

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING
COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2016**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Freitag at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call Showing: Jerry Frederick, Daniel McAnally, David Paul, Melvin Zilka, Celeste Roscoe, Edna Talon-Jemison, Mike Glotfelty and Cathy Freitag

Excused: Mike Prybyla

Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner and Christina Wilson, Planning Secretary

3. Motion by Zilka supported by Glotfelty to approve the amended agenda. Items 6 and 7 will be switched. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, McAnally, 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. Public Hearings
 - A. RZ-2016-001/SPR-2016-003; **M & M Express Trucking** requesting conditional rezoning from M-1, Light Industrial to M-T, Industrial Transportation to allow truck repair, tractor/trailer storage and outdoor contractor storage on 4.70 acres at 27732 Ecorse. Parcel #80-044-02-0839-000. Zoning – M-1, Light Industrial District. (Action required: recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial to the City Council or postponement of the conditional rezoning request.)
 - B. PC-2016-002; Zoning Ordinance Amendments – **Sidewalks and Nonconforming Sites**
 - C. PC-2016-003; Zoning Ordinance Amendments – **Uses Requiring Site Plan Review** (Action required: recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial to the City Council, or postponement of the text amendments.)
- Table 3.02, 6.02, 7.02, 8.02, Schedule of Uses, Animal/Agricultural
Article 11, Section 11.15, Animal/Agricultural
Article 24, Definitions
Appendix A, Table of Uses by District
(Action required: recommend approval, approval with conditions or denial to the City Council, or postponement of the text amendment.)

7. Old Business

A. PC-2012-006; Romulus Village Phase 2, requesting a 12-month extension of the site plan approval for a commercial development on 4.3 acres on Ecorse Road east of Hannan, Parcel #80-026-99-0016-702. Zoning – C-3, Highway Service District. (Action required: postpone, approve, approve with conditions or deny approval of site plan extension.)

B. Master Plan of Land Use Update. Chapter 4, Transportation and Chapter 6 Design

8. New Business

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 McAnally supported by Roscoe to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Wednesday, March 21, 2016.

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

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

6. Old Business

A. PC-2012-006; **Romulus Village Phase 2**, requesting a 12-month extension of the site plan approval for a commercial development on 4.3 acres on Ecorse Road east of Hannan. Parcel #80-026-99-0016-702. Zoning – C-3, Highway Service District.

- Frank Jarbou, 4198 Orchard Lake, West Bloomfield, MI 48323 stepped forward as petitioner for Romulus Village Phase 2 and he explained that they are requesting an extension for Phases 2 and 3 of the development. He noted that there has been interest and he has commitments from a bank for a drive-up ATM. Tim Horton's, in Phase 1, will be opening soon and they continue to work with other prospective tenants for the remaining portion of the development.
- Ms. Maise clarified that Mr. Jarbou's site plan does not expire until July 28, 2016 but he is being proactive by requesting this extension now. The extension will be from July, 2016 – July 2017.

Motion by Zilka supported by Paul to extend site plan approval for 12 months for **PC-2012-006; Romulus Village Phase 2** from July 2016 through July 2017. Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Zilka, Paul, Glotfelty, Talon-Jemison, Frederick, McAnally, Roscoe and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

