

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING
COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Freitag at 4:30 p.m.
2. Roll Call Showing: Jerry Frederick, Mike Glotfelty, Daniel McAnally, Edna Talon-Jemison, Dave Paul, Melvin Zilka and Cathy Freitag

Arriving late: Celeste Roscoe and Jessica Workman

Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner; Brad Strader, MKSK Studios; Jessica Katers, OHM Advisors; and Christina Wilson, Planning Secretary

-
3. Motion by Paul supported by Glotfelty to approve the agenda as presented.

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

Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Planning Commission Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. New Business – Master Plan Amendment – **Vining Road Development District** and Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – **Vining Road Development District Overlay**
 - A. MKSK and OHM Presentation
 1. Draft Master Plan Future Land Use Map and Text
 2. Future Land Use Plan Compared to Zoning Text Amendments
 3. Vining Road Development District Goals/Vining Road Development Sub Districts
 4. Vining Road Development District Site Elements
 5. Vining Road Development District Architectural
 6. Planning Commission Discussion and Direction
 - B. Public Comment
 - C. Planning Commission Direction and Determination of Next Steps
5. Adjournment
4. New Business
 - A. MKSK and OHM Presentation
 - Brad Strader, MKSK, stated that this was the third meeting on this matter and that he and Jessica Katers, OHM will go through their presentation and see where everyone is at. He introduced Ann Marie Kerby, MKSK, new employee from Cincinnati. She has zoning ordinance, zoning administration and neighborhood plan experience with the City of Cincinnati.

- Mr. Strader commented that he wanted to do a quick recap. He stated that there were a couple meetings with the Planning Commission on the concept of changing the master and zoning of the Vining Road area. There was a joint meeting with the City Council where much of the presentation was on the market study that was done by the firm out of Indianapolis which talked about the changes in the market. The Planning Commission and Council were then asked to give some direction so draft text, maps and graphics for a master plan amendment and a zoning ordinance text amendment have been prepared. As they were putting things together they realized that they need to have an understanding of the direction and details from the commissioners so that they can proceed.
- Mr. Strader noted that this meeting is set up as a working session, a draft plan and a draft ordinance to feedback so that they can revise it. The master plan will be going through an amendment, which would require a public hearing. If the zoning ordinance moves forward it would also require a public hearing. Because the plan is a guide in the long range, the ordinance is what we can do today. Rather than going through all of the planned text and the ordinance text, they've put this together by topic. So, when they talk about land uses in the plan they will talk about what that means in the zoning ordinance. When they talk about landscaping, they will talk about what that means in terms of the ordinance. They will go topic by topic, rather than all plan and ordinance.
- Mr. Strader presented a PowerPoint presentation to the commissioners. He pointed out that the Vining Road District has been vacant for a long time and planned for Regional Commercial. There have been proposals over the years and the most recent one is Amazon, which is currently under construction. It went through a conditional rezoning. There was also Medline, however the site plan didn't meet the Planning Commissions expectations in terms of landscaping, building materials, building color, architecture and so forth. Medline withdrew their application and there was some discussion that while something like that may be appropriate in part of this area, there needs to be good standards before we would consider it, rather than a conditional rezoning process, which is very open-ended and dependent upon it. He explained the map as follows:
 - Master Plan Update
 - The area planned Regional Commercial has largely remained vacant
 - A variety of factors have prevented development of major commercial centers of the type envisioned by the City
 - Allow some additional land uses in specific parts of the overall Vining Road Sub-Area
 - The intent is to accommodate some lower intensity industrial users that can provide a spark to jump-start development of the remainder of the Sub-Area
 - Defines and encourages the Vining Road Sub-Area as a "campus" district
 - Additional industrial land uses may be considered
 - Standards for lakefront properties
 - Specific standards for building architecture and landscaping
 - Include pedestrian and bike pathways
 - Sets expectations for site development standards through imagery
 - Need to exclude industrial along Wayne Road frontage
 - Vining Road Overlay District: Purpose
 - Implement recommendations of the City of Romulus Master Plan

- Provide opportunity for Regional Commercial uses in a more concentrated area north of the I-94 interchange and around the lake
 - Accommodate some of the current market demand for advanced manufacturing, warehousing and logistical uses
 - Provide a higher standard for open space, landscaping and building design along public streets
 - Provide standards to ensure that arrangements and design for various uses result in complimentary mixture of uses in a campus-like setting
 - Limit truck traffic volumes and direct trucks to I-94 interchange and not travel through nearby residential and commercial areas
 - Provide amenities for employees, visitors and residents including open space, pedestrian pathways and landscaping in campus-like setting
 - To provide employment opportunities, especially for residents of Romulus
 - Provide tax base to provide a return on the infrastructure investment made by the State of Michigan, City of Romulus and the Tax Increment Finance Authority
- Mr. Strader explained that the intent is to allow some types of industrial on the east side of Vining Road with Amazon being the most intense and working down to less intense, keeping a significant amount of Regional Commercial around the interchange area. On the west side of Vining Road, a mix of uses of lighter intensity than the east side of Vining which could potentially include some residential could be considered. Along Wayne Road the Master Plan updated map shows mixed use, which is the current plan and he believes that it would have to be tweaked because the direction has always been for many years that the eastern side of Wayne Road would be different types of residential. So, it wouldn't be endorsing any types of industrial.
 - Mr. Strader commented that he gave the commissioners a questionnaire in their packet to help guide them through the slides and with discussion at the end of the presentation.
 - Mr. Strader stated that they took the previously proposed sub-area plan and made some modifications to it. Medium intensity industrial is limited to the northeast portion. South of Smith Road will allow a light industrial campus which would not allow some of the more trucking oriented uses. The idea in all of these districts, we would not have truck sales and display, like some of the other areas within the city that have smaller buildings with lots of pavement and truck storage and vehicle storage. The direction that he has for the commissioners is that the use would not be allowed anywhere in any of these districts. There would be places in another part of the city for that type of use.
 - Mr. Strader noted that there was some unique things that they talked about at the last meeting that they put into the draft text including upgrades on landscape design and building architecture, special standards for setbacks, pathways along the lake, instead of sidewalks throughout the district, 10-ft. wide pathways for bikes and pedestrians and having some amenities along there. They are finding that in some of the better centers throughout the state that employees like to go out on their breaks and walk around and giving them places to walk to and having shade, so hence the term "campus". It wouldn't just be industrial uses since there would be more green and pathways with shade and maybe even some open space or a park to give them some place to walk. The general idea is that the long envisioned town center commercial aren't really being built anymore because the market is down. We still want to have some area for that however he wondered what other types of commercial can they accommodate and make it fit into the quality design as envisioned. So, the uses would change but the only way to allow any type of industrial is to raise the design standards so that

it would still be compatible. Regional commercial is wanted in the southern part of the development area.

- Mr. Strader stated that the Vining Road Overlay District restates all of the purposes based on the master plan. The reason that the purposes are important is when an applicant or a judge says “what are we trying to achieve here?”, the purpose sections of the district explain uses and also raise the design standards.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Strader to explain about tweaking the east side of Wayne Road because right now it is shown as mixed use.
- Mr. Strader referred to the map on the PowerPoint and noted that south of Ecorse and east of Wayne Rd., in the old plan that was mixed residential and it should be expanded further down Wayne Rd.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Strader if it was like a buffer.
- Mr. Strader replied yes.
- Mr. Strader compared the previous land use map and the future land use map and stated that if they change the strip on the east side of Wayne Rd. to mixed residential and explained how it would translate into zoning. The area east of Wayne Rd. is zoned regional center and we wouldn’t propose to change that area. Areas north of Smith Rd. around the interchange is currently zoned for hotels and that would stay regional commercial. Then there would be the 3 different campus districts: mixed use campus on the west side of Vining, medium industrial in the northeast and light industrial between Smith and Wick. When we change the land use map we would want to make a corresponding change to the zoning map.
- Mr. Strader went on to talk about the zoning in the sub-districts as follows:
 - Three Sub Districts
 - Mixed Use Campus – expand regional commercial uses to permit some lighter industrial types, designed in a campus-like setting with additional greenspace and buffering
 - Lots adjacent to the lake shall meet setback and other standards so that the lakefront location retains aesthetic appeal for all the lakefront lots
 - Light Industrial Campus – permit M-1 uses but, with special architectural and design standards to promote a campus setting. Any dock doors must be in the side or rear yard
 - Medium Industrial Campus – permits truck dock doors to face a road provided if there is additional setback and landscaping
- Mr. Strader noted that the reason that this was done was because the commissioners explained that they wanted to keep the option of regional commercial or if there is someone that wants to do a single family or the demand goes up we wouldn’t have to go back and rezone it again so everything that is allotted regional commercial would stay. The overlay would be an option for a developer by showing a master plan of their own of all the properties owned to show what the uses are going to be and how the roads would work and all of the open space. They would need to come up with a concept plan before their first site plan can be submitted so we would have a PDA/Master PDA of sorts. They would have to make sure that the storm water, utilities, and traffic works. The fortunate thing is that there are not a lot of different property owners out there and he believes that the city would get a pretty large concept plan and they can come in with this understanding and meet all of the standards or they can develop under the commercial zoning that is already in place. This gives a developer options if they so choose to pursue it.

- Mr. Strader continued discussion with the following:
 - Additional Land Uses in the Sub-Area
 - Mixed-use
 - Multi-family Residential
 - Regional Commercial
 - Offices
 - Hotels
 - Restaurant
 - Event Facilities
 - Recreation Facilities and open space
 - M-1 and M-2 Industrial
 - Medical Research and testing facilities
 - Advanced Manufacturing
 - Technology research and advanced manufacturing
 - Certain types of warehousing but without the large truck volumes or truck storage found in the cities more intense industrial areas
- Mr. Strader commented that one of the implications of industrial uses is trucks. He turned the meeting over to Jessica Katers to speak about changing the truck route to coincide with the land use map.
- Ms. Katers stated that she understands that the Vining Road extension is occurring this year and will be open and ready for business this year. This corridor was designed for truck traffic that requires no additional infrastructure improvements in order to allow truck traffic from Ecorse to access the I-94 interchange at Vining. She noted that Brad Strader will talk about additional landscaping that can occur on the Vining Road corridor. This is the only change that OHM has proposed to the truck route map.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that the firm that created the truck route map showed it as a Class A road on the map when it is not. He's ok with it.
- Mr. Strader commented that Steve Dearing, OHM Traffic Engineer, drew up a chart to show the truck volumes by land use and presented it on the screen as part of the presentation. He noted that the commissioners asked in the previous meeting what uses would generate the most truck traffic so that some standards could be put in place on these uses or they could be prohibited altogether. He stated that a lot of the trucks come from uses with a small building and a lot of pavement so they've already not allowed that. He then summarized the chart with the commissioners. He noted that written into the district, like for the more intense uses in the current ordinance, they would be required to do a traffic impact study. To clarify, because trucking is the focus of a lot of the discussion, information on the truck volumes and the types of trucks, peak hours of truck deliveries will need to be provided. This could include a case study of a similar development to show that truck traffic won't have a negative impact. They will need to describe the operations in relation to the median crossovers. These are some additional things that the ordinance is set up for besides a traffic impact study.
- Mr. Strader continued the presentation with the following:
 - Building and Site Design
 - Guidelines in plan, standards in overlay
 - Building Façade
 - Length

- Height
 - Façade Materials
 - Patterns and Textures
 - Glass
 - Overhead Doors/Storage vs. Screening
 - Building Landscape Buffer
- Ms. Katers commented that these are some of the things that OHM looked at and they could ask for in the overlay district in order to get a higher standard of architecture. The guidelines are in the plan and in the overlay ordinance. She noted that with the building façade, depending on how long the building is, starting at 100-ft., there are additional requirements in regards to the materials shift that would be required of the façade. She explained that if you had a 40-ft. tall building and it was 100-ft. long you would have to have a shift in materials every 60-feet depending on what section of the overlay you were in. She noted that this is not arbitrary but rather they did speak to developers and they believe that it is a reasonable standard. She noted also that there would need to be a shift in materials in height, up to 3 material types for up to 35-feet and 5 material types would be required if over 35-feet. Depending on the height of the building an indentation or a push out would also be required. There is also a requirement for glass on the front of the building to give it texture and so the occupants can see the landscaping. There are also types of screening that would be placed into the ordinance for these districts along with a landscape buffer between the building and the concrete.
- Ms. Katers showed examples in a PowerPoint presentation.
- Mr. Strader commented that the idea was that the plan and ordinance will work in tandem. Based on the discussion had at previous meetings, Ms. Katers and other architects came up with some images and others that will be put in the draft plan. Photos are not typical in the ordinance but they can be placed in the design plan.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he likes what he sees but he's not crazy about some of the poured concrete panels. He realizes that it is the way of the future but he's just not happy with the way that some of them have turned out. He appreciates the breakup of materials presented by Ms. Katers and Mr. Strader.
- Ms. Katers stated that aesthetics can be added to the concrete panels to dress them up. The ordinance requires a depth change and there can't be a long concrete panel.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he wishes the commissioners would have done a little more homework on this because the city does currently have some recent buildings with just concrete panels and no depth or breakup of materials.
- Ms. Katers asked the commissioners for comments and feedback on the presentation/pictures.
- Mr. Strader stated that these would be that standards for this district and the idea is that it will allow some additional uses. He then went back through the site designs in the sub-area.
 - Building and Site Design in the Sub-Area
 - Decorative and pedestrian lighting should be implemented throughout
 - Buildings should be neutral in color and use patterns and textures to avoid monotonous facades
 - Surface parking should be screened from view along the roadways through the use of trees, shrubs, hedges and berms

- Low-impact storm water design
 - Overhead doors or loading areas should not be visible from the street or residential area
 - Open space and pedestrian connectivity should be encouraged within the site to promote a campus atmosphere
-
- Mr. Strader mentioned that the lakefront area was talked about at the last meeting and standards were added to include a pathway and a building setback long the lake with open area. He understands that the commissioners would rather have a building on the lake rather than a lot of pavement. Therefore, the building setback would be greater to keep the pavement farther away from the lake. The concept is that there will be a deep setback for parking. They do have an allowance if you are on the lakefront you can reduce your setbacks on the non-lakefront side. Open space and connections all along the lake, and open space for employees and residents is desired. There would also be public and private parking as well.
 - Mr. McAnally was concerned about tenants putting a dock or gazebo up on the water and wondered how it would be addressed.
 - Mr. Strader commented that zoning is regulated for water as well in Michigan and although they did not place that in the ordinance they can address it and add something into the plan and ordinance for that.
 - Ms. Katers stated that she will look up the ownership of the properties on the lake to see if the property line stops at the lake.
 - Mr. McAnally commented that if they get something in writing they can address it beforehand.
 - Mr. Strader noted that the previous PDA, Metro World Center had something similar in their PDA agreement and he will look into that.
 - Mr. McAnally commented that his concern is that they don't want anyone pumping grey water out into the lake.
 - Ms. Katers commented that they have talked about collaborative storm water management. They would have pre-treatment prior to anything coming out into the lake.
 - Mr. Strader discussed standards for the RC, M-1 and M-2 districts. He noted that the RC standards would remain the same. He commented that in keeping with the idea of a campus setting, the draft language they have come up allows less impervious surface coverage within the campus district which means smaller buildings and parking footprints than what is allowed in the current M-1, M-2 and M-T districts. He discussed the heights and setbacks for the overlay district.
 - Mr. Strader went on to discuss the 10-foot wide pedestrian bike trail/pathways and the standards and supporting language for the plan proposed.
 - Mr. Strader wrapped up the presentation commenting that there will be higher standards for landscaping in this district particularly along the lake edge, pathways, and road frontages and buildings. He showed the commissioners illustrations that would go into the plan and ordinance standards. He asked the commissioners to give him some feedback on things they would like to see changed.
 - Mr. Paul asked Mr. Strader what the vision is for the lake. He wondered if there would be a beach. He believes that it is currently under one ownership.
 - Ms. Katers acknowledged that it is under one ownership. She explained that the applicant would need to go through the DEQ in order to have a beach.

- Mr. Paul mentioned that he has heard that divers have seen an old car at the bottom of the lake.
- Ms. Katers commented that they are not looking for it to be a recreational lake, more of a visual for the pathways.
- Mr. Strader commented that there would be some FAA guidelines that would come into play and because of the birds, the FAA was at one point looking to place a screen of some kind over the lake.
- Mr. Glotfelty expressed concern about the quality of the trees in the area. He would like to see the trees preserved in the district.
- Mr. Strader asked the commissioners to turn their surveys in by the end of the week so that they know how to proceed.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Strader to explain what uses qualify as advanced manufacturing.
- Mr. Strader asked Mr. Keyes to explain.
- Mr. Keyes stated that manufacturing today is a lot different than it was back when Powertrain for example, first came to Romulus. He would now call the Powertrain plant, with their 6 million dollar investment, advanced manufacturing. It's less manual labor and more computer and robotic controlled and a lot cleaner environment.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Mr. Strader to explain vehicle traffic versus truck traffic. She noted that with a movie theatre she couldn't see trucks there but with warehousing or light industrial development, there is that possibility. She would like to see the difference in what the traffic would be like.
- Mr. Strader commented that Steve Dearing was working on that information however the transportation manuals typically used note that there is more research needed. This is why it would be required that the applicant provide their own traffic study. He will continue to look for data for the commissioners. He did mention that Amazon and Medline provided an estimate of trucks per day and it may be helpful to include that in the study.
- Ms. Workman commented that she likes changing up the architectural features of the buildings.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he likes the presentation as a whole and he's happy about the direction that they are taking.
- Mr. Frederick commented that he feels like maybe there should be an established tree line in the setbacks between parcels rather than mowable grass. This would help break it up from the residents while still moving forward.
- Mr. Strader agreed and commented that a dilemma they have is if there are going to be future hotels, no matter what is done they could be looking down on industrial development and trucks. So even though there are setbacks, the hardwoods would provide long-term and better screening.
- Mr. Frederick suggested that companies leave green ways and be required to plant trees.
- Mr. Strader commented that going back to the traffic issue, he suggested that they can add medium, high and low truck generation and maybe add to the chart some things that they are not going to allow so that the City Council can see that while we are allowing some industrial uses, we are not allowing some of the major uses that generate a lot of truck traffic.
- Mr. Frederick noted that Worthington Steel, off of Allen Road near Breast, is not even visible from the road because of the established hardwoods. You wouldn't know it was there. This is just an example of what development could look like with the growth of trees over time. He also stated that

as for the lake, nothing flows into it so, nothing can flow out; it would just overflow. There are no tributaries leading it.

- Chairperson Freitag commented that she is not in favor of truck docks facing the road. She feels that it ruins the appearance.
- Mr. Strader went back to the PowerPoint presentation and inquired about dock doors facing the road if they had more landscaping and better architecture. Light industrial could not, they would have to be in the side and rear yard. He asked the commissioners if they would or wouldn't want dock doors if these things were in place.
- Chairperson Freitag replied that it would depend on how many dock doors an applicant wanted.
- Ms. Katers suggested maybe a percentage.
- Mr. Strader was understanding that the commissioners were alright with the dock doors facing the road in the northerly section if there were deeper setbacks and heavy landscaping but not in the southern portion. He asked for clarification from the commissioners.
- Mr. Paul commented that it didn't make sense to have a nicer building with better architecture and hide it with heavy landscaping.
- Mr. Frederick wondered if the future direction of this was cross docks. He suggested that the orientation of the buildings away from the road is how they should go.
- Mr. Strader noted that some of the parcels are dimensioned appropriately for that but other parcels, it would be more difficult.
- Mr. Frederick commented that maybe the parcels need to be rethought out.
- Ms. Maise commented that another thing that needs to be thought about is the standards for screening, meaning could the docks face the road whether or not there is the 200-foot setback like in the current ordinance for the M-2 and M-T districts. The outdoor storage section of the ordinance deals with trucks and trailers, as well as supplies, equipment, etc. and screening is required for anything visible from the street. Even if loading docks were in the side yards, they may still be visible. If we want to maintain consistent standards that are currently in the ordinance, note that a building can face the street if it's set back 200 feet or more in the M-2 and M-T districts.
- Mr. Frederick asked Ms. Maise for clarification on cross-dock versus other set-ups.
- Ms. Maise stated that there is a section in the ordinance now for overhead doors and there is a distinction between the orientation of overhead doors and screening in the M-1 district, which facing the road isn't allowed and in the more intense district where if the building is setback at least 200 and screening provided, they can be allowed.. It's putting the overhead doors and screening together and working with both.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison asked Ms. Maise if it was possible that with the M-2 district, if docks were allowed, screening would be heavy on Smith Road and none on Vining. The screening would be minimal on Vining with the mixed use but if there is residential in the district they would not want to see trucks. They might expect some traffic but not truck traffic right out of their window. This may be a compromise. She added that she is not a fan of cross-docks, she really doesn't see a spot in this district for that and if the Planning Commission did allow it there should be consideration for more screening.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison commented that some of the residents of the Preserves are already unhappy with the truck traffic and have had meetings to discuss putting up a wall.

- Mr. Strader commented that there are ways to have a buffer and he agrees that dock doors should not face Vining Road, this would keep the quality up and down the road.
- Mr. Glotfelty wondered if the DNR would regulate the easements of the lake, depending on the size.
- Mr. Strader commented that they placed provisions in the ordinance that there couldn't be any paved areas going up to the lake, unless for maintenance.
- Mr. Frederick also suggested a path for rescue as well.
- Mr. Strader stated that there were some of the property owners and developers in attendance that wanted a chance to speak to the commissioners. He asked the commissioners if it seemed as though they are heading in the right direction.
- The commissioners responded yes.
- Mr. Strader noted that he will address the things that were brought up in this meeting and get back to the commissioners and move forward.
- The commissioners agreed.

B. Public Comment

Tony Antone, Kojaian Companies, 39400 Woodward Ave #250, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304 stepped forward to speak to the commissioners.

- Mr. Antone stated that they are the owners of the property just south of Amazon.
- Mr. Antone thanked Mr. Strader and staff for all the hard work that went into the study. He commented that Mr. Frederick was right, interest level is for cross-dock warehouses from large companies, particularly from out of state. He feels that the property is situated well enough that Vining can be really maintained without docks facing the road. The property is conducive to having docks back up to Amazon and also facing Smith Road, assuming you can get the landscaping, berms and setbacks. The trick will be aesthetics and landscaping and we can get into that when a site plan comes before you. He thanked the commissioners and noted that there are real companies that are watching and asking themselves if they should come to Romulus and he feels that this is a great step forward.

Chad Meyer, President and Chief Operator, Northpoint Development, 4825 NW 41st St #500, Riverside, MO 64150 stepped forward to speak to the commissioners.

- Mr. Meyer stated that Northpoint has an industrial property in this district under contract and presented the commissioners with a PowerPoint presentation.
- Mr. Meyer gave the commissioners some background on Northpoint and explained that they have about a thousand employees coast to coast and they are one of the top 2-3 industrial developers in the country. They have signed about 13 million-sq. ft. of leases with corporate occupiers that are looking at the Vining Road.
- Chairperson Freitag asked Mr. Meyer if they have an option on the property in the light industrial designated area and the Regional Center property between Smith Road and I-94.
- Mr. Meyer replied that they have the entire light industrial and commercial properties. He commented that they do a lot of work for General Motors and they are General Motors largest landlord in the United States. They also do work for Ford, Magna, Plastic Omnium and a handful of other companies like Chewy.com. A handful of these companies have already reached out to

them about this project and as they were listening to the list of concerns he noted that they are excited about the concerns that the commissioners have and they can address those head on.

- Mr. Meyer commented that they had presented a plan to city representatives, similar to what he wanted to show the Planning Commission tonight, in August last year.
- Chairperson Freitag reminded Mr. Meyer that the commissioners are not asking anyone to come forward with site plans at this time to consider for approval. She stated that this was not the purpose for this meeting. The meeting is to consider changing the zoning ordinance and Master Plan map and it appears that Northpoint wants to show the commissioners a development that they want to put in this district.
- Mr. Meyers commented that they also brought samples of elevations that support of what the Planning Commission is discussing. They have pictures with examples of how they address many of the issues that the commissioners have brought up. Also, they can address any concerns with what modern manufacturing companies are looking for. They can certainly address those concerns with some of the buildings that they have constructed. They are not looking for any approvals tonight but they have read the plan and wanted to address it point by point if possible or at least some of the highlighted items, which include what companies will actually adopt. He added that there should be consideration for the companies that may want to come here that are going to bring the jobs and look at it from their perspective because they have options and they can go elsewhere. The issues that the Planning Commissioners have about the setbacks, dock doors, how to screen them and landscaping are concerns that he can help address since he deals with these types of occupants.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Meyer what they are proposing. He wondered if Mr. Meyer will be proposing 1 building for an occupant or several buildings.
- Mr. Meyer stated that they don't have a proposal, they are in attendance because they are in support of the plan. He stated that their parcel will accommodate 6 buildings. He mentioned that one of the biggest concerns from the commissioners was how to screen the trucks and storage areas, how to address the offices and frontages and what do you do about all of the paving. He showed the commissioners what they have done with other parks, with other buildings in other cities. He added that they have modified a plan that he feels that checks the box on every concern that they heard tonight. He commented that this is just by way of example and what they intend to build here.
- Mr. Strader suggested that the commissioners consider listening to Northpoint and what they have to show them on how to address concerns and information that they can take and possibly tweak to make work for Romulus.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that she was not particularly in favor of 6 large buildings going on that particular piece of property.
- Mr. Meyer showed the commissioners pictures of buildings that they have built for warehousing and light manufacturing companies. He demonstrated how to achieve different architectural design with building materials, finish changes, depth lines and color.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Meyer if the buildings were geared towards trucking companies.
- Mr. Meyer replied that they are for companies such as Amazon, Spectrum Brands and BNSF. These are warehouse and light industrial manufacturing buildings. He went on to demonstrate ways to screen the docks and suggested that buildings be oriented so that the dock doors are not visible from the street.
- Mr. Paul stated that he was not interested in a lot of truck companies or cross docks coming into this district. He would consider these types of buildings to be suitable for trucking companies.

- Mr. Meyer asked Mr. Paul if he considers Amazon a trucking company. He noted that it really is an E-commerce fulfillment center but the nature of their business does drive truck traffic.
- Mr. Paul stated that Amazon is there and that he's not interested in more trucking in that area since there are other districts for trucking within the city. He also stated that this area is going to be the highlight of the city and he doesn't wish to see a bunch of trucking companies in there.
- Ms. Maise commented that Mr. Meyer and his team are looking for direction from the Planning Commission. They are reading the draft ordinance and showing the commissioners some ways to help with design standards if this is going to be something that is acceptable in the ordinance. There are a lot of things including building materials, level of landscaping, dimensional requirements, lot coverage requirements, etc. that will be considered as part of the overlay standards and requirements.
- Chairperson Freitag wondered how many trucks would be generated from Northpoint's development of the area.
- Mr. Paul also was concerned about the trucking.
- Ms. Maise commented that with warehousing and distribution comes truck traffic and she asked Mr. Paul if they were against having these uses in this area.
- Mr. Paul stated that he would have to see the buildings. He's just not sure about having trucks in the district 24/7.
- Ms. Maise stated that this is what we need to give some direction on.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that they are not necessarily opposed to trucking, they just want to know how many trucks would be generated from the uses.
- Mr. Meyer commented that the scale of these buildings are large since there are 200 acres in this area so with a use like UPS with cross docks, or an Amazon, a fulfillment center, whose business drives a lot of trucks, not a trucking company but they have a high density of traffic count. Manufacturers have to get stuff in and out and there is no way for commerce to flow in and out of an industrial park. He also commented that whether you have light manufacturing, heavy industrial and distribution or a trucking company, you have an ESAL count which is an equivalent single axle load count. Based on the business, there are projections and every company that Northpoint has built for can come in and ask for some personal property tax break in exchange for "x" amount of jobs. They can tell the commissioners, based on their history, how many trucks a day that they generate. With their experience with Amazon, they own 5 buildings that are leased by Amazon, they generate anywhere from 250-1,000 trucks a day, depending on what type of fulfillment center that it is. They have built manufacturing centers for Magna and they can have only 8 trucks a day. It's all over the board. Manufacturing typically drives lower truck counts and e-commerce brings those counts up. He suggested that as a rule of thumb, a million square foot building would average 250-400 trucks per day and on a smaller manufacturing building of 250,000-sq. ft. you can expect 6-7 trucks per hour.
- Mr. Meyer stated that the reason that they are here in attendance is because they have the property under contract and are partnered with Northwestern Mutual, who is the blue chip investment company. They build the nicest parks anywhere in the country, hands down. They are looking at an investment of \$200 million dollars and they cannot go forward without a clear understanding of what the Planning Commission wants and what they need to give in return. It's that simple. They want to be great partners and they would love for the Planning Commission to meet other cities that they have worked in but, before they make that kind of investment, which is substantial. They want to be here for 25-50 years once the move forward but, they just need to know. They can't risk \$200

million dollars and bring a tenant in and you say sorry about your luck. They just want to be fair and he hopes that the commissioners can appreciate that.

- Mr. Paul commented that he wants to be fair for the city too.
- Mr. Frederick commented that at the last meeting the commissioners did discuss putting the trucks on the inside of these buildings as a possible solution. He just wanted to remind the commissioners of this.
- Chairperson Freitag commented that there will still be trucks on the road and asked Mr. Meyer if they would have cross docks with their development.
- Mr. Meyer replied yes, they have clustered them within the building campus so that they are not as visible from any road and the offices will abut the roads.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison stated that she feels part of the issue is that Mr. Meyer keeps referring to Amazon and if he may recall, as discussed earlier, Amazon was supposed to be the most intensive use of trucks in the district and anything else that came later would be less. She noted that they are in the M-1 district and Amazon is in M-2 so for Northpoint to compare themselves with Amazon makes the commission feel as though since we already have a lot of trucks, what is wrong with more. It also sounds as though whomever is going to be placed in this spot is going to have the same amount of trucks as Amazon and she reminded Mr. Meyer that the commission is not looking to do that because of the surrounding area and also because of the residents. The Planning Commission can't give a definite answer without knowing the amount of trucks will be generated. She added that they were looking to decelerate the truck traffic from Amazon.
- Mr. Meyer commented that he understood and that he used Amazon because they are the high water mark as far as use generator but there are not many, unless they are going to allow a FedEx or UPS there that are not going to generate more traffic than an Amazon. He also commented that they get it loud and clear on what the Planning Commission wants and they are trying to work with a crystal ball. They have had Plastic Omnium that wanted to locate here and others like Magna and Ford are interested in this campus and we haven't been able to tell them with certainty that we can move forward. These are great companies that they would love to have here because they bring huge investments and jobs and they are just trying to understand the rules of the road.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison stated that it is pretty simple, on Vining they don't want truck bays and Smith, maybe not a bad idea but nothing as much truck traffic as Amazon. If there are, we want some shielding.
- Ms. Workman stated that she understands what Northpoint and the commissioners are looking for, in particular for our resident's needs. She wondered if there was a way without saying yes or no to be open to making sure that if there was high volume truck traffic for fulfillment centers that the traffic was designated to certain roads.
- Chairman Freitag stated that there is no real way to control traffic and enforce it.
- Mr. Strader stated that the idea was that the trucks will go the routes that are the easiest.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Meyer if their proposed plan fits in the zoning discussed here tonight.
- Mr. Meyer replied that it does.
- Mr. Meyer gave the commissioners more information and examples of design standards, screening and landscaping to consider for the Vining Road District.

- Mr. Paul stated that he understands that there are going to be trucks there he just doesn't want this district to be filled with nothing but trucks.
- Chairperson Freitag stated that the Planning Commission needs to get zoning squared away.
- Mr. Meyer stated that they just want to be good partners and they want to be clear as to what the commissioners want from them.
- Mr. McAnally commented that a lot of the commissioners had envisioned a mix of uses and not all one big industrial area. They are looking for something better and different.
- Mr. Meyer stated that they have held the southern parcel open for a commercial or office type user. This economic cycle the manufacturing and distribution types are what happens and they are ready to move in now, start paying taxes and bring the jobs. What they have seen on manufacturing is box within the box, office with manufacturing in the same building. This can be more intertwined with an industrial use as well, they do this all the time. He added that it does drive more surface area because you have more employees and they need parking but, that is a good thing.
- Mr. McAnally stated that was more of what he envisioned. This would certainly drive head count in our community. The citizens see great big buildings with trucks and nothing else and he can see why they would be upset.
- Mr. Paul commented that he would like to see more roof tops if it was done properly.

C. Planning Commission Direction and Determination of Next Steps

- Chairperson Freitag stated that she feels that Mr. Strader understands what direction the Planning Commission wants to go in.
- Mr. Strader commented that he will do a recap and if it looks good they can schedule a public hearing in September.
- Chairperson Freitag agreed and thanked everyone in attendance for their input

5. Adjournment

Motion by McAnally supported by Workman to adjourn the meeting at 5:50 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Workman, Zilka, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe, Frederick, Glotfelty, Paul & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.



David Paul, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission