately. Northline actually is a City road in that section; it is County when you get into Taylor. The advantage of the discharge to Northline is you avoid Wayne County and I can understand your desire to do that. If you can't get gravity outlet you may want to pursue, that often times would be critical path so you are going to need a drain permit, you'd want to know that and get that process started early.
- Ms. Freitag stated if they were to approve this tonight, she thinks they'd be doing them an injustice. We want you to come to the City, we want your business, but we want to make sure it's right for you, for the type of business you do. So evidently there was some confusion in the wording when it was in the translation or whatever. When you applied and it went to the

attorneys and everyone for the agreement. So again, I recommend that we table it until next month

- Mr. McAnally stated when we talk about what we see on the site plan drawings, you say well these are preliminary it's not on there, well this is the only shot we have and this is why we like to see as much developed drawing as we can because we only have one shot to look at it
- Mr. Rea responded that he understands that but he knows, he's positive that he thought that on the engineering drawing that he did indicate that there was that interceptor on there. That was the only point and again, I know there are other items that were requested that were added to the architectural site plan and all that. Obviously, taking Marcus's comments for the next submittal certainly the engineering drawings will be more concise.
- Ms. Freitag asked, so they can still go through with the BZA on April first
- Ms. Maise responded that they haven't applied
- Ms. Freitag questioned they haven't applied yet
- Ms. Maise responded that is why we needed to know if it were a regulated wetland or not. They had said on their plans that it wasn't per the owner, but we needed verification of that, so that's something that's, so now that we have that we just have to put them through the application process. We'll getcha on for the beginning of May. So they'll come back to you first and then go before BZA the beginning of May.
- Ms. Freitag said ok, thank you

Motion by McAnally, Supported by Glotfelty; To table PC-2015-009/010; **Northfield Trucking**, requesting a condition rezoning from M-1, Light Industrial to M-2, General Industrial and site plan approval for a 30,000-sq. ft. trucking facility with thirty (30) trailer storage spaces located on the north side of Northline Road between Middlebelt and Harrison Roads. Parcels #80-095-99-0026-000 and #80-095-99-0027-000. Zoning M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: Recommendation on conditional rezoning to City Council and action of site plan.)

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

7. Old Business – None.

8. New Business –

- A. PC-2015-011; **DTE Solar**, requesting site plan approval for a 750 kilowatt solar photovoltaic facility located on 4.1 acres on Citrin Drive, south of I-94 and east of Middlebelt. Parcel# 80-047-99-0024-704, Zoning: M-T, Industrial Transportation. (Action required: Action on site plan.)

Jason Slattery, Director of Solar and Kyle Kreft, Solar Project Manager, came forward as petitioners on behalf of Rudolph|Libbe

Mr. Slattery and Mr. Kreft gave a powerpoint presentation of the DTE Solar project

- Ms. Freitag asked Ms. Maise if she had any questions or comments to make.
- Ms. Maise stated she had one thing she wanted to add to her report, she was talking with Bob McCraight and Steve Hitchcock our City Attorney and wondered about performance guarantees and if we should be looking at a removal bond or guarantee of some sort. The City Attorney

thought it would be a good idea and that the City has the ability to do that in the zoning ordinance. I spoke to Bob McCraight and he agreed. The issue with a removal bond or guarantee is determining an appropriate cost.