7. Public Hearings

- A. RZ-2016-001/SPR-2016-003; **M&M Express Trucking**, requesting conditional rezoning from M-1, Light Industrial to M-T, Industrial Transportation to allow truck repair, tractor/trailer storage and outdoor contractor storage on 4.70 acres at 27732 Ecorse Road. Parcel # 80-004-02-0839-000. Zoning M-T, Light Industrial District.
- Dennis Krestel, Guido Architects, 23419 Ford Road, Dearborn, MI 48128 stepped forward as petitioner on behalf of M&M Express Trucking
 - Ms. Maise gave a brief overview of the status of the property noting that while the property has been occupied by some of the existing tenants since the 1980s, there are no certificates of occupancy. The new property owner, M&M Express Trucking purchased the property for trailer repair which is not a permitted use in the district and therefore they are requesting a conditions rezoning. A zoning agreement, which is required, was not provided.
 - Mr. Krestel explained there has been some attempts at some initial clean-up of the site already by the owner. He also reiterated some of the background and why a conditional rezoning was requested. His client became unknowingly the bearer of the responsibility to obtain proper certificates of occupancy. They wish to cooperate as best as they can and as they are able.
 - Mr. Krestel noted that the property's current M-1 zoning will not permit the uses that they purchased the property for, nor will an M-2 zoning allow for the type of business planned. The financial burden is great to plan the property for the M-T zoning sought for and which will allow the business to continue. He pointed out that it is part of the City's Master Plan to make this district an M-T zoned district. Our clients are requesting the M-T conditional rezoning of the property. The plans presented include improvements mostly compliant with all the M-T requirements and will greatly improve the property. A forthcoming additional agreement that the attorneys are working on will identify and offer the applicant's business operations, usage intent, conditions and restrictions. Mr. Krestel requested that there be some give and take with improvements. If the cost of the total improvement to M-T zoning is too great this client may be forced to sell the property and the property will remain as-is; unimproved.
 - Mr. Krestel commented that he believes that what the owners are attempting to do is work together with the city and the neighbors to try and develop a much better use of the land. The city's consulting engineers, OHM do recommend site plan approval. Obviously, they are looking for a set of completed construction documents that will meet Romulus and Wayne County standards. Also, LSL Consulting letter dated April 13, 2016 they mention that in order to obtain a certificate of occupancy the site will have to be brought closer into compliance with the zoning ordinance. The key words here are "closer into compliance." This would possibly suggest that full compliance may not be required to allow for a better situation than the current one.
 - Mr. Krestel stated that improvements being responsibly proposed include; and can be pointed out on the power point, a redesigned drive approach to meet the city and county zoning standards for truck traffic providing safer entry and exit, additional paved traffic areas in-lieu of existing gravel to minimize dust and mud, a fire hydrant located on the site, a designated fire lane and organized tractor/trailer parking that will provide dedicated truck and emergency vehicle turning space. The

organized parking will greatly improve the appearance of the site over the haphazard current arrangement.

- Mr. Krestel noted that there is a 50-foot landscape buffer along the residential districts to the north and west that are proposed and along the street frontage. The landscape buffer includes plantings on the 4-ft. high berm. No new site lighting is proposed at this time only the current building flood lights are to remain. Proper site design and grading are needed to provide for storm water and drainage which is currently non-existent and is planned. An offer to restrict the current crane storage apparatus to the 20 foot height limit is proposed. Construction of a city sidewalk faces a number of challenges and they are looking for payment in-lieu of construction of the sidewalks.
- Mr. Krestel went on to inform the board members of the hours of operation. (8-5 Monday through Friday and 8-noon on Saturday, closed Sunday). They are offering an enclosed dumpster; one does not currently exist at this time. The owner will have to be aware of noise and odor restrictions. Also that all of the work is going to have to take place inside the existing structure. At this time no new structures are planned although they have identified a small area for future use which would work in conjunction with both the site plan and the parking arrangements that we have proposed.
- Mr. Krestel pointed out some of the site plan features on the power point presentation.

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

Chairperson Freitag opened the public portion of the meeting for anyone wishing to speak to please come forward.

Kimberly Tomblin, 27773 New Castle, Romulus, MI 48174 stepped forward to speak to the Planning Commission

- Mrs. Tomblin stated that the proposed business butts to the rear of her property. She has lived in Romulus for 22 years and has seen the amount of dirt on the other side of the fence go from being level to 3-4 feet high. She has about an acre of property and when a good rain drops her garage becomes flooded. She is not sure if it's runoff but, this is a very big concern of hers. She is unaware of who is responsible for the flooding.
- Mrs. Tomblin noted that when the trucks come in at night that the headlights shine through the house. She mentioned that the petitioners have cleaned up the property and it is a great improvement to what they have seen in the past.

Ibri Shehn, Edge Financial Group, 6349 Beverly, Romulus, MI 48174 stepped forward to speak to the Planning Commission.

- Mr. Shehn explained that the petitioner's property has been a mess and there has been trucking operations and repair done there and it has been for sale for a long time. Two years ago Edge Financial Group made an offer on this property with a complete rebuild project and the first thing that the seller and the agent warns you is to check with the City of Romulus on the zoning restrictions, which he says he did. He claims that when they looked at this particular property and a few others, Romulus kind of turned them around; the approach was that there are plenty of M-T zoned parcels or buildings that are still for sale and suggested that we look into those, so that is what he did.
- Mr. Shehn stated that they improved another parcel, which is not far from this property, and his budget sky rocketed almost 4 times as much as this property would have cost him including

improvements. If he had known it was that easy to get the zoning changed we would have purchased it.

- Mr. Shehn stated that beside the opportunities that were missed there he doesn't think that the zoning should be changed for this property and he doesn't think that truck operations should be allowed there. It is dangerous when trucks leave the property. He drives this street 2-3 times per day and to get out of this parcel you can only make a right turn. To get into the property you have to come Inkster to Ecorse and none of the truck drivers that go in there respect.
- Mr. Shehn commented that as far as the site and all of the design and lay out for M&M Express Trucking was considered, if it was as easy as that then we will have to recheck a few things with the City of Romulus on a few other projects if this site will be allowed.

Chairperson Freitag asked if there was anyone else who wishes to speak to please come forward. Seeing no one Chairperson Freitag closed the public speaking portion of the meeting and opened it for comments and questions from the commissioners.

- Mr. McAnally reminded Mr. Shehn that the Planning Commission has not approved anything at this point so, to say that if this was so easy; we haven't done anything yet.
- Mr. Shehn stated that everyone in the trucking industry loves that parcel. These are not the first buyers that have approached that parcel in the last 4 years. Two years ago we approached and the owner of that parcel said to check with zoning, M-1 is not allowed. So, just because the parcel has been purchased that should be no excuse for relooking at the zoning because we're stuck with it right now, instead of doing their due diligence beforehand and knowing that M-1 is not allowed for trucking.
- Mr. Shehn commented that if it is in the city's master plan for the next 20 years, then yeah, that's fine. The next 20 years but, in the short round the opportunity cost going into an M-1 building versus going into an M-T area for us has been catastrophic so far. I just wanted to point that out. I know it's not been approved, this hearing is to get it approved.
- Mr. Shehn stated that trucking has been going on there for a very long time and that's what attracts every buyer.
- Mr. Shehn suggested that the petitioners are under the impression that it might be allowed.
- Mr. Krestel reiterated that although they do not have an approval here they are looking for comments and that it hasn't been easy to get to this point. There have been a lot of meetings and discussions with the help of Carol and her staff, as well as the consultants on how to plan this. When we found out it was a problem we knew we were going to have tackle it. The owners were willing to give it a try and it has not been easy and it will be an improvement to the property. We appreciate Mr. Shehn's comments and the Tomblin's as well. We had a chance to speak before the meeting and we were aware of what was going to be said. Duly noted but, as I indicated earlier there have not been any approvals for this site and we are now going through it the proper way. The drainage has to be maintained on-site, it has to go through a system and end up in a detention pond.
- Mr. Krestel noted that this is expensive and neighbors normally wouldn't care about that but, there are things that have to be done in order to get approved. This will be an improvement for the site and the abutting neighbors, as I'm sure they will attest to, if that flooding were to stop I'm sure the neighbors will greatly appreciate it.
- Mr. Krestel stated that the headlights are a good point and if it is creating a problem they will address this concern in a reasonable way.
- Ms. Freitag asked Mr. Krestel if the hours of operation are 8-5 why are there trucks coming in all night. Are these to be left there for repair?

- Mr. Krestel replied no.
- Ms. Freitag commented that what Mrs. Tomblin was alluding to was that trucks are coming in at night.
- Mrs. Tomblin stated that there have been trucks that come in at night occasionally. When the trucks do come into the property the lights come right through my house.
- Mr. Krestel asked Mrs. Tomblin if it was recently or could it have maybe been the previous owner.
- Mr. Alhussaini stated that they purchased the property in June and that they did not come in and clean the site until November. There is a mechanic shop there that has been existent for years and there are trucks coming in and out but, it is not us. This is something that was done by the previous owner, he has a lease with these mechanics until June of 2016. These are his trucks coming in and out and I can't stop them.
- Ms. Freitag asked Mr. Alhussaini if after the contract ends in June if there will be trucks in and out of the property.
- Mrs. Tomblin stated that she doesn't know who it is but, that there is a problem with the lights.
- Mr. Alhussaini stated that they could put a wall up to avoid the lights shinning into Mrs. Tomblin's house. They are trying to improve the site and it has been this way since 1995.
- Mr. Krestel stated that the petitioners are willing to do the improvements.
- Mr. Alhussaini asked who Mr. Shehn was and where his location was.
- Ms. Maise replied to Mr. Alhussaini that Mr. Shehn was the business across the street, down a little ways and under construction, Lindi Transportation, and asked Mr. Shehn if his sign was up.
- Mr. Alhussaini stated that he wasn't sure how his operation has affected Mr. Shehn.
- Mr. Shehn stated that it has affected him in the way that he tried to purchase the property 2 years ago and was warned to take a look at something else.
- Ms. Freitag explained to Mr. Shehn that he and Mr. Alhussaini can have that discussion after the meeting, it was not appropriate to have that discussion now.
- Mr. Shehn stated that his discussion was with Romulus after all and congratulated Mr. Alhussaini on his parcel. Mr. Shehn went on to discuss his feelings on the matter without coming to the commission for permission to speak.
- Ms. Freitag reminded Mr. Shehn and Mr. Alhussaini that their conversation could be discussed after the meeting.
- Mr. Alhussaini asked Ms. Freitag to explain what it was that Mr. Shehn had a problem with so that he may try to correct it.
- Ms. Freitag stated to that she believed that Mr. Shehn is upset because he tried to purchase this property and was not allowed to get the zoning.
- Mr. Alhussaini asked Ms. Freitag again what that had to do with his operation.

Chairperson Freitag was forced to use her gavel and asked Mr. Shehn and Mr. Alhussaini to stop speaking out of turn and without permission. Chairperson Freitag also explained that there was a forum that needed to be adhered to and that if Mr. Shehn and Mr. Alhussaini wished to discuss this matter further they could also set up a meeting with the City Planner.

- Mr. Krestel stated to Ms. Freitag that what Mr. Alhussaini was trying to find out was if Mr. Shehn's property border Mr. Alhussaini's property.
- Ms. Maise replied no.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he has known this property for 60 years, it used to be a contractors yard. It was a mess and this is going to be an improvement by a thousand percent.

- Mr. Zilka also stated that he believes that what Mr. Alhussaini wants to do will help the whole neighborhood with what is shown on the plans.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked Ms. Maise if they are going to table this request until we get some plans in front of us.
- Ms. Maise replied yes. The recommendation is that the commissioners can certainly take action on this tonight but, the piece that is missing is the zoning agreement. As part of this, M&M Express Trucking are offering up some conditions and those all have to be enumerated in a document.
- Ms. Maise stated that she is suspecting there will be things in the document as was described what they are offering. There may likely be time periods put on the improvements, restrictions pertaining to change of ownership, all sorts of things like that we will work on with the attorneys. I understand that will start tomorrow.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he has a concern with the neighbor and that he would like to see some plans in front of him and maybe some pipe down the west side of the property.
- Ms. Maise noted that they do have plans here that are the start and the hope was that tonight we would get some of these comments out so that the petitioners could go back and address some of the drainage issues.
- Ms. Freitag clarified that in order to approve the site plan they would need to have what the conditions are of the rezoning.
- Mr. Krestel asked the commissioners if they had a full set of drawings because they have some site engineering drawings.
- Ms. Freitag stated that they need the rezoning that is part of the site plan.
- Mr. Paul stated that he visited the site and met with a couple of the gentlemen there and they indicated that they had cleaned up the site quite a bit and I was glad to see that the neighbors are saying that they have.
- Mr. Paul agreed with Mr. Zilka that something needs to be done to improve the site.
- Mr. Paul noted that they have a storm sewer there but, he was unsure where the outlet is. The drawings say that they are plugged. Mr. Paul asked Mr. Krestel if they intend to use that system to get it into the underground storm sewer.
- Mr. Krestel replied that there will be a new system. Because the current system is plugged we don't know how they will run. If we discover that they can be used and approved by your city engineer, we may possibly but, it doesn't appear so.
- Mr. Paul stated that the commissioners would like to see on the next site plan is where the storm sewer is going to go and where it's going to pick-up. You have some asphalt here but, you have some gravel as well.
- Ms. Maise commented to Mr. Krestel that it might be best to put the site plan back up.
- Mr. Krestel stated that all of this was on the packet that we submitted. We had site engineering.
- Ms. Maise asked the commissioners to look at page S-01, storm and grading.
- Mr. Krestel apologized to Ms. Freitag for the interruption. He stated that he knew this was included in the packet.
- Mr. Paul and Mr. Glotfelty apologized to Mr. Krestel, it was an oversight.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Krestel if they have water and sewer on site. That does not show on the plans.
- Mr. Krestel stated that there is a topographical survey that would indicate water and sewer and that should be in your packet as well.
- Mr. Paul commented that he did not see that but, it was an easy fix.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Krestel if the retaining wall would remain.
- Mr. Krestel replied to Mr. Paul if he was referring to the L-shaped wall at the entrance, yes.

- Mr. Paul stated that when he visited the site he seen pavement but it was covered with dirt and asked if it will all be cleaned up and repaired as necessary.
- Mr. Krestel replied yes. Some of the pavement needs to be removed in order to get the grading to the storm drainage.
- Mr. Zilka asked Mr. and Mrs. Tomblin if the water was coming from this property or is it coming off of their own.
- Mr. Tomblin replied that this property sits about 3 feet higher than their property. Mr. Alhussaini is talking about putting a 4 foot wall there. Well, a trucks lights are about 4 feet off the ground and then when you add that their property is about 3 feet higher than mine that is not going to do anything for me. I would think that there should be a masonry wall there.
- Mr. Zilka asked Mr. Tomblin how long the adjacent property has been 3 feet higher than theirs.
- Mr. Tomblin replied that he has been there for 21 years or so.
- Mr. Zilka asked Mr. Tomblin if the property has been this way that long.
- Mr. Tomblin replied yes.
- Mr. Zilka stated that was all he wanted to know.
- Ms. Maise asked Mr. Tomblin if this was a pre-existing condition and asked if this was something that didn't just happen.
- Mr. Tomblin agreed that it was a pre-existing condition.
- Mr. Tomblin stated that was sure that he gets some run-off water from the adjacent property because some of the water looks oily.
- Ms. Maise asked Mr. Tomblin if there has been any regrading done lately.
- Mr. Tomblin relied that there has never been any grading done.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Mr. Krestel if there was a way to investigate if whether the run-off was coming from this property and if so, will the drainage system will resolve the issue. Is this a part of the plan?
- Mr. Krestel stated that it was part of the plan.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Mr. Krestel if that will be presented to the Planning Commission next month.
- Mr. Krestel replied that it is indicated on the plans and they will try to make it a little clearer and more identifiable but, it will also be a requirement of the city's consulting engineer's approval of the project.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked if there will be a guarantee that this will resolve the Tomblin's issue with run-off because she needs a guarantee in order for her to vote.
- Mr. Krestel noted that it will be designed properly and according to city standards and that would include retaining storm run-off on site.
- Ms. Freitag commented that other than the storm run-off, if the Tomblin's property is lower 3 feet lower than this they are always going to have flooding issue.
- Mr. Krestel suggested that there is an opportunity along the landscape berms along the property lines to create a swale to divert the water and we will check into that. We have done some work on this already and we will make it clearer for the Planning Commission.
- Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise that knowing what work we have yet to clear up, are we looking to try for next month or are we looking beyond?
- Ms. Maise stated that it was a good question and that it would benefit the rest of the commissioners to know about the conversations that she and Mr. McAnally had about the difference between a tabling and a postponement. These words are used interchangeably and we tend to use tabling more than postpone. If the intent is to have the petitioner back at a specific time, say the next meeting, it

would be appropriate to postpone the decision until the next meeting. If the return timetable is unknown, tabling the decision is better.

- Ms. Maise asked the applicant if 30 days was enough time and they responded that it was.
- Mr. Alhussaini stated that it was unfortunate that his attorney and architect have not done a conditional rezoning before so, he had to have his attorney get help from another attorney who was the Mayor of Novi who has a law firm in Farmington Hills and we are all meeting tomorrow at 4:30 to draft the rezoning agreement. He was unsure how long this process will take.
- Ms. Maise asked Mr. Alhussaini if they wish to be back on the agenda for May.
- Mr. Alhussaini replied yes.
- Mr. Alhussaini asked Ms. Maise in her experience if she knew how long it takes to draft a rezoning agreement.
- Ms. Maise stated that she believes it can be moved along to get M&M Express Trucking back on the May agenda since both attorney's know each other.
- Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise if for some reason it doesn't happen, they can postpone.
- Ms. Maise replied yes and that when the agreement come back the commissioners will have to read and make sure you are comfortable with some of the conditions. There will be something for you to respond to in addition to some of the comments that came out tonight on their site plan.
- Mr. Paul commented that after looking at the site plan again (page S-01) he sees some topographicals and asked Mr. Krestel if those will be the final survey. There is going to be a lot of area here and you suggested that there may be some kind of a swale. There doesn't appear to be a lot of topographicals on this site plan.
- Mr. Krestel replied that if Mr. Paul looked closely, some may be small but, there are numbers indicated on a diagonal line of all the grades.
- Mr. Paul noted that he seen them from 605 to 634.
- Mr. Krestel stated that the numbers indicate the new grading. He was suggesting here tonight that because of the water along the property line that we can incorporate more shots and identify a swale to eliminate the problem.
- Mr. Paul suggested to Mr. Krestel that if the property is 3 feet higher than the neighbor's property, it could be part of the berm once the water is away from that area.
- Mr. Krestel replied that Mr. Paul was correct.
- Mr. Paul commented to Mr. Krestel that they both are on the same page.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison noted that in the commissioner's packets it was indicated that there were some unpaid taxes. She asked Ms. Maise if the unpaid taxes were addressed.
- Ms. Maise replied that they have been taken care of. What was in the packets was an older report from the city assessor.
- Mr. Frederick commented that to improve the entryway to this property would be a good step in the right direction. To address any issues going off the north side of the property to the neighbors is also a good step in the right direction.
- Mr. Frederick thanked the petitioners for those improvements to be addressed so far. We just want to be encouraging, not discouraging.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to postpone RZ-2016-001/SPR-2016-003; M&M Express Trucking until next month's regular Planning Commission meeting to be held on May 16, 2016.

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

B. PC-2016-002; Zoning Ordinance Amendments – **Sidewalks and Nonconforming Sites**

Chairperson Freitag opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. She asked if there is anyone who wishes to speak on this matter please come forward. Seeing no one, Chairperson Freitag closed that portion of the meeting and opened it up for comments and questions from the commissioners.

- Ms. Maise stated that the sidewalks are addressed in 2 sections of the zoning ordinance; Section 13.04 includes the technical regulations including when they have to be put in, and where and how they have to be designed.
- She mentioned to the Commissioner's that the various colors in the draft result from the track change tool and they really do have not meaning except it indicates that the changes were done at different times. There were no content changes to this section and the green and purple portions were just taken from other sections of the zoning ordinance. She noted that the significant changes come under Section 20.09, which is the non-conforming section.
- With regard to sidewalk requirements, Ms. Maise used M&M Express Trucking as an example. There are no existing sidewalks and therefore per ordinance requirements, based on their proposed reoccupancy and improvements, they currently are required to be installed or payment in-lieu of construction provided.
- She noted that the Zoning Ordinance and Code of Ordinances had different requirements and consistency is needed. The requirements and process for approval conflict and these amendments will clean that up along with a little bit of reformatting by taking sections of the ordinance and moving them together so that it is all clear.
- Ms. Maise noted that when new construction is being done, new sidewalks are being put in the full length of the property or payment in-lieu of construction is provided. The Zoning Ordinance and Code of Ordinances are inconsistent as to the requirements if someone is expanding, doing a parking lot addition, or a building addition with regard to what level of compliance is required. The city attorney advised that we need to be reasonable and proposed that if a building and/or parking is expanded by more than 50%, then sidewalk compliance is required in an amount proportionate to the increase. If a business is doing an expansion, whether it be a parking lot expansion, pavement expansion, or a building expansion or a combination of the 2, and it's more than 50% of the existing, then full compliance is mandatory with the sidewalk across the front of the property. If less than 50% expansion is proposed, then sidewalks must be provided proportionally based on the amount of building or parking expansion. The attorney feels this is much more legally defensible.
- Ms. Maise went on to discuss nonconforming parking and storage and noted that what is in the ordinance right now is difficult to understand because it was written in one long sentence. The modifications to this section are just a reformatting changes. It was a bit unclear when screening was required. The ordinance currently says that dumpster screening is required as part of any improvements including a reoccupancy. If a site abuts residential or if the outdoor storage was not previously approved, screening is required. These are current standards however the amendments are just reformatting to make it a little easier to read.
- Ms. Maise stated that the nonconforming landscaping section is confusing and difficult to interpret. Modifications are proposed for standards similar to the sidewalk requirements which require upgrades based on the extent of improvement being proposed.
- Ms. Maise went on to number 8, Building Materials and noted that a reference to another section of the ordinance was included.
- Ms. Maise commented that for the most part the proposed amendments are a clean-up and reformatting while it looks extensive, for the most part it is bringing sections in from the Code of Ordinance and making the regulations consistent. Content changes to the sidewalk requirements

were made so that the regulations are legally reasonable and proportionate to the level of improvement that is going on.

Motion by Paul supported by Glotfelty to recommend to City Council approval for **PC-2016-002; Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Sidewalks and Nonconforming Sites.**

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

C. PC-2016-003; Zoning Ordinance Amendments – **Uses Requiring Site Plan Approval**

- Ms. Maise noted that these amendments are needed based on other amendments, particularly revisions made to the Zoning Ordinance last year regarding uses in the Industrial Districts and temporary uses.
- Recent amendments to the animal and agricultural uses have also been addressed in this table.

Chairperson Freitag opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. She asked if there is anyone who wishes to speak on this matter please come forward. Seeing no one, Chairperson Freitag closed that portion of the meeting and opened it up for comments and questions from the commissioners.

- Mr. Paul asked Ms. Maise if on page 3, the change in land to be more intensive use and goes on to explain that the Planning Director and Building and Safety determines, evidentially, what is too intensive and what is not. He asked Ms. Maise to describe what was too intensive because otherwise it is done by ARC instead of the Planning Commission.
- Ms. Maise replied that typically they use traffic and parking, where there are some actual numbers that they can go to, that being the ITE Manual that gives traffic generation numbers. An example is a retail use changing to a restaurant; a restaurant generates more traffic so that would be a change in use to something more intense and therefore an ARC review would be required.
- Ms. Maise informed the commissioners about PZE, which is software the Building and Planning Departments are using for reoccupancies. This is an opportunity to look at the change in uses. If outdoor storage is being added for example, there are requirements in the ordinance that have to be adhered to.
- Mr. Paul commented that he knows it hadn't changed that much and he double checked with the zoning ordinance, it's the same thing but, he just didn't know about it before.
- Ms. Maise stated that in some communities and ordinances that she has worked with in the past, every change in use goes to the Planning Commission and that is where it gets tricky as to what more intense means. Applicants will argue that it's really not a change in use.

Motion by McAnally supported by Zilka to recommend to City Council for approval for PC-2016-003; **Zoning Ordinance Amendment - Uses Requiring Site Plan Approval.**

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

A. Master Plan of Land Use Update. Chapter 4, Transportation and Chapter 6 Design

- Ms. Maise reminded the Planning Commission that last month the notices of Intent were sent out and now we are starting to see some drafts come in. LSL Consulting is actually putting

these drafts together, as you know. They are reformatting the sections and amending them. I was glad to see that we had 2 sections to show the difference in what the existing Master Plan looks like and what the new formatting is. They are reformatting it and amending and some areas you will see changes and in other areas you won't. They write them, we review the; Tim Keyes is involved and our DDA Director, Maria Lambert is helping with the downtown area section. This is really an LSL driven thing and we are helping where needed.

- Ms. Maise stated that the hope is to get a completed draft to the Planning Commission by May, this will need to be noticed as well.
- Kathleen Duffy from LSL Consulting will possibly be attending next month to go through all of this with you.
- Ms. Maise also suggested that, in an effort to save time and money, for the commissioners to go over the changes and if they have any questions or mark-ups she can take those to Ms. Duffy.
- Ms. Maise noted that the reason for choosing the transportation section was, as they may remember, Brad Strader, who was very involved in transportation and was sort of his forte' and we are fortunate to have him very involved in this section. This section was reformatted and has his edits in it.
- Ms. Maise went on to chapter 6, this is exactly what is there now. There is a design change, not really and rights and wrongs, we were looking for the commissioner's opinions to see if what was approved in 2009 was still valid or if there were any new ideas.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he was looking at the draft for the transportation plan and city roads. The section that caught his eye right away was item #11, it states: reconstruct Inkster Road to class A standards. Inkster Road is currently a class B road from Goddard Road south. They've brought it down to Eureka Road and they stopped. That road is literally crumbling and falling apart; it's an enforcement issue. If they are going to bring it to Class A standards, they may as well bring it down to our city border; which would be Pennsylvania Rd.
- Ms. Maise noted the request from Mr. Glotfelty.
- Ms. Maise informed the commissioners that she had a meeting one afternoon with Marcus McNamara from OHM and others and went through all of the old stuff and this section is probably the one section that has been looked at the closest.
- Mr. Paul suggested that it was probably the most expensive too.
- Mr. Paul asked Ms. Maise about the design standards for the business and central city sub areas on pages 6 and 7 and asked for clarification on the central city's sub-area.
- Ms. Maise stated that it was in another article and it's a reference that is probably going to be changed. The central city was the downtown area and broken into a couple of different areas and those are the kind of things that will get amended. Metro World Center is another sub area that is now referred to as the Vining Road Development District. These sub areas will require input from the commissioners. These are the areas that I definitely would like to have the consultants here for, I want them to hear your comments so that we can incorporate them and get it right.
- Ms. Maise suggested that if the commissioner wanted to take their time going over these, mark them up and email her with concerns or comments or come in and sit down and go over any of these to please do so, that would be great. We are making some big headway with it now.
- Mr. McAnally inquired about airport enhancements on Section 6-14 and asked if the commissioners will know ahead of time of projects since they usually find out after they have been done.

- Ms. Maise replied that she hopes to. In the implementation section, the last section of a plan; where it gives you some of the strategies and she believed it was pretty clear about communication and coordination with the airport.
- Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise if she was getting this from the airport.
- Ms. Maise replied that she does and that Tim Keyes is in constant communication with the airport.
- Mr. Paul asked Ms. Maise if correct and that once adopted, the section in particular on page 6:8, that refers to where we are going to try to get people to move closer to the road and put the parking on the side means that we are going to have to change one of our ordinances if this kind of thing goes through. People aren't going to want to walk from the back to go into a business.
- Ms. Maise replied that it was intended for the downtown area and that it is a guide when looking at a redevelopment area.
- Ms. Freitag asked Ms. Maise if this section was referring to the downtown area.
- Ms. Maise replied it was and the least intense district. The idea was to keep the cars and the parking off the streets to keep a nice streetscape since this blends right into the neighborhood.

8. New Business – None.

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

- Mr. Zilka stated that it looks like Block's will be opening this weekend.

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

B. City Planner

1. Planning Department Status Report –

- Ms. Maise noted that there will be a meeting next month that will involve a gas station at the old Clark Gas Station on Middlebelt and Goddard and possibility a special land use for an unauthorized occupancy. She gave a report on the status of the Master Plan
- Mr. Zilka asked if there were any new developments on the Outlets of Michigan. Ms. Maise replied that she believed that they were waiting to get more tenants to meet their threshold.

11. Reports on Interest Designation

- Ms. Roscoe also announced that yard waste pick-up has started. Next week the city will be looking for volunteers for the annual city-wide clean-up. The DPW will hold a free city-wide dumping and tire take back days April 28th, - April 30th and the city-wide garage sales will be from Thursday, May 19th – Sunday, May 22nd.
- Mr. Frederick stated that he wasn't sure of the details but, Wayne County will have a hazardous waste collection at Huron High School.
- Mr. McAnally stated that the hazardous waste collection will be from 8:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. on Saturday, April 23rd, 2016.

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Paul, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, Zilka & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

cw

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Prybyla", written over a horizontal line.

Michael Prybyla, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission