

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2014**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Freitag at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call Showing: Michael Glotfelty, Diane Banks-Lambert, Daniel McAnally, David Paul, Michael Prybyla, Celeste Roscoe, Melvin Zilka and Cathy Freitag  
Unexcused: Byron Butler  
  
Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner; Robert McCraight, Director Pubic Services; and Linda McNeil, Senior Secretary
3. Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, McAnally, Lambert, Roscoe, Prybyla, Paul, Glotfelty, and Freitag. Nays – none. Motion Carried.

Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, April 21, 2014.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
6. Public Hearings
  - A. PC-2014-009/010; Apex Structural Innovations LLC, 14011 Harrison, requesting SLU/SPR approval for the outdoor storage of lumber and finished lumber products located on the east side of Harrison between Northline and Eureka Roads. Parcel # 82-80-100-99-0001-001. Zoning: M-1 Light Industrial District. (Action required: Make recommendation on the SLU to City Council and take action on site plan.)
7. Old Business
  - A. PC-2014-004; United Tank Trailer Driveway (10200 Harrison), requesting sketch plan approval for a new driveway and outdoor storage area located on 1.4+-on the west side of Harrison Road between Hildebrandt and Goddard Roads. Parcel # 82-80-051-99-0001-003. Zoning: MT- Industrial Transportation. (Action required: Remove from table and take action on sketch plan.)
8. New Business
9. Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission
10. Reports
  - A. Chairperson

## B. City Planner

### 1. Planning Department Status Report

11. Election of Officers

12. Reports on Interest Designation

13. Communications

14. Adjournment

4. Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, April 21, 2014. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Glotfelty, Paul, Lambert, Zilka, Roscoe and Freitag. Nays – None. Abstain – Prybyla. Motion carried.

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

6. Public Hearings

A. PC-2014-009/010; Apex Structural Innovations LLC, 14011 Harrison, requesting SLU/SPR approval for the outdoor storage of lumber and finished lumber products located on the east side of Harrison between Northline and Eureka Roads. Parcel # 82-80-100-99-0001-001. Zoning: M-1 Light Industrial District. (Action required: Make recommendation on the SLU to City Council and take action on site plan.)

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting for discussion and comments from the petitioner.

Cameron McCausland, Plante Moran, came forward representing the applicant.

- Ms. Maise explained that this petition is for the re-occupancy of an existing building in an M-1 District and because of the amount outdoor storage that is needed, special land use approval is required. The existing site conditions were not apparent when the special land use application was first submitted. The applicant knew there was a risk in scheduling a public hearing without a site plan being submitted and unfortunately there was not time to revise the plan prior to the meeting. The review letters note many outstanding items and tabling this site plan is recommended. The petitioner is prepared to answer any questions and while they do have a revised plan ready to resubmit, it will be presented for informational purposes only since it still must be reviewed by ARC.
- Mr. McCausland started with an overview of the project and stated they are prepared to answer any questions with regards to the submission. The outdoor storage is existing crushed gravel and he believes it has been such since the onset of the building development several decades ago and had been used by the previous tenant for outdoor storage of a different product. One of the concerns that needs to be addressed is the low spots in the gravel storage yard. Finished and raw lumber products will be stored there and those spots will need to be brought up to grade with 21AA crushed aggregate which is frequently used. The current drainage will be maintained. The entire site has been shot for grade and it appears to be very well graded and drains to southeast as well as to the north to an existing drainage swale. It is actually crowned very well with the exception of a few low spots that the petitioner is

proposing to fill as needed but that it is not as substantial as it appears due to the vegetation that has grown through due to a lack of usage. Weed control will handle this.

- Mr. McCausland continued by noting that the petitioner is proposing to use a dust fighter that will be sprayed on the site aggregate so that any dust will not kick up and go to any of the neighboring properties. The Dust Fyghter LN100 is a natural produced material that is not oil-based and it will not environmentally impact the site. Once in place, the gravel will be graded and compacted which will prevent any dust from exiting the site. Pictures of the site were shown that included the low spots in the existing gravel area which are currently water puddles due to a heavy rain but they are proposed to be filled with the crushed aggregate, graded and compacted. The next picture illustrated the fence and vegetation at the east property line and the northeast corner of the property and he stated that the vegetation has grown primarily due to the drainage swale that runs along the east property line. The following picture illustrated the fire lane on the north side of the property from both the east and west and he stated that the existing lean-to is proposed to be removed primarily for the installation of new asphalt on the entire north side of the property for fire truck access to circulate through the property. The next picture shows the view of the south side of the property including the ponding that has occurred due to the installation of a concrete drive that prevents the water from entering the existing swale and properly drain to the east. The proposal is to relocate the existing downspout to the other side of the drive which will eliminate the water concerns on an ongoing basis.
- Mr. McCausland explained that the next picture illustrated the view from the back of the property looking to the west showing the rear of the building and the gravel area that is properly graded but vegetated due to a lack of use. Once this area is sprayed along with the high-low traffic and the material storage that will be stored in that area, he stated that there should be no vegetation in the future. The following picture showed the way that the raw and finished materials will be stacked. The storage will be in the center of the site and will stay within the twenty (20)-foot height restriction. There were concerns with regards to the view from Five M Center Drive and the picture illustrates the view which will in fact be neatly stacked lumber.
- Mr. McCausland reported that the revised plan is ready to be submitted and all the setbacks have been revised to comply with the fifty (50) foot setback along with the fire circulation plan. The landscape plan addresses all the supplemental plantings for the front of the building which will provide screening in several areas, both in the front of the building and parking area as proposed. All truck traffic will be during the daylight hours and will be for the pick-up of the finished building trusses. There will be no nighttime traffic related to that. The finished product is relatively light-duty stuff that is utilized for residential construction and it will be stacked very neat and orderly. All construction/production is done inside the building and the finished product will be exited out of the south side through a very large overhead door avoiding the front and north side of the building.
- With regards to the environmental impact Mr. McCausland explained that the wood product is chemical free and the drainage was confirmed through the new topography that the petitioner just had done last week. Most of the activity will be on the east and south sides of the building which is out of site of Harrison Road and it will be two (2) lots away from Five M Center Drive. The on-going maintenance of a 30,000-pound high-low moving product around and loading onto semi-trucks is why the petitioner is proposing to keep the storage area as gravel due to the fact that a hard surface would not hold up to the constant wear and tear of the type of vehicles utilized on this site. Also, from a public safety standpoint there is a fire hydrant on the south side of the building that needs a riser of eighteen (18) inches and the petitioner is proposing to install that riser. With regards to the setbacks and greenbelt the revised site plan shows compliance with the fifty (50) foot setback to the north, ten (10) feet

to both the east and the south. They will meet the maximum height restriction of twenty (20) feet on the raw unfinished product and have confirmed through the topography the positive site drainage direction going away from the outdoor storage area, and most likely in compliance with a previous site plan that allowed the property to drain to the south, east and north. The loading and unloading will be restricted to the south and east side of the building and the existing front overhead door, which fronts Harrison Road, will remain closed and is not intended to be used at all. The revised site plan accounts for all the setbacks, truck traffic and the fire lane that circulates the entire property. The petitioner intends to make payment in lieu of the installation of the sidewalk as there is little to no pedestrian traffic down Harrison Road and they will maintain the north driveway, fixing all the asphalt and making sure the fence is accessible to ensure efficient truck maneuvering and emergency circulation.

- Mr. McCausland thanked the City for their time and consideration and stated that he has pictures of the site to show to the Planning Commission. The pictures illustrated the north drive that is not in good condition as there is a lot of vegetation growing through and the petitioner intends to fix that. He pointed out the lean-to that will be removed, the fence to the north that is adjacent to the residential property and a lot of mature trees, the Buck's building to the north, the fencing to the west that the petitioner will maintain for security purposes, along with low voltage communication lines that will be removed, the new piece of concrete that is preventing the swale from draining as it should be, the downspout that will be relocated to allow the water to drain through the swale, the swale that exists between the two buildings, trees on the adjacent property to the north showing there is no need for additional landscaping and the swale at the east parking line that also shows there is no need for additional landscaping as it will only interrupt the flow of the swale. He finished by presenting the site plan which shows the setbacks and the fire lane that circulates the entire property and the existing swale. The outdoor storage area will be compacted and all vegetation removed prior to the storage of the raw and finished materials and will not exceed the twenty (20) foot height limitations. The petitioner intends to comply with all the requirements with regards to the landscaping along the front of the building and parking area as well as along the north property line.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether Apex is an existing company that is moving or expanding to the City of Romulus or is this is a new start-up company.
- Mr. McCausland answered that this is a new venture and that the principals that are involved are twenty plus year veterans in this industry.
- Ms. Freitag asked whether they are currently associated with other companies.
- Mr. McCausland replied that they are currently associated with other companies.
- Ms. Freitag noted that it is a new start-up company.
- Mr. McCausland reaffirmed that yes this is a new start-up company for them.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the entire north side of the building would be asphalt.
- Mr. McCausland answered yes.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether there would be asphalt wherever there is parking.
- Mr. McCausland stated that there is no intention for parking on the north side of the building since the north side of the building is for fire trucks and emergency access and circulation only.
- Ms. Freitag inquired if the back portion of the property would remain gravel.
- Mr. McCausland answered yes.
- Ms. Freitag noted that according to the reports, that gravel is in disrepair and it is her understanding that the petitioner only intends to fill in the low spots.
- Mr. McCausland replied that the petitioner shot elevations primarily for drainage purposes and as the pictures show there are very few low spots that are primarily where you have

exited off the asphalt and on to the gravel which creates a depression where water will stand. With exception of those couple spots, the elevations show that the site is draining properly at the elevations that it should be. He finished by saying that what you are seeing is vegetation that is growing up because of non usage.

- Ms. Freitag commented that the City is very concerned about aerial elevations due to the large amount of air traffic over Romulus and this property is a representation of Romulus. She noted that the FedEx property adjacent to the petitioner's property is very nice and neat and tidy and the proposed property looks like a mess as it is right now.
- Mr. McCausland replied that it is because the building is unoccupied.
- Ms. Freitag stated she has a concern that only the low areas in the storage area will be filled in with the gravel.
- Mr. McCausland stated that they intend to get rid of the vegetation and it will not grow back when there are thirty-thousand ton vehicles running over the top of it along with the product that will be sitting on top of it. The top of the storage area will be dusted off so dust does not arise off when vehicles travel back and forth. The result will effectively be the same quality as a paved material. He believes it would more difficult to maintain a paved surface because of the size of the vehicle that will break the material up.
- Ms. Freitag mentioned that she can appreciate that they deal a lot with requests for outdoor storage for heavy equipment and such. She asked about the picture that showed everything stored in nice orderly rows.
- Mr. McCausland answered that is what is intended.
- Mr. McCraight expressed his concerns with the existing indentations and wondered what further damage may be caused with additional wear and tear. He questioned whether there have been any excavations to determine the thickness of the existing gravel on site now as some of it looks like broken asphalt and some of it looks like gravel.
- Mr. McCausland responded that they have not done any cores or anything to that effect and based on aerial photography, the property had been used previously for storing heavy machinery and parts. They believe what is there is more than adequate and because the wood structures are so long, they are not going to create a heavy load on the asphalt. He finished by saying that the petitioner realizes there will be ongoing maintenance as needed, as they would not want their product sitting in water.
- Mr. McCraight stated that the lumber was not his concern but rather the impact of the high-low with regards to further ruts.
- Mr. McCausland stated that either way it will be an on-going issue with regards to maintenance whether it be asphalt or in this case gravel. There will be holes created in the gravel from the high-low and the petitioner intends to fix those on an on-going basis.
- Ms. Maise followed-up on Mr. McCraight's concerns and noted that there was never an approval or Certificate of Occupancy issued for the previous tenant. She showed the Commission an aerial photo from approximately five years ago when heavy industrial equipment was stored there however it was never approved. Had the request for storage been reviewed they would have checked for things like drainage and condition of the surface and that is why the engineer had so many comments in his report wanting the information that needs to be provided.
- Mr. Paul stated that he would think the applicant would want core samples so that he knows what is there. He questioned where the swale drains to as they do not want the neighbor to the north to be flooded out.
- Mr. McCausland responded that the engineer has looked at it and believes the swale drains to the north.

- Mr. Paul questioned where to the north and does it flood out the neighbor to the north. He noted that there is some bad asphalt on the south side of the building as well and he questioned the condition of it and whether that would be taken care of.
- Mr. McCausland answered that the south side has some spider cracking but that he believes it is serviceable for the operation and does not believe it is in need of fixing. If it is in need of repair they will fix it but the north side is indeed bad and will be fixed.
- Mr. Paul mentioned that another concern he has is with the use of saws as he believes this will be a noisy operation.
- Mr. McCausland responded that all work will be done inside the building.
- Mr. Paul commented that the doors will be opened during the summer months and the reason he knows this is because there have been problems with this site before with regards to the noise. It affected the neighbors and that is why the fence was installed. The back-up alarm on the high-low will not be pleasant sound for the adjacent homeowner especially since the business will be open until midnight.
- Mr. McCausland answered that they will not be utilizing any of the overhead doors except the ones located on the east and south sides of the building.
- Mr. Paul questioned whether there is an overhead door located on the north side of the building.
- Mr. McCausland answered that they do not intend to use any of the doors located on the north side of the building.
- Mr. Paul noted that when it gets warm the employees open the doors as we have had this problem before.
- Mr. McCausland stated that he cannot speak to that issue because he does not know if it is an issue or not.
- Mr. Paul replied that noise associated with the open overhead door on the north side of the building is a concern that he has along with the drainage. He noted that the owners may know more than Mr. McCausland as it is not his company.
- Mr. McCausland stated that he knows a lot about it.
- Mr. Paul restated that he has concerns about the noise from saws working at night along with the staple/nail guns.
- Mr. McCausland responded, with no disrespect but if they were not asking for special land use approval for the outside storage they would be able to utilize the building for the purpose of utilizing the saws and such regardless of the concerns.
- Mr. Paul cautioned that if there is a problem with noise, with City will hear from the neighbors.
- Mr. McCausland replied that he understands that however the petitioner is cognizant of the neighbor to the north with the landscaping that is proposed to the north. He noted that unfortunately this is an industrial building next to a residence and it will be hard to be one hundred percent soundproof.
- Mr. Paul reiterated that he has concerns with the back-up alarm on the high-low as that can be very annoying at midnight. Many of the other items will be dealt with during site plan review.
- Mr. McCausland noted that his clients have expressed to him that all work will be completed inside the building and that it is not a noisy operation but rather it entails lasers hanging from the ceiling that line everything up in a jig in angles and sizes. Thankfully the residential construction is back at that is why this applicant is before you this evening. He stated that they are losing dollars every day that they are not operational.
- Mr. Paul stated that these are his concerns.
- Mr. McCausland acknowledged that Mr. Paul's point is well taken and that they will address his concerns as best they can.

- Mr. Prybyla questioned whether the product in the outside storage area would be moved around with a high-low.
- Mr. McCausland answered yes.
- Mr. Prybyla asked where the trucks would be loaded.
- Mr. McCausland replied that trucks would be loaded in the drive lane at the rear of the building out of site from Harrison Road.
- Mr. Prybyla stated that the plans indicate that the trucks would be loaded on the fire access road.
- Mr. McCausland responded that it would be in front of the fire access road and showed Mr. Prybyla on the site plan.
- Mr. Prybyla questioned whether the product would be distributed from the door on the south end of the building and not the north end.
- Mr. McCausland answered that the fire access road will sometimes have truck traffic however it is primarily for emergency purposes. Trucks will be crossing the fire lane from time to time to exit the property.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he also has concerns with the noise along with the dust and he questioned what would be utilized to control the dust.
- Mr. McCausland answered that they will be utilizing the product that he mentioned at the beginning of his presentation.
- Mr. Zilka asked whether the product is liquid.
- Mr. McCausland replied that it is a liquid that solidifies the dust and it is used on a lot of the local dirt roads.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the high-lows running back and forth over it will disrupt the product and if Mr. McCausland has been around high-lows.
- Mr. McCausland answered that he's been around high-lows all his life.
- Mr. Zilka asked whether he has seen a high-low tear up an area like the proposed site.
- Mr. McCausland replied that it is a large high-low that has balloon tires, not a hard tire and that it will not be a one-time application. They believe the application will last several months but will be reapplied as needed as they see the dust coming up as it will not be good for their operation.
- Mr. Zilka clarified that the applicant will reapply the dust control as needed even if it is two or three times a week.
- Mr. McCausland answered yes, not only in relation to the dust control but with the grading, filling of the holes or anything of that nature.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he also has concerns with regards to the noise and suggested that should the neighbors complain, the applicant may have to cut the hours of operation.
- Mr. McCausland answered that he cannot speak to that other than all operations will be contained to the inside of the building and there will be no activity outside. He noted that Fed Ex has vehicles going in and out of the building as well and this is pretty much the same type of operation with even less vehicles.
- Mr. Zilka mentioned that he believes that they may need to put a condition on the approval of the site plan that if the neighbors complain, the applicant will have to cut the hours of operation.
- Mr. McCausland responded that one thing that he would like to point out on the site plan is that the residence to the north is several hundred feet from the industrial building and is blocked by forty-foot trees and an eight-foot tall privacy fence. He believes they have proper screening outside as well as proper insulation related to the interior of the building where the cutting will be going on and that there will only be truck and high-low traffic on the exterior of the building.

- Mr. Zilka stated again that if the neighbors complain they will probably have to do something about the noise. He also asked whether Mr. McCausland could tell the Planning Commission who the owners of this operation will be.
- Mr. McCausland answered that he cannot.
- Mr. Zilka questioned why.
- Mr. McCausland replied that they are currently in the industry and confidentiality is of the utmost importance right now. He can tell the Planning Commission that they are veterans of the industry for several years and have a high confidence in this business opportunity due to the rebuilding of southeast Michigan and a high desire for this building product. They are very well funded and believe they will be very successful.
- Ms. Freitag guessed that they are working for company currently and are planning on leaving and do not want their employer to know.
- Mr. McAnally asked if the parking lot on the south side of the building is a shared parking lot or dedicated solely to the applicant.
- Mr. McCausland answered that it is solely dedicated to the applicant and that the adjacent property has quite a bit of parking right on the corner of Five-M Drive as well as in front of their building and it is not a highly manned operation. Apex will only have a crew of thirteen employees on a per shift basis.
- Mr. McAnally questioned Mr. McCraight whether there is a requirement as to how the gravel is compacted.
- Mr. McCraight answered that there currently is not but through research and conversation with the City Engineer about industry standards, a prepared base with a six (6) inch 21AA would be adequate. That is why he questioned if excavation has been done to determine the thickness of what is existing.
- Mr. McAnally questioned if there is any way to verify if what they have existing is adequate.
- Mr. McCraight answered no and stated there is nothing in the engineering standards to determine how much to install so that is why they talked about industry standards and spoke to other individuals who have experience.
- Mr. McAnally stated that since we do not know what they have on the existing site are we talking about adding a little to the top of what is already there.
- Mr. McCausland replied there are no specifications.
- Ms. Maise explained that the City Engineer, Fire Chief, DPW Director and Mr. McCraight all had concern since it is not known what is there currently there. Just adding gravel to the holes might not be to a standard that they find acceptable.
- Mr. McCraight stated that they would recommend a prepared surface and a six (6) inch base. Core samples of a couple different areas should be taken to determine what is out there, whether it be two inches of broken concrete or a foot of fill that was unapproved back in the day. He finished by saying that without a core sample we have no idea what is out there.
- Mr. McCausland replied that they could definitely go out and do that and it would probably behoove them to do that. He feels because of the previous uses, that they are confident in the product surface that is there. He clarified that the applicant only intends to fill in the low spots that are existing. He suggested that the Commission keep in mind that keeping in mind they currently have gravel which is a porous surface which allows drainage through it as opposed to asphalt which would cause a major problem as it relates to the flow off of that property and by keeping this product they are reducing that issue.
- Mr. Paul explained that the water is going somewhere once it hits the swale and he questions where that is.
- Mr. McAnally asked if the applicant is agreeable to doing the core sample.

- Mr. McCausland answered that they will do it but stated that they would not be held to a specification that does not exist.
- Mr. McCraight stated that if he finds the specifications within the industry standards, he is willing to work with the applicant. The lightest side of the standard is three (3) inches with the highest side being eight (8) inches depending on the use. The City Engineer felt comfortable with six (6) inches at this point and the applicant may have that but at this point we do not know.
- Mr. McCausland stated that he does not want to be difficult but if there is no specification than there is no specification. He finished by saying that the applicant needs it for operational purposes.
- Ms. Maise noted that a hard surface is required and that the applicant is requesting a waiver to that requirement.
- Mr. McCausland replied that the applicant is in agreement to doing a core sample to make sure everyone is very satisfied with the existing condition. His concern is that they are being held to a standard that is greater than the intention here and he does not want to be held to an airport standard for something that is not going to be required.
- Ms. Maise explained that the City is very reasonable in that regard and hence the ability to ask for a waiver. In order for the Planning Commission to grant the waiver, supporting documentation from the applicant is needed. The City Engineer along with the Fire Chief and Building Director all work together to come up with a recommendation for the waiver.
- Mr. McCausland stated that he knows how it works as he has been through many of these but the applicant can't wait another thirty (30) days for a core sample and he thinks this can be a condition of approval.
- Ms. Maise noted that the plan is not approvable at this point and the next meeting will be on July 21st. She asked if this is a reasonable amount of time to get the core sample done.
- Mr. McCausland stated that he thinks that would be reasonable.
- Ms. Freitag said that based on what the Planning Commission saw this evening the plan cannot be approved.
- Mr. McCausland mentioned that the revised plan they have this evening has addressed all the items brought up during the review.
- Ms. Maise replied that any time a waiver is being requested, the Planning Commission has to have a report from the city engineer and the current reports are requesting a lot more information. City policy is that the site plan review reports are provided and the plans get revised accordingly. Revised plans will have to be reviewed by the engineer before the Planning Commission can move forward. Typically plans with this many outstanding items are revised prior to coming to the Planning Commission however because of the applicant's time frame a public hearing was scheduled prior to plans being complete.

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

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting up to comments from the public and asked if anyone wished to speak on this matter.

- Rick Johnson, 13905 & 13857 Harrison came forward and stated that his father lives to the north of the subject site and still operates a farm in the rear of the property. His father's biggest concern is that they continue to keep the emergency and fire access on the north side of the property. They have no problem with a small business occupying the site but suggested that a gate be installed at the north entrance off Harrison Road. The other concern that they have is noise due to past tenants parking on the north side of

the building along with trucks being loaded on that side as well as fowl language being used as his parents are very religious people. He suggested that no work be allowed on the north side. If the applicant is intending to remove the addition on the north side he suggested closing off the north overhead door and just have pedestrian doors in case of an emergency. That would assure that the overhead door is not opened or utilized during the summer months.

- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the north door was being utilized.
- Mr. Johnson answered yes and stated that they were loading trucks there and the fowl language was an issue. He suggested that the noise level on the north side of the building be kept to a minimum and that the fork lift's utilizing the northeast entrance could be an issue with their back-up alarms as he has been around high-lows for thirty five years as well and suggested that if the loading were done on the southeast corner the noise would not be a factor. He also is concerned with the product being stored outside during the winter months and questioned whether it would be tarped or not. He also suggested that if the petitioner moves to a larger location that they would be required to post a bond to ensure the clean-up of the subject site of any wood product that is left behind due to the fact that there is an abandoned site on Middlebelt Road that is a mess. He questioned what type of ventilation system would be utilized due to dust that would be caused from the saw cutting and questioned whether there would be fire suppression installed for emergency purposes as a fire could spread very quickly. With regards to drainage there is a large county ditch that runs east and west that drains off to Inkster Road and they have never had any issues with any type of flooding and that he does not see anything that the petitioner is proposing that would cause any type of flooding issue going forward. He stated that the main problem with loading the trucks on the gravel will be in the spring when the ground is thawing and he suggested checking with MIOSHA for the load limits on the high-lows with regards to loading on the gravel storage area. He finished by saying that he hopes that the petitioner is granted approval and is successful as he is in support of the small businesses coming to Romulus.
- Mr. Prybyla questioned what gate Mr. Johnson was referring to on the north end of the property.
- Mr. Johnson answered that on the north side of the property that exits onto Harrison Road there is about thirty or forty feet between the fence line and the north side of the building that used to have a gate. The city restricted access to that gate for fire and emergency use only and when Tower occupied the building they removed the gate and put in a solid chain link fence all along the front.
- Ms. Freitag questioned what Mr. Johnson is suggesting with regards to that.
- Mr. Johnson answered that there needs to be a gate there for emergency purposes.
- Mr. Prybyla stated that he is sure that the Fire Chief will have comments regarding that.
- Ms. Freitag questioned Mr. Johnson as to whether the wood privacy fence is adequate.
- Mr. Johnson answered that it was installed in the early 70's or 80's when one of the first contractor's occupied the building.
- Ms. Freitag questioned what shape it is in.
- Mr. Johnson answered that it is in pretty poor shape and leans to the north but that there is a ton of vegetation along that north property line. It is old but that looks solid but that he is willing to bet that the posts are rotted underground as it has been there for years and years and years.

Chairperson Freitag closed the public comments portion of the meeting and opened the meeting up to additional questions from the commissioners.

- Ms. Freitag stated that Mr. Johnson brought up some very valid points, some of which the petitioner has already addressed, but questioned Mr. McCausland as to the plan for the utilization of the north overhead door and whether it would be kept closed.
- Mr. McCausland answered that it is not intended to be utilized for any activity as it relates to loading or unloading as that will be done to the east and south side of the building.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the north side would be utilized as an access drive only.
- Mr. McCausland stated that there is an overhead door there but that it is not intended to be used for operational purposes and that he cannot speak as to whether it will be opened for air circulation. It will not be used actively as it relates to the flow of the operation.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether an exhaust system would be utilized inside the building for dust control.
- Mr. McCausland answered that he is not sure what that would entail.
- Ms. Freitag stated that she would think that that would be an OISHA regulation to take care of the dust.
- Mr. McCraight replied that the building code speaks to that.
- Mr. McCausland said that they will be utilizing all radiant heat so that there will be no gas fired or open flame units used for this operation and there will be no air conditioning in the building.
- Mr. Paul commented that he would like to see the north overhead door closed permanently because he knows what is going to happen.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether it is required that they have an access door for emergencies on that side of the building.
- Mr. Paul stated that they should have a pedestrian door on that side of the building.
- Mr. McCraight stated that they would have to look at the code with regards to distances for egress.

Motion by Prybyla supported by Lambert to recommend to the Romulus City Council special land use approval for PC-2014-009; Apex Structural Innovations Outdoor Storage at 14011 Harrison based upon the finding that the proposed outdoor storage area is consistent with the Master Plan, compliant with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and compatible with adjacent land uses; the proposed use will not negatively impact the environment, traffic or public services. This approval is subject to the following:

1. Review and approval of the site plan by the Planning Commission;
2. A waiver to the screen wall requirement; and
3. A waiver to the hard surface pavement and curbing requirement as determined by the City Engineer

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

Motion by McAnally supported by Paul to table PC-2014-010; Apex Structural Innovations Outdoor Storage at 14011 Harrison so that the site plan can be revised to address the items noted above and those in the reports of other departments and agencies.

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

## 7. Old Business

- A. PC-2014-004 United Tank Trailer Driveway (10200 Harrison), requesting site plan approval for a new driveway and outdoor storage area located on 1.4+-on the west side of Harrison Road between Hildebrandt and Goddard Roads. Parcel # 82-80-051-99-0001-003. Zoning: MT-Industrial Transportation. (Action required: Remove from table and take action on site plan.)

Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to remove PC-2014-004 United Tank Trailer from the table.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes - Zilka, McAnally, Lambert, Roscoe, Prybyla, Glotfelty, Paul & Freitag.  
Nays – None. Motion Carried

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting for discussion and comments from the petitioner.

Rich Garbacik & Dave Brier, United Tank Trailer came forward as the petitioners.

- Ms. Maise reported that last month there was a lot of concern regarding the condition of the site as well as the note on the site plan that stated that there would be no outdoor storage. The petitioner was required to come before Planning Commission due to the proposed driveway. Had they not proposed the new driveway this would have been a simple re-occupancy handled through the Building Department. As the review proceeded, it became apparent that outdoor storage was also being proposed. This is an older site that we don't have much history on and there is no certificate of occupancy on the property. There is also no approved site plan on file to see how the property was approved and developed. Assessor Office records indicate only 2,000 square feet of hard surface (asphalt) and they explained that the remainder of the site, while at one time may have included pavement, currently has no value in that regard. In addition to the proposed driveway, the amount of outdoor storage that is being proposed also requires review and approval by the Planning Commission. It appears that improvements done in the past along with past use were never approved.
- Ms. Maise continued and noted that the good news is that since the last meeting the petitioner has revised the plans and gotten the cross section detail of the asphalt millings which has been reviewed by the Building Department, DPW, City Engineer as well as the Fire Chief and they have determined that the portion of the plan that is parking, the front portion, will need to be a hard surface which is a requirement of the Ordinance. The City has found that the proposed asphalt millings are acceptable for the back portion where the outdoor storage is proposed. She referred to the site plan and told the Commissioners to simply draw a line at the back of the building and everything to the side of the building will be a hard surface and the back would be the asphalt millings detail that they show on the plan. The plan also shows that the setbacks meet the requirements and they are adding some additional landscaping that brings this closer to meeting the greenbelt requirements. She finished by saying that we are getting very close here with getting this plan cleaned up and turned it over to Mr. McCraight for any additional comments.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the applicant has received a copy of the planner's report and whether they had any problems with the issues addressed here this evening.
- The applicants answered no and stated that they have no problem with the issues.

- Ms. Maise commented that the applicants have met with Mr. Keyes since the previous meeting as well as reviewing the issues with staff.
- Mr. McCraight said that with regard to the interpretation of the newer millings, which are a product that is being utilized more and more, that in an effort to use existing materials we had OHM write a standard form with what they wanted to see. The existing hard surface for parking will be repaired/replaced and the millings for the outdoor storage area will be installed in accordance with OHM's recommendation.
- Ms. Maise referred to Marcus' report and noted that he does have a list of items, however it is her understanding in talking with him that he was fine with those items being handled during the construction review. This may look overwhelming but he (Marcus) does need some additional information regarding the grading and storm water to make sure that the site does not drain onto the adjacent property.
- Ms. Freitag noted that it looked like the Planning Commission will be granting a lot of waivers.
- Ms. Maise replied that again this is an existing, non-conforming site and many of these things were not requirements back when this building was built. The ordinance addresses situations like this and the level of compliance is determined per the ordinance.
- Mr. Glotfelty mentioned that as discussed at the previous meeting, he is not comfortable with the use of a twelve (12) inch corrugated metal pipe as the trucks will destroy it. He was hoping to see the applicant's use a piece of concrete piping.
- Mr. Brier replied that they can do that and that it's not an issue for them. They expressed that to the architect and didn't realize it was not on the plan, but they can utilize a piece of concrete and that is not a problem.
- Ms. Freitag said that maybe the architect overlooked it when revising the plan.
- Mr. Brier stated that he thought the architect thought they meant crush proof.
- Mr. Glotfelty explained that when the trucks run over the metal piping they will destroy it.
- Mr. Brier responded that it is fine that they are just trying to get the business operational and will do whatever the Planning Commission wants within reason.
- Mr. Garbacik stated that the doors will not be installed for another year or so if the Planning Commission wanted to put a condition on that.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he wants the applicants to be successful but that he has a real problem with the asphalt millings and would really like to see them utilize 21AA stone. The asphalt millings will be a constant maintenance issue whereas the 21AA stone once installed will allow drainage and harden up almost like concrete.
- Mr. Garbacik replied that they have taken care of lots like this before and their guys are on top of it and once you see it, although it is in shambles right now because they can't do anything with it, you will not be disappointed in how they upkeep the lot.
- Mr. Glotfelty noted that he has worked in a lot of communities where they do not allow the millings at all except as a base. He emphasized that once you start plowing for snow they (the millings) push right out as they do not bind at all.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he disagrees with Mr. Glotfelty as he always has in regards to the millings. OHM engineers have indicated that we need to utilize the millings in some cases as they are becoming more and more available and there is nothing else that they can be utilized for. He finished by saying that OHM has approved the use of them and we are going to have to live with them the best that we can.
- Mr. Prybyla questioned how long the applicants have been at the proposed site.
- Mr. Brier answered that they have been working on this project for almost six months.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the applicant has received a temporary certificate of occupancy.

- Mr. Brier answered yes.
- Mr. Prybyla asked why the proposed site is such a mess with regards to the loading dock that is full of cinder blocks, doors and air conditioners and there is nothing on the plans addressing that.
- Mr. Garbacik responded that the site looks a lot better than it did when they purchased the property. There were over three hundred tires on site and they have done a minimum amount of work because they did not want the city to think they were operating without a certificate of occupancy but have done the bare minimum just to keep the business going. He finished by saying that they had to do some storage there due to some storage issues where they were previously located.
- Mr. Prybyla questioned whether they will be utilizing the dock once it is cleaned up.
- Mr. Garbacik answered no.
- Mr. Prybyla asked whether they intend to fill it in or leave it like it is.
- Mr. Garbacik replied that they do not have the typical truck deliveries that the dock would be utilized for.
- Mr. Prybyla questioned the status of the portable storage unit.
- Mr. Garbacik answered that it will be moved out of site of Harrison Road.
- Mr. Brier stated that they know it looks terrible and that not only is it driving them crazy but it is also driving their shop manager crazy as well.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether everything would be cleaned up after they receive their approval.
- Mr. Garbacik answered that everything will look good and that their shop guy had already ordered a loader and a dumpster and they made him send it back because they had not received approval from the city.
- Mr. McCraight stated in the applicant's that defense he had requested that they keep any site activity to minimum until they were in compliance.
- Mr. Garbacik noted that Tim Keyes came by last week and can vouch for the conditions of the interior of the building which will be the same standard by which the outside is maintained.
- Mr. Prybyla commented that he only saw the exterior.
- Mr. Paul said that it is his understanding that the petitioner is proposing asphalt to the rear of the building and millings beyond the rear of the building.
- Mr. Garbacik answered yes.
- Ms. Maise stated that in the review letters it is not that specific in that it only speaks about the parking area and the circulation and we determined today with Bob, Dave and Tim that from the rear building line east (parking lot) shall be hard surface and to the rear (storage area) shall be asphalt millings.
- Mr. Paul verified that everything from Harrison Road to the back of the building would be asphalt and to the rear of the building would be asphalt millings.
- Ms. Maise answered yes and stated that the plans need to be revised.
- Mr. Paul said that he has no problem with that if they get everything organized.

Motion by McAnally supported by Roscoe to approve to approve the sketch plan for PC-2014-004; United Tank Trailer at 10200 Harrison Road subject to:

1. Waivers to the following sections:
  - Section 14.06(c)(2) to allow two driveways with less than 300 feet of frontage where only one is allowed

- Section 14.06(e) to reduce the driveway spacing requirements from 245 feet (35 mph) to 124 feet
  - Section 11.17(b)(3) to the screen wall requirement since the adjacent land use is industrial
  - Section 11.17(b)(6) to the hard surface requirement and to allow standard ground millings due to the volume of truck traffic and weight of the trucks
  - Section 11.17(b)(7) to the curb requirement since a hard surface will not be provided
  - Section 11.17(b)(9) to the concrete apron requirement since a hard surface will not be provided
  - Section 13.06(a) to allow the trash receptacle in the side yard setback
  - Section 13.02(u)(10) to allow an alternative means of irrigation
2. Pavement (concrete or asphalt) of the parking and truck circulation areas.
  3. Payment in lieu of construction of sidewalk in an amount of \$3,600.00. This must be paid to the Planning Department prior to issuance of building or occupancy permit and noted on the sketch plan.
  4. Four (4) trees being added to the side greenbelts if it is determined that the existing trees are not on the applicant's property.
  5. Submittal of ten (10) copies of a revised site plan that will be reviewed administratively addressing the outstanding comments noted in this report and in the reports of the ARC committee.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes - McAnally, Roscoe, Zilka, Lambert, Prybyla, Glotfelty, Paul & Freitag.  
Nays – None. Motion Carried.

8. New Business- None.

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

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

- Ms. Freitag stated that she hopes all the fathers had a Happy Father's Day yesterday.

B. City Planner

- Ms. Maise stated that she will be happy to answer any questions with regards to her report and that the Planning Department has had a new submittal for the month of July for outdoor storage from HD Supply off Jay Kay Drive. If you remember they received approval about a year ago and they now want to expand into the area to the west.
- Ms. Freitag asked if they already received an approval for outdoor storage.
- Ms. Maise replied that she was correct and that they now need more storage area. The special land use application was received to get the public hearing published and the site plan will follow along with the ARC meeting with Steve Sorenson.

- Ms. Maise also noted that another site plan that Steve is working on may be submitted for the July meeting. She asked the Commissions to let her know if anyone will be away on vacation.
- Mr. Paul questioned the status of Aero Realty.
- Ms. Maise stated that she needs to add that to Bob's list of things to follow up on but that they were going to give them ninety days to submit engineer plans and the ninety days will be up in August so they will then need to determine what we need to do from there.
- Mr. McCraight noted that he and Carol sat down to determine a time from by which someone is not cooperating with the city and the ninety days seemed to be fair in taking some kind of action. Ms. Maise stated that the ninety day is approaching so he told her to send a memo stating such and he will issue a citation.
- Mr. Paul stated that the city has already had them in court.
- Mr. McCraight stated that it looks like we are headed in that direction again and will address the issue.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether Aero has a temporary certificate of occupancy.
- Mr. McCraight indicated no.
- Ms. Maise noted that they are clearly operating.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned the status of Jimmy John's.
- Ms. Maise answered that she had talked to them a couple months ago and the potential tenant really wanted another curb cut. They were going to be talking with the County. We are not sure what is holding them up at this point but that they were very excited to get going.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether Tim Horton's is tied up in flood mitigation.
- Ms. Maise answered yes.
- Mr. McAnally questioned whether the home adjacent to Upscale Warehouse is occupied or unoccupied.
- Mr. McCraight answered that it should not be occupied as there has been no certificate of occupancy issued. The owner lives in Chicago and there is no gas or water going to the property and we get calls every now and then and have to chase squatters out of there.
- Mr. McAnally questioned whether it was on the demolition list at one point.
- Mr. McCraight answered that it will be on the next list since it has lost its non-conforming status and has become a blight to the community.
- Ms. Maise questioned whether the commissioner's had a chance to visit Romulus Village as they are opening for business tomorrow.
- Ms. Freitag noted she drove by a couple days ago and a car drove in to get gas. She and Mr. Prybyla questioned if and when the old party store would be torn down.
- Mr. McCraight answered yes and stated that he has started the process by having the utilities cut and will start Phase II and III.
- Ms. Freitag said that he has turned that into a really nice corner and the gas station at Wayne and Wick Roads is coming along nicely as well.
- Ms. Lambert questioned the status of Candyland Academy.
- Ms. Maise answered that we have not heard and have tried to contact her with no response and will have the Building Department look into the status of the home occupation.
- Ms. Frietag remembered that she was approved by the Planning Commission in July of last year and questioned whether that plan is about to expire.
- Ms. Maise answered that she received a conditional approval and was required to submit revised plans. She technically does not have a finalized approval.
- Ms. Lambert questioned whether the petitioner purchased the subject building.
- Ms. Maise answered that she thought she purchased the building as well as the lot adjacent to it. She finished by saying that they will try following up with her again.

## 11. Election of Officers

Motion by Prybyla supported by Paul to re-elect Cathy Freitag, Chairperson and Diane Banks Lambert, Vice Chairperson and elect Daniel McAnally as Secretary.

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

## 12. Reports of Interest Designation

- Ms. Roscoe stated that there are a lot of wonderful things happening in the City of Romulus starting Saturday, June 21<sup>st</sup> with the re-opening of Elmer Johnson Park and the ribbon cutting will take place at 11:00 a.m. On Thursday, June 26<sup>th</sup> will be the fireworks show which will take place at dusk and will be set off at the same location as last year which can be seen from Elmer Johnson Park or the Romulus Middle School. Also there will be the Sounds in Downtown every other Friday night with the next one being on June 27<sup>th</sup> from 7 p.m. until 9 p.m. so make sure and come out and enjoy the wide variety of music. And finally the city-wide free dumping starts on June 23<sup>rd</sup> and runs through June 28<sup>th</sup> from 9 a.m. until 3 p.m. for Romulus residents only at the Department of Public Works building.
- Mr. Paul questioned whether there is a list of items that they will and will not accept.
- Mr. McCraight answered that there is a flyer as well as notifications on the website and facebook page stating what is permissible and what is not permissible.
- Ms. Maise mentioned that the Farmer's Market starts this Wednesday as well from 11:00 a.m. until 4 p.m. and is located the driveway between City Hall and the 34<sup>th</sup> District Court.
- Ms. Roscoe reported that the Recreation Program is starting back up with a variety of activities for both children and adults. Activities include such things as Summer Recreation Day Program, Cheer America, Youth Craft Classes, Softball, Kids Pee Wee Soccer, Golf and Volleyball and to contact Julie in the Mayor's office to make reservations or if you have any questions.
- Mr. Prybyla stated that the Romulus Rotary in conjunction with the City of Romulus are in the process of rebuilding the BBQ at Elmer Johnson Park.
- Ms. Roscoe noted that Lee Steel as well as the Romulus Rotary are the sponsor's for the fireworks this year as well.

## 13. Communications

- Ms. Freitag welcomed Mr. McCraight and his wife Kendra back to the City of Romulus.
- Mr. McCraight thanked Ms. Freitag and stated that it will make it a lot easier to attend these types of meetings.

## 14. Adjournment

Motion by Zilka supported by McAnally to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, McAnally, Lambert, Roscoe, Prybyla, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

lm

---

Daniel McAnally, Secretary  
City of Romulus Planning Commission