- Ms. Maise asked if this was something that the applicant had seen with other communities they had been before.
- Mr. Slattery stated they typically have not. He said they typically pay a site plan approval fee.
- Mr. Slattery stated he doesn't recall having paid a bond in any of our other site plans.
- Ms. Maise stated it gave the city a layer of protection if the facilities became dysfunctional.
- Mr. Kreft stated that a lot of the materials used are salvageable and recyclable with salvage value.
- Ms. Maise responded that is an aspect to consider
- Mr. Slattery replied in addition to that, DTE is going to be the asset owner. They're going to own this. Their intent, they're not going to simply pay the sticker price for this thing to sit out there and be dysfunctional. Their intent is to generate electricity by it, it is in their best interest to make sure the system is running at optimum conditions. They may go with us or another firm to maintain the array, and basically when we maintain a solar array we'll make sure that the system is performing to optimum conditions. Each year it will degrade, so the warranty period of the panels themselves is twenty five (25) years. So essentially, from day 1 (1) to 25 (25) years from now that system will be operating at eighty (80) percent of its designed life from the install point. So, I highly doubt that DTE would want a system out there that not only is an eye sore, but is a system that is not performing as intended per its use. We've got a pretty good track record of our systems that we've installed. We've had equipment failures, where equipment has simply failed and it might be a transformer that has failed. Traditionally that happens most of the time at the start up. It doesn't typically happen five (5) years into the project. That's just how electrical equipment typically performs, either it works right away and continues to work for the life span of that equipment or it fails right away.
- Ms. Freitag asked so basically you said twenty (20) years
- Mr. Slattery responded twenty five (25) years is the warranty of the modules themselves
- Ms. Freitag stated right, but you said something about you have the property leased for twenty (20) years
- Mr. Slattery responded yes, I believe the DTE easement agreement
- Ms. Freitag stated I think you said it was twenty (20) years in the beginning
- Mr. Slattery stated it's twenty (20) years
- Ms. Freitag asked so after the twenty (20) years you'll either renew or pull out
- Mr. Slattery replied correct and as Kyle said there is a salvage value and we've done economics on the solar array, there is enough scrap metal and copper to pay for that decommissioning.
- Ms. Freitag asked the electricity that is generated, what will it be used for
- Mr. Slattery responded that it will be directly grid tied in to DTE's grid so it will supply electrons to essentially the closest use in their grid. This is roughly the equivalent of seventy eight 78 houses a year, roughly is how much electricity will be generated from this array.
- Mr. Frederick asked, it's four and a half (4.5) acres of twenty three (23) do you think there would be any chances of expanding this
- Mr. Slattery stated there definitely would be, the property owner Ashley Capitol has an interest to expand it, they're trying to do other development on the site so they would have an interest. I don't know if DTE would have an interest at this time, but it is definitely a possibility to go further to the east.
- Mr. Frederick stated it seems like a good use of that land being that it is bordering railroad and freeway, access in there is limited
- Mr. Slattery responded correct, it is an ideal spot; the western side of that property is raised above Middlebelt. Ashley capitol had farmed it, it was a corn field for many years previous to this, so

there are oil tanks to the south and the interstate to the north, it's great for a visibility stand point for even future development as you go further east.

- Mr. Frederick responded thank you
- Mr. McAnally asked what is the potential danger, I noticed the fence goes from seven (7) foot to four (4) foot, but what is the danger of someone getting inside, what risk will they have if they come in contact with the wrong stuff in there, I mean is it enough voltage to take them out or
- Mr. Slattery said there's definitely a risk there, I'm not going to say there's not because there is DC current flowing through that at all times, I believe this is six hundred (600) volt. It's a six hundred (600) volt system, and it's DC. Honestly we haven't had a whole lot of vandalism or anything like that. We've actually had a car run off the road before and literally lodge itself into one of our solar arrays, in that case it was one thousand (1,000) volt DC power and there was no harm to the driver. They actually blacked out they were diabetic. The terminations themselves, if someone were to pull them apart they're plug and play connections, it's male and female connection so when you pull the termination apart there's no physical conductor that you can actually touch with your hand without sticking some metal object into that male female connection
- Mr. McAnally stated, I've seen people do some foolish things when they're thinking oh there's some scrap
- Mr. Slattery responded and we've installed in some rough neighborhoods, we've actually had golf balls we've had baseballs, you name it, these are glass modules. We've had some damage, we've had hail damage, but it's typically a pretty safe thing
- Mr. Kreft added that it's an electrical design meaning that it is all grounded and fused, so that if something were to happen there are safety measures there to blow a fuse for people's safety. Obviously there will also be signage, signage everywhere, danger, letting people know what is there. There's not going to be a mystery to them, they'll know.
- Mr. McAnally asked which portions were the seven (7) foot fence and which were the four (4) foot.
- Mr. Kreft clarified basically the whole perimeter of the array is the four (4) foot and the seven (7) foot is basically around the equipment, some of the equipment rack
- Mr. Slattery stated that it is kind of a secluded site, there is a fence along I-94 from the north side and it's kind of very far off Citrin drive to the west and Middlebelt is very elevated at that point
- Mr. Kreft stated it's low
- Mr. Slattery responded right, Middlebelt for the road surface elevation is very low
- Mr. Zilka stated his concern was with Mr. McAnally's concern. He is concerned about kids getting back in there over the four (4) foot fence. How often will you have a sign saying what that is posted on the fence
- Mr. Slattery asked if Mr. Kreft remembered the spacing on the signs
- Mr. Kreft responded that he did not know the spacing off the top of his head on the fence
- Mr. Zilka stated you know how kids are they get curious, and if they challenge one another they'll try to get in there and see what it's all about
- Mr. Slattery agreed
- Mr. Zilka stated I thought maybe a seven (7) foot, of course, I guess if they'll get over a four (4) foot fence they'll get over a seven (7) foot fence too.
- Mr. McAnally stated you can't make it high enough if they're after it. You're not in a neighborhood area though
- Mr. Zilka responded they could come in from Citrin drive
- Mr. McAnally stated no, no I'm sure, but it's not like there are a bunch of houses
- Mr. Zilka responded no, that's true

