

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 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 Prybyla, Mike Glotfelty and Cathy Freitag

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

3. Chairperson Freitag suggested a motion be made to move item 6/B: Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Animal Ordinance to follow 8/B: New Business.

Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to approve the revised agenda to move item 6-B: Public Hearing Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Animal/Agricultural. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, McAnally, Prybyla, Paul, Glotfelty, Frederick, Talon-Jemison, Roscoe and Freitag. Nays – none. Motion Carried.

Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
  - A. Approval of the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on February 17, 2016.
  - B. Approval of the revised minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on November 16, 2015.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
6. Public Hearings
  - A. SLU-2016-001; **Goddard Associates (Phase 2)**, requesting special land use approval for an existing long-term parking facilities on 9.48 acres at 29171 Goddard. Parcel # 80-094-99-0011-000. Zoning – M-T, Industrial Transportation District. (Action required: recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial to the City Council or postponement of the special land use.)
7. Old Business
8. New Business

- A. **SPR-2016-002; USF Holland Expansion**, requesting site plan approval for a 44-door, 17,680-sq. ft. terminal building dock addition; 15,840-sq. ft. maintenance building with fueling island; 124 new trailer storage and 42 tractor staging spaces; reconstruction of employee parking lot; and construction of a detention basin and associated storm water facilities on 35.81 acres at 27411 Wick Road. Parcels #80-049-99-0001-715 and 80-049-99-0001-705. Zoning – M-T, Industrial Transport District. (Action required: approval, approval with conditions, denial or postponement of the site plan.)
  - B. **SPR-2016-004; US Park Entranceway**, requesting redevelopment of the front entryway of the long-term parking facility including a new 1,736-sq. ft. building width canopy and ticket boxes on 17.60 acres at 9601 Middlebelt. Parcel #80-050-99-0003-007. Zoning M-T, Industrial Transport District. (Action required: approval, approval with conditions, denial or postponement of the site plan.)
  - C. **Public Hearing - Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Animal/Agricultural (6/B: Resumed)**  
  
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.)
9. PC-Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission
  10. Reports
    - A. Chairperson
    - B. City Planner
      - 1) Planning Department Status Report
      - 2) Coal Tar-based Sealcoat
  11. Reports on Interest Designation
  12. Communications
    - A. Notice of Intent to Prepare a Master Plan Amendment – City of Romulus.
  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, February 17, 2016. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Roscoe, Prybyla, Paul, Glotfelty, Talon-Jemison, Zilka, Frederick, and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion carried.
    - B. Motion by Prybyla supported by McAnally to approve the revised minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on November 16, 2015 for PC-2015-027; Logos Logistics, 16500 Wahrman Road. Ms. Maise explained that item #11 in the motion should be corrected to remove

the following "...additional 60 feet" and replace with ..."split-faced material must be wrapped further along the south side of the building in the amount to be determined." Enlarged evergreens provided to supplement the tulip trees. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Prybyla, McAnally, Talon –Jemison, Zilka, Frederick, Roscoe, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion carried.

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

6. Public Hearings

A. SLU-2016-001; **Goddard Associates (Phase 2)**, requesting special land use approval for an existing long-term parking facilities on 9.48 acres at 29171 Goddard. Parcel # 80-094-99-0011-000. Zoning M-T, Industrial Transport District.

Brian Biskner, Powell Engineering, 4700 Cornerstone Drive White Lake, MI 48383 and Julie Allison, Goddard Associates, 29171 Goddard, Romulus, MI 48174 stepped forward as petitioners for Goddard Associates, Ltd.

- Mr. Biskner stated that he and Ms. Allison will be representing Goddard Associates for Phase 2 of Goddard Associates.
- Ms. Maise clarified that there might be some misleading information in the way that the project was described; the request tonight is for the Phase 2 portion of what the Planning Commission previously approved for Jack Cooper Transport, which was considered Phase 1. This portion, which is existing, includes the rear portion which is comprised of asphalt millings. The long-term parking is the special land use that is being requested; however there is not an occupant at this time.
- Mr. Biskner stated that the last time he was before the Planning Commission he was discussing the Phase 1 portion of the site and that the special land use was going to go with the entire site. The question was what was going to be done about the millings and Phase 2. Since that time the owner has taken a more pro-active role and decided to ask for special land use approval to get a waiver for the asphalt millings to remain. They will use it as long-term parking, since they will not be able to do anything to that portion of the site. The owner understands that they will have to come before Planning Commission again for site plan approval if they get a user and want to utilize the property. But, for the time being, they are requesting special land use approval so that Jack Cooper can continue to be the tenant on Phase 1. They are looking for the millings to stay as they are, no user, unused, just as it is.

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. No one came forward. She closed the public comments portion of the meeting and opened the meeting up to comments from the City Planner and questions from the commissioners.

- Mr. Glotfelty stated to the petitioners that he was very disappointed to see the millings on the site. It looks as though Romulus has turned into a dumping ground for millings. A lot of places in western Wayne County do not allow millings and somehow they get dumped in our city. He was not happy with it and would rather see the millings removed and replaced with 21AA pavement instead with a good base underneath it.
- Mr. Biskner replied that he understood Mr. Glotfelty's concerns but felt that millings are relatively a common and suitable base.

- Mr. Paul noted that he also has a concern. When the Planning Commission gave approval for Jack Cooper Transport, they indicated that the millings were to be removed, or bond put up, or something. There is nothing involved in that. He agreed with Mr. Glotfelty in that he doesn't like the millings and it appears that the petitioners are trying to get around the ordinance to remove the millings.
- Mr. Biskner replied that they had pursued the bond and what it would take to remove the millings. The owners had a few contractors look at the millings and they felt the best decision was to go through the process of getting a conditional approval for them to remain, rather than take the time to haul them off site or post a bond for removal. He noted that they are suitable base for asphalt and they are used a lot in different communities and in many ways it's like hauling off gravel.
- Mr. Biskner commented that the City Engineer from OHM agreed that the millings are a suitable base so in that regard, rather than haul them off, to maybe bring in millings later for an asphalt base, the owner was hoping to leave the millings. They can't do anything back there but leave them until they get a user and based on the user's needs and what would go on back there, go through the site plan process. He stated that the Planning Commission could revisit these millings if they really don't find them suitable.
- Mr. Paul commented that he was aware of the project and the process, he just thought it was unanimous by the Planning Commission that either the bond be put up or the millings be removed. Now they are coming back for special approval to leave the millings there.
- Mr. Biskner replied that he understood going through the special land use approval process was another alternative.
- Mr. Paul replied that Mr. Biskner was right, it is another alternative.
- Mr. Biskner stated that at the time of Jack Cooper Transport Phase 1 they did not have the owner of the property involved in the project. Ms. Allison was there to now represent the property owner.
- Mr. Biskner specified that was the problem before, he didn't have an alternative since the property owner wasn't involved.
- Ms. Allison stated that Goddard Associates was not aware of the problems being presented to Jack Cooper Transport. It went through a whole process and once she became involved in it she went out and looked at the site and wanted to know what was going on.
- Ms. Allison acknowledged that she had talked to Carol Maise, City Planner, and upon investigating it she could see what was going on and what the concern was. This area at this time is not going to be utilized; Jack Cooper Transport is not going to utilize it. As the commissioners may know, Jack Cooper Transport is a tenant. As the owner of the site, she really doesn't know what they are going planning to do. She understands it's not really what the Planning Commission wants but they don't know what's going to happen back there. It's fenced off and not being utilized. In the future that base may be needed so to tear it all out really isn't practical.
- Ms. Allison commented that she knows that they would have to come back to the Planning Commission and it's not been utilized, as can clearly be seen. Until they can find out what a future use can be for it they would like to keep it as it is. They inherited situation and Jack Cooper Transport is not going to be utilizing it and they do not want them to be held up because of it. So that is why they went ahead and went through the special land use process since it appeared to be the easiest and best solution on what to do with what they had to work with at that time.
- Ms. Allison stated that she didn't want to hold up their tenant and not knowing what will happen back there in the future is why she made that choice to apply for special land use and work with

administration asking what the best thing to do was. She's inherited this problem and she would like to know what she can do with it that is going to make the city happy, as well as this tenant that has an immediate use for it. She feels that since it's fenced off and not being utilized, it's not hurting anything right now. When the time comes to use of that portion of the property, they will come back to the Planning Commission and do what we need to do. That was the common consensus and they chose to go through the review process.

- Mr. Paul asked Ms. Allison if they inherited the millings or if they had brought them in.
- Ms. Allison replied that she didn't know exactly where the millings came from. There was a tenant before Jack Cooper Transport. They are the land owner but they are not over at the site a lot. She asked Ms. Maise if she had any information on where the millings may have come from.
- Ms. Maise replied that there was a building permit on file and she believes it was in the mid 90's (*corrected to 2005*) that a permit was granted for roughly 3,000 sq. ft. of expansion of asphalt. It appeared however that this was an attempt to circumvent the ordinance because that was the threshold and beyond that the permit holder would have to go before Planning Commission. Based on aerial photography, it can be seen that around this time, a large area of millings appeared, however it is not certain if this coincides with the building permit on file. It appears that the millings were from one of the Goddard Associates tenants during that time period.
- Ms. Allison stated that when they bought that property they knew that at one time it used to be a parking facility. It was very dilapidated and no one was there; it was quite a site. They bought it and cleaned it up and leased it to a prior tenant, not Jack Cooper Transport. She believes that it was during this time when the millings were brought on site. That area was sectioned off and no one was permitted to use it because it was not a part of the agreement that they had with the prior tenants. They didn't want a bunch of people parking cars where they were not supposed to, so that's why it was fenced off. She commented that even though they own the entire site, only the trucking company is utilizing the site and the rest is not being utilized for any reason. Their company has never utilized that site but rather they just cleaned it up and leased it out so it wasn't an eye sore.
- Mr. Paul asked Ms. Allison if they purchased the property with the millings on site.
- Ms. Allison replied that she doesn't believe it was purchased with the millings on site. She believes that it could have been one of the tenants that brought it in. Not Jack Cooper Transport, it was a prior occupant.
- Mr. Paul stated that he believes that the parking lot was made for trucking, a trucking company bringing in cars when it was originally established.
- Ms. Allison replied yes, that was the first tenant. They brought cars in and stored them there and she believes that's when the additional storage of the vehicles and trucks was needed or something.
- Mr. Paul stated that is the same operation as Jack Cooper Transport is now. He asked Ms. Allison again if they brought the millings into the site.
- Ms. Allison replied no, that she believes it was a previous tenant. They inherited the problem but, like she stated earlier, they aren't sure what is going to happen back there so instead of tearing it all up and having someone come back and asphalt it what's there provides a nice base as you'll see if you go back there and look at it. In the future it could be a parking facility, they just don't know. There is not a need for it now but you never know what could happen and that's why they want to leave it as it is. They certainly understand that if it is ever utilized they would have to come back and meet Planning Commission approval.

- Ms. Allison apologized for the miscommunication as she wasn't aware of this and she really doesn't work with Jack Cooper Transport. Someone from her office was notified who then notified her and said that she needed to get involved in this.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he disagreed with Mr. Glotfelty and Mr. Paul about the millings. There are more millings be used every year and the city should have to find a use for these millings. He also noted that he has driven to the site and seen the millings twice and he sees no problem with them. This parcel is drained to all of the catch basins which flow out in to the drain at the back of the property. He doesn't see a problem with it for just parking cars, or whatever. Every year there is more and more millings because it is cheaper to mill the asphalt down, put new on.
- Mr. Zilka asked what else can be done with the millings. Rather than dumping them into the river the city has got to find a use for them, as long as they are maintained and the drainage is kept to flow in the catch basins, then he doesn't have a problem with them. He feels that if our City Engineer doesn't have a problem with the millings and if they can be put to use like this, than he has no problem with the millings and he is for them.
- Mr. McAnally commented that it appears that in order to get this off center and allow everyone to get their work done the Planning Commission will have to approve the special land use, not a site plan, and allow the millings to stay in place just for special land use. Then at that point when the site is ever developed, a site plan will address the millings and at that point it will be determined whether the millings will be used as a base for something else, like asphalt or anything else.
- Mr. McAnally conveyed that he too does not have a problem with the millings however, he asked if the city ordinance allows millings.
- Ms. Maise replied that the ordinance does not specially address millings and it has been interpreted that the city will allow millings like gravel if approved by the Planning Commission after a recommendation from the City Engineer. She then referred to Marcus McNamara, City Engineer to address Mr. McAnally's question.
- Mr. McNamara replied that was correct, that the city does not allow them unless approved by the Planning Commission.
- Mr. McAnally clarified that the city ordinance prohibits the use of millings for the use of a parking lot.
- Ms. Maise replied that was correct.
- Mr. McAnally stated that the ordinance speaks for itself and for what is before them tonight, he doesn't have any issues with it.
- Mr. Prybyla wanted clarification from Ms. Allison that this property was not going to be used in the near future by the current tenant or anyone else.
- Ms. Allison replied no. No one will be using this section of the parking lot. It is fenced off and if any of the Planning Commission has been out to the site they can see it is fenced off and not being used.
- Mr. Prybyla noted that there was fencing but that the fencing is in disrepair in areas.
- Mr. Biskner commented that the fencing is in need of repair.
- The commissioners agreed.
- Mr. Paul stated that he can agree with Mr. McAnally but he thinks since it is there and the owner and current tenant didn't have the millings brought in that as long as the owner and tenant understand that if a building, parking or anything else was put back there, it will be a serious problem.
- Ms. Allison replied that she and the current tenant understand that.
- Mr. Paul stated that he will go along with Mr. McAnally at this point.

- Ms. Freitag summarized that there is a tenant that wants to do business in the City of Romulus but because of prior owners or tenants doing something to the property that is not allowed, the current tenant is in limbo because they cannot operate.
- Ms. Allison agreed with Ms. Freitag.
- Ms. Freitag clarified the action the Planning Commission took with regard to the Jack Cooper Transport special use. The Planning Commission conditioned the recommendation for approval on either pulling out the millings or getting a bond for the removal of the millings.
- Ms. Maise replied that in addition, the property owner could come back before the Planning Commission to ask for special land use approval for Phase 2.
- Ms. Freitag agreed with Ms. Maise.
- Ms. Maise stated that when this was initially submitted it was treated as one special land use for the entire piece of property, even though Jack Cooper wasn't using the whole property. It needs to be noted that the millings while not approved, do encroach into the setbacks of the property and the lot coverage exceeds ordinance requirements. Therefore there are some things that need to be addressed once there is a future use for this piece of the property.
- Ms. Freitag stated that the purpose for tonight was to get Jack Cooper Transport to operate.
- Ms. Maise replied yes and to get them on the City Council agenda once Phase 2 was resolved.
- Ms. Freitag agreed that Jack Cooper needed special land use, even though that piece of the property was not going to be used and knowing Ms. Allison's reputation and the company that she represents. She noted that there has never been any issues with them and they have always gone above and beyond whatever is asked of them. So, that being said, Ms. Freitag noted that she doesn't see a problem with the millings either.
- Ms. Maise commented that one suggestion she would make to the commissioners on this special land use recommendation is that since they want to wait and deal with the asphalt millings issue, perhaps they change #5 and #7 of the City Planner's report. She recommended changing the review authority from ARC approval to Planning Commission approval. When a use and/or users is determined, they will need to come before Planning Commission for site plan approval and determination on the use of the millings. The variances will also need to be addressed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at that time.
- Mr. Prybyla asked Ms. Maise about number 4 on her report.
- Ms. Maise replied that it sounds like the commissioners do not want to make a decision on the millings tonight but they would rather wait for a site plan when Goddard Associates gets a user in the future. She also reiterated that #5 and #7 need to be changed from ARC committee approval to Planning Commission approval.
- Ms. Freitag stated that she cannot see making Goddard Associates do something now with the millings when they have no idea what will happen in the future and what that future tenant may need. It wouldn't be fair to them.
- Ms. Maise noted that her report recommendations could stay the same with number 4 saying that approval by the Planning Commission of the alternative paving material, which are asphalt millings, will need to be determined during site plan review. Number 5 and number 7 would be changed from the ARC Committee to the Planning Commission. This would mean that the site plan would have to come back to the Planning Commission for review and approval.
- Mr. McAnally asked Ms. Maise if that would only be if they develop the second phase.
- Ms. Maise replied yes, when they want to use Phase 2.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison stated that she wanted to make sure that the commissioners don't ignore the fact that the ordinance is in place for a reason and with Romulus looking to raise our standards, which also helps raise property values and bring businesses here, we can keep in mind that the ordinance is in place for a reason. She also expressed her understanding that

Goddard Associates inherited this problem without their knowledge but unfortunately it is still Goddard Associate's problem. She went on to explain that she hopes that Ms. Allison understands that it's a problem if it violates City Ordinance even though the previous tenant did it, Goddard Associates is still responsible and that is where liability comes into place.

- Ms. Allison replied that she is very well aware of that.
- Ms. Talon-Jemison conveyed that she would not like to see that we make a habit of ignoring our ordinance because they are there for a reason; for the beautification of the city.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. McNamara if it was acceptable if Goddard Associates wanted to asphalt over the millings to make a paved surface.
- Mr. McNamara replied that Mr. McAnally was correct and as long as they were at the proper gradations, asphalt millings are a suitable base and the City of Romulus does have a grinder to grind up an existing road and pave right over it. We would have to confirm that the drainage slopes are ok and there would probably be some type of fine grading but millings are a perfectly acceptable material.
- Mr. McAnally just wanted to clarify the logic of what the Planning Commission's decision is.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that before any paving was done at the site, he would like to see them do a core sample on the millings because it is very wet in Romulus. The owner can tell us whatever they want to tell us as far as the millings go but, typically a base is 1 x 3 stone, they pave over top 22 with AA over top of that. You just wouldn't go over there and pave over top of that instantly. There would be a core sample performed and the depth checked first; it's not that simple of a process.
- Ms. Allison stated that she can assure the Planning Commissioners that they have no need but, if they did they would come back to the Planning Commission for approval.

Motion by McAnally supported by Prybyla to recommend to City Council special land use approval for **SLU-2016-001; Goddard Associates** located at 29171 Goddard Road contingent upon:

1. Variances from the BZA being granted for the side yard setback and lot coverage. Parking lot landscaping will be addressed at this time.
2. Waivers to *Section 14.05, Long-term Parking Facilities, (b)(3),(13), and (14)* since the parking lot is existing.
3. Waiver to *Section 13.02(h) Parking Lot Landscaping*, if determined acceptable by the BZA during the variance review.
4. Approval by the Planning Commission during site plan review of the alternate paving materials which are asphalt millings.
5. The special land use approval is for long-term parking use and when an occupant has been determined, prior to commencing the use, review and approval by the Planning Commission is required.
6. Portions of the fence that are in disrepair as determined by the Building Department must be replaced or repaired.
7. Approval of a revised site plan by the Planning Commission must be provided.

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

7. Old Business

8. New Business

- A. **SPR-2016-002; USF Holland Expansion**, requesting site plan approval for a 44-door, 17,680-sq. ft. terminal building dock addition; 15,840 sq. ft. maintenance building with fueling island; 124 new trailer storage and 42 tractor staging spaces; reconstruction of employee parking lot; and construction of a detention basin and associated storm water facilities on 35.81 acres at 27411 Wick Road. Parcels #80-049-99-0001-715 and 80-049-99-0001-705. Zoning – M-T, Industrial Transportation District.

Robert Wagner, Midwestern Consulting, 3815 Plaza Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48108 stepped forward as petitioner on behalf of USF Holland.

- Mr. Wagner thanked the commissioners for moving up his agenda item.
- Mr. Wagner stated that he was the Civil Engineer for USF Holland and with him tonight is his partner, Ted Hirsh, Civil Engineer, who helped in putting the site plans together.
- Mr. Wagner recognized the City staff and consultants for working with them for close to a year before the application was submitted. Carol Maise and Marcus McNamara were very helpful in assisting with the submittal. There were some pre-design meetings and he noted that we have a really nice process here at the City of Romulus. After submitting, we went through a round of comments and had an ARC review meeting and we were able to revise the plans to develop what we think are approvable plans.
- Mr. Wagner stated that he understands that the Planning Commission is very well educated and probably reviewed your packets but, will point out the project quickly.
- Mr. Wagner presented a power point presentation of the project. The proposed site is at the intersection of Wick and Inkster Roads. USF Holland has been in Romulus and operating for many years. The site is 20 acres and in close proximity to Canada and Metro Airport. USF Holland intends to add a 40 door dock addition to enhance the operations on site. At the south end of the parcel USF Holland would like to add additional pavement and parking for the tractors and vans. The existing employee parking lot is getting old and USF Holland would like to reconstruct it.
- Mr. Wagner stated that there is a 15 acre vacant adjacent parcel to the west of the site and USF Holland is planning on purchasing this site and connecting it to their existing site. They plan to relocate their shop building to this new, adjacent site to suit the needs of the company.
- Mr. Wagner explained that the reason for not paving the entire site was because of the existing woodlands and wetlands. They would like to leave as many natural features to the site as possible to help preserve it and make it a more suitable site.
- Mr. Wagner stated that they are proceeding with permitting through Wayne County and DEQ for the wetland. They have a nice review and a few conditions of approval if the board has any questions. They have no issues with any of the conditions.
- Ms. Freitag commented to Mr. Wagner that it appears that USF Holland is really trying to clean the site up.
- Mr. Wagner replied that was true. They are trying to make it a more useful site for USF Holland and also by relocating the shop USF Holland will have a newer and bigger facility, along with more area for operations.

- Mr. Wagner pointed out to the commissioners that they also intend to bring the landscaping and screening to compliance with current ordinances along Wick and Inkster Road, which will improve the site quite a bit.
- Mr. Glotfelty welcomed Mr. Wagner to Romulus. He noted that when looking at the plans he did not see the sanitary going into the new maintenance garage.
- Mr. Wagner replied that it was on the utility plan on page 10. The proposed sanitary lead connects to the existing sanitary lead to the shop. They will have a forced main and a grinder pump because they have to go under the county drain. The site is adjacent to the Wayne County Sloss and Ganong Drain. They have had to apply for permits for that drain crossing and they are proposing another.
- Mr. Paul asked Mr. Wagner if they will be using a 2 inch drain pump system.
- Mr. Wagner replied that they are using a 2 inch force pump.
- Mr. Paul complimented Mr. Wagner on his drawings. He noticed the bio-retention, three to four noted on plans, which is not seen very often. The plans are very complete.
- Mr. Glotfelty commented to Mr. Wagner that he had visited the site the day before the meeting and he noticed a pile of millings on the south end of the property.
- Mr. Wagner replied that the plan was to use the millings during the engineering phase of the project as a base for the new asphalt on the lot for the shop building and paving over those. During the ARC meeting the Building Official brought this to our attention and we are aware of the millings.
- Mr. Glotfelty asked how they got there.
- Mr. Wagner replied that during the last couple of years there were improvements to the paving and that the millings are a result of one of those projects.

Motion by Prybyla supported by Paul to approve SPR-2016-002; USF Holland Expansion located at 27411 Wick Road *subject to the following*:

1. Waivers to the following:
  - a. Section 11.17(b)(7) and Section 14.02(b)(2) to waive the curbing around all new pavement edges, consistent with existing pavement and drainage plan.
  - b. Section 13.02(m)(2) to waive the irrigation requirement based on the proposed plant material and function of the storm water system.
2. A variance being granted by the BZA to expand the nonconforming front yard setback along Inkster Road.
3. Approval of any new barbed wire fencing by the Planning Commission.
4. Combination of the parcels by the City Assessor's Office.
5. Restriping of the new tractor staging area along Inkster Road.
6. Light intensity shall not exceed the maximum illumination levels allowed in *Table 13.05*. Manufacturer's specification sheets for the light fixtures must be provided.
7. Upon completion of construction a site inspection will be conducted to verify that screening on Inkster Road is adequate and practical; additional plantings may therefore be needed.

8. Any other items identified by the ARC committee being addressed during engineering/building review.

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

- B. SPR-2016-004; **US Park Entranceway**; requesting redevelopment of the front entryway of the long-term parking facility including a new 1,736 – sq. ft. building with canopy and ticket boxes on 17.60 acres at 9601 Middlebelt. Parcel # 80-050-99-0003-007. Zoning M-T, Industrial Transportation District.

Thom Dumond, Boss Engineering, 3121 E. Grand River Ave., Howell, MI 48843 stepped forward as petitioner on behalf of US Park Entranceway.

- Mr. Dumond presented a PowerPoint and site plan for reference to the proposed project at 9601 Middlebelt Road. He explained that the site is in need of some tender loving care. The owner is looking at raising the existing structure by taking it all out and reorienting it. The structure currently runs parallel to the road, very close to the road, which doesn't allow stacking to get into the facility so they would like to rotate the facility 90 degrees and tuck it back more to allow stacking and screening. The new structure will lend itself very nicely to allow for better in and out movement of the facility.
- Mr. Dumond also explained that the approach will be further north to allow for more stacking. There were a number of buildings on the site, including an existing ticket booth. They are going to combine them all into one facility. The amount of pavement on site would be reduced as well, which is a good thing, and adding quite a bit of landscape.
- Mr. Dumond commented that with a facility like this, security is very important. They need to ensure that the thousands of cars on site are being taken care of.
- Mr. Dumond suggested that the building itself is a modern looking building, similar to the airport. The building has overhangs that appear to look like wings of an airplane. Very stylish looking. There is also a lot of glass on this building, for security purposes. The tenant would like to be able to see all the way around and see who's coming and going. Which would lead to a waiver that is being asked for, a reduction in the brick on the structure. There will be brick along the bottom and a lot of windows. Very high quality materials being used, a lot of stuff you see on buildings today.
- Mr. Dumond went on to explain that the canopies will be translucent to allow light in. There will be lights used at night as well. He believes that it is a nice design and a vast improvement to the existing site.
- Mr. Dumond stated that they are looking to get approvals and get the project started by late June or July and get things wrapped up by fall.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. Dumond if they intend to stay open during construction and use the same entryway.
- Mr. Dumond replied yes. There are plans being made for a contractor now so that there is a smooth transition.
- Ms. Allison stated that it won't be difficult to transition since the driveway will venture off to the right of the property while the construction will be going on in the interior, it will all be sectioned off and we'll be operating to the right. Upon exiting they will come from each area

and exit out the same way. Once we open that whole facility the front will be removed. It's going to be a state of the art, incredible facility.

- Mr. Glotfelty commented that he likes the look of the building. He questioned Mr. Dumond and Ms. Allison about the furthest south driveway; is it for fire protection?
- Mr. Dumond replied that it was and it was a requirement of the Fire Department for at least 16 feet of clearance, which we have vertically on the sides where the wings of the building will be. They are requiring 26 feet width and with security issues, having gates that wide make it very difficult. So, what we came up with is the disconnection and having a Knox-box, so that the Fire Department can get in and out of the site.
- Mr. Prybyla noted that this facility will be good for the eye as you are traveling down Middlebelt Road and will also take away from the lingering traffic on Middlebelt Road.
- Mr. Prybyla asked Mr. Dumond if the black vinyl coated fencing will be permanent or only for construction.
- Mr. Dumond replied that it will be permanent.
- Mr. Frederick stated to Mr. Dumond and Ms. Allison that he had sat at the Wendy's for about 10 minutes and watched a considerable amount of traffic stack up on Middlebelt Road to get into the facility so, he does see the need for this improvement and it's fantastic turning it 90 degrees, how it fixes everything. However, the employees are designated to park in one area but, how are they to access the building if there is no sidewalk? Are they to go around to the other side of the parking lot and through the gates?
- Mr. Dumond replied that is something that they are looking at currently. They would access through the south entrance.
- Mr. Frederick asked if they would be crossing on the other side of the lot.
- Mr. Dumond replied yes, because it would be safer.
- Mr. Frederick asked about the smoker's shelter on page 2 of the site plan.
- Mr. Dumond replied that it is old and not sure if it will stay.
- Ms. Allison stated that the smoker's shelter is going to be removed.
- Mr. Frederick noted that he didn't see the removal reflected on the new plans.
- Mr. Frederick asked Mr. Dumond and Ms. Allison if the barbed wire on the front fence was really necessary. He noticed that some of the perimeter barbed wire fencing is in need of repair and necessary but, with a 24 hour operation is it necessary for barbed wire fencing on the front.
- Ms. Allison asked Mr. Frederick to more specific with the area he was questioning.
- Mr. Frederick responded that it was the front where traffic pulls into the property.
- Ms. Allison replied that they would not need barbed wire fencing in the front area. She thought that Mr. Frederick was referring to the hotel and Wendy's side of the property.
- Mr. Frederick stated that a certain message is being sent if the entire property is fenced in with barbed wire but, some of the fencing does need repair. It appears to be damaged maybe by snow plows.
- Ms. Allison replied that she understood and that they could do away with the barbed wire in the front of the property since it will be manned 24/7.
- Mr. Frederick commented that the property was very clean and that he was impressed by the number of spaces to park an electric car and plug in; there were 3 Chevy Volts in a row.
- Ms. Allison stated that electric cars are becoming very popular. Also, Bosch has given them some charging stations and they are going to be doing that as part of the plan.
- Mr. Frederick commented that it looks good.
- Ms. Allison thanked Mr. Frederick and stated that they are very excited about this project, it's been a long time coming.

- Mr. Frederick relied that it will raise the area up to other airport standards. Something this simple.
- Ms. Freitag commented that it will bring a lot of class to that whole area there and it will look so nice.
- Ms. Freitag added that when Ms. Allison is involved in a project the City is going to get a first class result.
- Ms. Allison thanked Ms. Freitag.

Motion by Glotfelty supported by Zilka to approve SPR-2016-004; US Park Entranceway for redevelopment of the front entryway of the long-term parking facility including a new 1,736 sq. ft. building with canopy and ticket boxes on 17.60 acres located at 9601 Middlebelt subject to the following:

1. Waivers to the following:
  - a. Section 14.06(e) to the driveway spacing requirement since the proposed driveways are an improvement to the existing driveways.
  - b. Section 13.01(f) to allow the percentage of brick/stone to be less than 50% on the front elevation of the building.
2. Approval of any new barbed wire fencing by the Planning Commission noting that the barbed wire will be utilized on the new interior fence.
3. Black vinyl-coated chain link fencing to be used on the redevelopment area.
4. Any other items identified by the ARC committee being addressed during engineering/building review.

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

### **C. Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Animal/Agricultural**

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

- Ms. Maise apologized for being a few days late with these amendments to the commissioner's packets and appreciates them looking at them electronically. She and the city attorney, Steve Hitchcock, are working very hard on these and they are continuously finding new information. There are a lot of different ways that different communities are managing both animals and agricultural uses.
- Ms. Maise stated that she relied on Mr. Hitchcock for the farm oriented things. He did a great job at clarifying the difference between right to farm activities and agricultural activities. The state exempts certain activities under the right to farm act however, as described in the definitions, the City can regulate agricultural activities though. She referred to the Schedule of Uses provided to the commissioners to review. In residential districts we allow agricultural activity. Those that are not covered by the right to farm act are just accessory uses, for example.
- Ms. Maise noted that the 5 acre minimum requirement for a farm was removed in residential districts because there are some people who are doing urban farming as it is becoming very popular and as an accessory use it was found to be acceptable. In the Industrial Districts though

a farm as a principal use is permitted. The intent is that if someone owns a piece of industrial property and not ready to develop it, this would allow someone to do agricultural activities. For example, there have been inquiries about raising livestock. While livestock may be appropriate in industrial, there have been some issues in the residential districts where the property size is not large enough.

- Standards for chickens were also tightened up and number allowed based on property size added. Overall, a chart was included that explains requirements for the various types of animal uses. Many of the standards are the same and however additional acreage requirements were included.
- Other standards were put in the Ordinance such as: you must be an occupant living on the property, it must be maintained for dust, drainage, etc. Many of the standards for setbacks are what is in place now. Also, a setback for storage areas for manure was added as well as provisions for dust and odor.
- Ms. Maise asked for direction on the keeping of bees. In doing the research both Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor seem communities that have looked at this. Ypsilanti has a very detailed ordinance in regards to bees and they require permits. We didn't think there was a need in our ordinance for permits since aside from that request a few years ago, there haven't been any inquiries. She and Mr. Hitchcock are still investigating this issue and it's likely it will get added to the Rural Estate District.
- Ms. Maise commented that regulations for stables and the keeping of horses need to be clarified since there is a difference between people wanting to board their own horses and people that want to have riding stables that are open to the public. Similar to kennels, there's the private aspect and the commercial side so if you want to allow this in the residential districts we probably need to require special land use approval so we can look at them on a case by case basis, checking lot sizes, for parking, etc. because they could be more of a commercial recreation use and in a residential district this might not be the most appropriate spot.
- Ms. Maise also discussed pet daycare. As discussed last month, it's being added to the allowed uses in the RC-District to accommodate those that are wanting to possibly combine it with park-n-fly or long-term parking with some kind of kennel use.
- Ms. Maise commented that in addition to the use regulation changes there are also some definitions and use district regulations that need to be amended including Article 17 that talks about all of our activities and where they go or what level of review they might have. She asked the board for any questions or thoughts they may have.
- Mr. Glotfelty mentioned that he had been speaking with different people in Washtenaw County and the City of Westland regarding chickens in the residential area. They don't allow roosters.
- Ms. Maise referred to footnote A in the draft language; the keeping of roosters shall be prohibited.
- Mr. McAnally commented that he doesn't like the idea of residential neighborhoods with bees. The houses are too close together and he believes that it should be kept to Rural Character Overlay or something with a little more acreage or space between homes. He also asked Ms. Maise if there was some notation about temporary signs in the ordinance to reference to all this.
- Ms. Maise replied yes, temporary signs require a sign permit and when the Sign Ordinance is amended this will be made clear. We need to make sure that temporary signs for roadside stands don't get out of control.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he didn't want one section over riding another.
- Ms. Maise stated that it was there and there are dimensional standards and the key is to not allow them in the right-of-way, making sure they are set back, not blocking site distance.

- Ms. Talon-Jemison stated that she too, like Mr. McAnally has an issue with the bees. If Washtenaw County and Ypsilanti feel the need to be as stringent as they are with the issue, maybe we need to look at the fact that they have already crossed that bridge in anticipation that it could be something that grows. So, instead of being reactive if it does grow, we should treat it as it probably will. Same with the horse stables, if this is something that is going to border commercial we should probably just treat it as commercial and not put it in commercial so that we don't have to revisit it later and change ordinances. She would be cautious to just anticipate growth because hopefully we will be experiencing growth in the city so we should be prepared for it.

Ms. Freitag opened the public portion of the meeting to anyone wishing to speak on the matter. Seeing no one, Ms. Freitag closed the public portion of the meeting.

Motion by Prybyla supported by McAnally to recommend to City Council approval of the Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance – Animal/Agricultural. Tables 3.02, 6.02, 7.02, 8.02; Schedule of Uses, Animal/Agricultural, Article 11, 11.15; Animal/Agricultural and Appendix A; Table of Uses by District. Ayes – Prybyla, McAnally, Frederick, Zilka, Roscoe, Paul, Glotfelty, Talon-Jemison and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

#### 9. PC-Cases Involving Advice from the Planning Commission

- Ms. Maise noted that Logos Logistics may be coming back and the commissioner may see it again for some changes to the approved site plan.
- Ms. Maise also commented that Jimmy John's has been talking about possibly changing some material on the building. The Commissioners recommended that the applicant come back to get approvals from the Planning Commission.

#### 10. Reports

##### A. Chairperson

1. Ms. Freitag wished everyone a Happy Easter.

##### B. City Planner

##### 1. Planning Department Status Report

- Ms. Maise noted that there may be a gas station coming next month and a public hearing will be necessary. She also informed the Planning Commission that an ARC meeting is scheduled for next week for a temporary use for the Wayne County Airport Authority regarding a project to reconstruct an airport runway.

##### 2. Coal Tar-based Sealcoat

- Marcus McNamara stated that the commissioners received a cover letter in their packets with some supporting information from David Wellston; Van Buren Twp Environmental Board, related to the coal tar-based sealers. Ms. Maise asked OHM, DPW and Building to take a look at this.

- Mr. McNamara commented that he thinks the letter does a good job in summarizing but the tricky part will be the enforcing. Driveway sealing is not something that will be a permitting activity as far as the Building Department is concerned. One question would be is if you are going to restrict something, how does enforcement work if it's something that is not a permit activity in the first place. Maybe it needs to be or maybe something else needs to change. He has been talking to Bob and Roberto about how we could potentially handle that. The educational side of this coal tar-based study shows that it is a real thing, it is legitimate. The Huron River Water Shed Council has a flyer showing the hazards and that city is obviously a member. The City could make several copies of that and have it as an informational piece for the public at City Hall or the Library. They would recommend to do that to get the word out but as far as officially having an ordinance to restrict it or not, he would suggest bringing other departments in so that we may discuss it some more.
- Ms. Freitag replied that the hardest part would be how to regulate it in the residential areas.
- Mr. McNamara commented that was what he meant since this is not a permitting activity, you don't need a permit to do it now.
- Ms. Freitag stated that this is where you have that run-off going into the sewers. She read the article and it was very eye-opening.
- Mr. McNamara noted that there are other communities that have passed similar ordinances. This is not something that is going away but, we want to take a closer look at what the most appropriate action is.
- Mr. McAnally asked Mr. McNamara if the EPA or DEQ has anything out there on the government side, State and Federal for regulating.
- Mr. McNamara replied that there are other municipal agencies that have banned or restricted the use. Whether the EPA has published anything, he doesn't know.
- Mr. McAnally suggested that if they regulated something it would all come down hill for everyone else. Then we could stop it.
- Mr. McNamara replied that's a good point because often times things like this or an action from another government agency would have more impact on the industry, it might be a more appropriate way for Romulus to have a more local ordinance.
- Mr. McAnally stated that it seemed to him that we can have the City Council make a resolution and we could piggy-back our concurrence on something like that and send something on both to our state and federal legislatures.
- Ms. Freitag suggested that the letter that Mr. Wilson sent out was what he was doing, he was asking for support and resolutions from cities.
- Mr. Prybyla asked Mr. McNamara if he had contacted any contractors who use black top. Most of the black top people use sealants. He was just wondering if we contacted any that may be registered in our community to notify them of this particular product.
- Mr. McNamara replied that he has personally not done that but, he believes that the DPW has.
- Ms. Freitag noted that if other communities are banning the use of coal tar tan they have to use something else if they want to do business in those communities.

- Mr. McNamara stated that there are other products out there for use, it wouldn't be banning or putting an asphalt company out of business, it would just be one particular material.

11. Reports on Interest Designation

- Ms. Roscoe wished everyone a good holiday weekend.
- Ms. Roscoe announced upcoming city events.

12. Communications

A. Notice of Intent to Prepare a Master Plan Amendment – City of Romulus

- Ms. Maise referenced the correspondence sent to surrounding communities notifying them of the Planning Commission's intent to prepare a master plan amendment. Her hope is that she has something for the Planning Commission to start looking at next month on the Master Plan.

13. Adjournment

Motion by Prybyla supported by Zilka to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Prybyla, Zilka, Roscoe, McAnally, Paul, Glotfelty, Talon-Jemison, Frederick & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

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

Michael Prybyla, Secretary  
City of Romulus Planning Commission

cw