- Mr. Slattery said it's really no different than the service panel coming into your house; a lot of our wires are encased in conduits and things like that into a fiberglass panel or metal panel. So similar to the electrical panel in your house. You can touch that, you can pull the meter socket if you pull hard enough. Same with transformers that you see sitting alongside of the buildings. Typically transformers are just sitting there; those are typically a higher voltage electrical component as well.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he heard Mr. Slattery say plug and play with these, is there any training our firefighters need with this, if there were a car to drop of 94, is there a breaker or something we can turn off
- Mr. Slattery responded, yeah very much. So what we do as part of our commissioning at the end is we coordinate with the fire department to go over that just from a safety standpoint concern. If they are the first to respond to the site, what do you do? So that plan is on file with them as well. At the equipment area to the north of the array there is a disc connect up there so it's essentially a kill switch for the entire array. If the power from the grid goes down the solar inverters automatically disconnect and that is a safety mechanism so the lineman further down the electrical line doesn't get electrocuted when he's trying to bring the electrical grid back up when the sun is shining. So there are a lot of safety mechanisms already built in. There will be a monitoring system that we can tell what's going on and we use that for monitoring and diagnostic reasons. Since we can tell if there is an equipment problem or anything like that going on in the site
- Mr. Glotfelty responded thank you
- Ms. Freitag added that in the ordinance it states that black vinyl coated fencing must be provided on certain frontages and that would be I-94 and Middlebelt roads. She asked if there was a problem with that
- Mr. Slattery stated there's no problem with that it's DTE's intent to have a very visible project so we would prefer not to do that, but we'll do it because it's a requirement of yours. From our standpoint, we don't really view that as an item you're going to see anyhow and that's kind of what we want, we want it to be a very visible thing for cars, but we're not going to object to doing that.
- Ms. Freitag stated they are waving the landscaping and the trash receptacle and everything and that stuff too, but I don't know if a black coated fence, I don't think it would be that noticeable
- Mr. Slattery agreed, no it's not. What we wouldn't want is the slats in the fence as well.
- Ms. Freitag stated right
- Ms. Maise responded we don't like those either
- Mr. Kreft stated he had one last comment. DTE wanted him to bring up. Currently it's showing the easement going over toward Middlebelt, it is DTE's wish for us to move it further to the east and essentially follow the existing fence line and be offset about one (1) foot and the reasoning being there is a gas easement through the parcel, we want to keep DTE's easement and the existing easement separate and unrelated. That is a request DTE has made
- Ms. Freitag responds that would be fun wouldn't it
- Mr. Kreft stated that it would reduce the acreage a little bit from the 4.1 acres.
- Mr. Slattery added that because of that reduction we don't feel that it is a concern to the Planning Commission
- Ms. Maise replied no, it will need to come on revised plans and we can handle all of that administratively, that is not a problem
- Mr. Slattery said just signage distance was a hundred (100) feet on the chain link
- Ms. Freitag clarified, you'll space it one hundred (100) feet
- Mr. McAnally asked about the performance bond

- Ms. Maise responded that it was up to the commission. She stated they explained their situation and it is up to the board whether they would like to accept their explanation
- Mr. McAnally stated he doesn't see a need. He doesn't see them walking away a risk
- Mr. Glotfelty stated DTE isn't going anywhere

Motion by McAnally supported by Roscoe to approve PC-2015-011; **DTE Solar**, requesting site plan approval for a 750 kilowatt solar photovoltaic facility located on 4.1 acres on Citrin Drive, south of I-94 and east of Middlebelt. Parcel# 80-047-99-0024-704, Zoning: M-T, Industrial Transportation. (Action required: Action on site plan.) Subject to the following:

1. A waiver to the trash receptacle requirement of Section 13.06 since the site is unmanned.
2. A waiver to the landscape requirements of Section 13.02 based on the nature of the use.
3. Black vinyl coated fencing must be provided in the I-94 and Middlebelt Road front yards.
4. Payment in lieu of construction of a sidewalk in the amount of \$5,313.00. This must be noted on the site plan and paid to the Planning Department prior to issuance of any building permits.
5. Submission of eleven (11) copies of a revised site plan for administrative review that addresses the comments noted above.

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

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

- Ms. Maise noted that she will consult with the attorney regarding the proposed conditional rezoning discussed this evening. She asked if the Commission has any problems with the repair of other people's vehicles in that location.
- Mr. Zilka responded he didn't.
- Ms. Freitag responded I don't I just think the whole thing we'd have to limit the number of trailers that they have on the site
- Ms. Maise stated which the agreement does. The agreement and the site plan both, more the agreement, that they're illustrated on the site plan, but the agreement
- Mr. McAnally stated again a conditional rezoning approval and when we tie that condition to the rezoning I don't have an issue with what they want to do
- Ms. Maise stated that's very helpful, thank you
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that what they proposed and what he saw today, their numbers did not add up
- Ms. Freitag clarified, you mean when you went to their Taylor location
- Mr. Glotfelty responded right. The numbers did not add up
- Ms. Freitag said, he said they had about sixty (60) trailers on site
- Mr. Glotfelty stated and about forty (40) tractors. Further he stated, my Romulus math is pretty good
- Mr. McAnally commented we're tying them to an exact number as condition of this approval, so we can put someone out there to inspect the site somewhere down the line
- Ms. Freitag added and if there are more than thirty (30) they'd just be out of business
- Ms. Maise stated she will review with her further and asked Mr. Glotfelty when he looked at the site, could it possibly have been another company that was there
- Mr. Glotfelty stated no, the trailers were marked

- Ms. Maise questioned, they all had Northfield Trucking on them
- Mr. Glotfelty yes they were just jammed in there. if there were a fire in there it would be impossible to get back in there
- Ms. Maise stated ok
- Mr. Glotfelty stated it was way too tight
- Ms. Freitag said they probably really need a bigger piece of property
- Ms. Maise responded good to know. Ok, Thank you

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

- Ms. Freitag wished everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day. .

B. City Planner

- Ms. Maise presented a copy of her report with all of the development activity.
- Ms. Freitag asked if anyone had their report on interest designation
- Ms. Roscoe mentioned this weekend the Romulus Athletic Center was going to celebrate their 7th anniversary and had special events planned in the afternoon from 12 to 6.

11. Reports on Interest Designation – None.

12. Election of Secretary

- Mr. Zilka asked if they should wait for all members to be present.
- Mr. McAnally responded that he had correspondence with Mike Prybyla and he had indicated that he would be willing to except the nomination if it were offered. Mr. McAnally has not heard anything else from anyone indicating that they would want it. It's up to the commissioners that are here, and they could wait and get everyone here at once, but Mr. Prybyla did say that he would take the nomination.
- Mr. Zilka asked if anyone else were interested.
- Mr. Glotfelty responded no thank you.
- Mr. Frederick responded no thank you.
- Mr. McAnally stated, with no objections he nominated Mr. Prybyla to be secretary.
- Mr. Zilka supported the nomination.

Motion by McAnally, supported by Zilka to nominate Mike Prybyla for the position of Secretary.

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

13. Communications –

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

- Ms. Maise explained that she had received an update from Bob McCraight who had spoke with the property owner they have been going back and forth a bit now that the weather is breaking. Mr. McCraight has emphasized that he has until the end of the month or tickets will be written.

14. Adjournment

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to adjourn the meeting at 8:26 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Frederick, Roscoe, Zilka & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.



Michael Prybyla, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission