

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 2012**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chandler at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call Showing: Melvin Zilka, Donald Morris, Emery Long, Julie Allison and Sheldon Chandler  
Excused: Kenneth Mientkiewicz  
  
Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner, Linda McNeil, Sr. Secretary
3. Motion by Zilka supported by Allison to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Allison, Morris, Long & Chandler. 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 meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals held on April 4, 2012.
5. Petitions
  - A. BZA-2012-004; Lee Steel, requesting two (2) variances:
    1. Building Material Variance. A variance to Section 13.01(f) is requested to allow the use of ribbed metal siding for the construction of a 199,785-square foot industrial building for Lee Steel. The ordinance requires that industrial buildings contain at least 50% brick, face brick, cast stone or C-brick on elevations facing a street; split face block or tilt-up panels may be substituted for the masonry required if greenbelt landscaping is increased by 50%. A variance is necessary for the elevations facing I-275.
    2. Building Appearance Variance. A variance to Section 13.01(i)(2) is requested to allow the construction of a building with elevations that are not broken up with varying building lines, vertical architectural features, windows, architectural accents or trees. The ordinance requires that such features be provided on building walls that are over 100 feet long. The subject property is located on Eureka Road. DP#82-80-116-99-0001-704.

6. Old Business

- A. BZA-2012-001; Bright Star Sign on behalf of America's Best Value Inn, requesting a variance to *Sec. 29-7* to allow a 100-square foot electronic reader board (ERB) changeable message sign; a 30-square foot electronic reader board part of a permitted sign structure is permitted. A variance of 70 square feet is requested. The applicant is also requesting a variance to allow a full color electronic reader board of red, green and blue; the ordinance limits ERB signs to one of the following colors: red, orange, or yellow. Since the existing sign is nonconforming in terms of height and area, a variance in accordance with *Section 29-8.2.c.* is also needed to replace a nonconforming sign with another nonconforming sign. The subject property is located at 7600 Merriman Rd. DP# 82-80-037-99-0027-707. (This item was tabled by the BZA on April 4, 2012).
- B. BZA-2008-004; Special Tree requesting an amendment to the use variance granted on September 3, 2008 to amend the wording on the motion to include the reference to "adult foster care group home".
- C. Board of Zoning Appeals Rules of Procedure – currently under review by the City Attorney

7. New Business

8. Communications

9. Discussion

10. Adjournment

- 4. Motion by Long supported by Morris to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals held on April 4, 2012. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Long, Morris, Zilka, Chandler. Nays – None. Abstain – Allison. Motion Carried.

5. Petitions

- A. BZA-2012-004; Lee Steel, requesting two (2) variances:

- 1. Building Material Variance. A variance to Section 13.01(f) is requested to allow the use of ribbed metal siding for the construction of a 199,785-square foot industrial building for Lee Steel. The ordinance requires that industrial buildings contain at least 50% brick, face brick, cast stone or C-brick on elevations facing a street; split face block or tilt-up panels may be substituted for the masonry required

if greenbelt landscaping is increased by 50%. A variance is necessary for the elevations facing I-275.

2. Building Appearance Variance. A variance to Section 13.01(i)(2) is requested to allow the construction of a building with elevations that are not broken up with varying building lines, vertical architectural features, windows, architectural accents or trees. The ordinance requires that such features be provided on building walls that are over 100 feet long. The subject property is located on Eureka Road. DP#82-80-116-99-0001-704.

Devan Anderson, Architect, Zack Taylor, Owner of Lee Steel and Tom Taylor came forward representing the petitioner.

- Devin Anderson explained that the petitioner is requesting to use an alternative building material rather than the metal siding that was originally proposed. He provided to the board members the revised elevation drawings and colored renderings of the proposed building and office area showing the building material upgrades.
- Mr. Anderson went on to address the various difficulties and impediments that the petitioner had to deal with in regards to this particular site. He continued by explaining that due to all the challenges that this property is plagued with, the petitioner had no choice but to locate the proposed building in the current location in order to minimize the requirements, mitigate the wetlands, preserve the woodlands to the greatest extent possible and to serve the site with a rail spur. He finished by saying that the petitioner would have preferred only one elevation facing I-275 and they would liked to have set the proposed building back the entire 300 feet but after realizing all the impediments with regards to this property, the petitioner was forced push the building closer to I-275.
- Mr. Anderson continued by saying that if you look in the general area where this property is located, a large majority of the industrial properties are undeveloped due to the fact that they are completely covered in woodlands. He went on to say that when the petitioner was looking for available land, this site was one of the few that his program would fit on. He continued by saying that the petitioner chose this site due to the fact that he would not have to clear a large amount of trees. He continued by saying that when this property was currently being staked for wetlands, they found four previous attempts of staking which means four previous clients looked at and chose to pass from purchasing this property due to the wetland issues. He finished by saying that the previous owner of this parcel also owns the property to the south and is looking to divest it also as he is no longer able to make money off the buildings he owns in the area.
- Tom Taylor, Lee Steel, came forward and stated that he did a comprehensive evaluation of surrounding properties up and down the I-275 corridor and it was the petitioner's opinion that this property was the best fit for their needs. He went on to say that this was also the best option for preserving trees and use of land that was previously

cleared. He finished by saying that this site was the best of the 10 sites that they looked at that best fit their needs.

- Mr. Anderson clarified that the petitioner has been working directly with the City of Romulus Economic Development Director as well as the Wayne County Community Development Director with regards to locating a site. He continued by saying that the proposed site is thirty acres of which ten acres is wetlands, and although this was the less wooded of all the sites, it was still 50% wooded.
- Mr. Anderson stated that although the Planner's report states the petitioner's desire for visibility from the I-275 freeway, the owner's business has no need to be seen from I-275. He went on to say that the property was not purchased due to the visibility from I-275, it was purchased due to the proximity to the ramps in terms of ease of trucking. He continued by indicating that along the property lines adjoining the 275 corridor, they have retained the original woodlands in that area and intend to build a ten-foot high landscaped berm, that when matured, will not allow the building to be visible. He also stated that anyone traveling south on I-275 approaching the proposed site will not be able to see the building unless they look back once they are past the building, all while doing 75 MPH.
- Mr. Anderson stated that the Ordinance requires the proposed building to be 50% masonry or block. He continued by stating that that would be the bottom 21 feet of a 42-foot tall building and with the elevation of the building and the landscaped berm in front of the property line, the building will be even more difficult to see.
- Mr. Anderson continued by saying the nature of the petitioner's business is steel processing and that he wants the proposed building to reflect that. He continued by saying that the petitioner is not in the brick business. The owner processes large, heavy, thirty-ton roles of steel that on occasion cut loose and hit the exterior of the building. He went on to explain that when the steel coil hits the metal building, it will either blow through it or be restrained by the metal wall. Whereas, if you have a steel coil hit the masonry wall, it's going to blow through it and now you not only have the coil on the run but you have twenty feet of masonry coming down on the inside of the building. He finished by saying that the concrete panel is secured only at the top and bottom so that when the steel coil blows through the concrete panel, the panel is going to hang there and create an unsafe situation.
- Mr. Anderson went on to address the adjacent parcels that have commercial buildings that were built 25 years ago that were constructed to a cheap industrial standard that are almost entirely metal with little to no brick at all. He went on to say that his client has a strong interest in design and a history of design excellence. He went on to say that his client's headquarters, which he constructed, is featured as the cover story for CAM Magazine's May 2012 issue. He continued by saying that his headquarters was also constructed of the same materials and color palet that is being suggested for the proposed site on Eureka. Mr. Anderson went on to say that the adjacent neighbors are transportation uses and because of the close proximity to I-275, the airport and the rail spur, they make good neighbors for the petitioner's type of business and that is why this particular site was chosen. He once again stated that the petitioner has a strong interest in good design along with premium materials and wants to maintain that history with

the proposed site. He finished by saying that the petitioner is willing to work with the Zoning Board of Appeals, should their proposal fall short of what the Board is looking for, to come to a compromise rather than an outright denial. He closed by addressing the staff report with regards to fairness to the adjacent parcels and went on to say that cost does not enter the picture. He stated that the petitioner's main concern is the design and safety of the building. He closed by saying that the proposed site will not only uplift the neighborhood but will improve this section of Romulus in a very real and positive way and they would appreciate the Boards help in making that happen.

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

Chairman Chandler asked if anyone wished to speak on this matter. – No one came forward.

Mr. Chandler closed the public comments portion of the meeting and opened it up to comments from the Board members.

- Mr. Chandler stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals is willing to work with the petitioner to come up with a plan for an attractive building that works for both the petitioner and the City of Romulus.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether there are precautions to prevent a coil of steel from getting loose.
- Mr. Zach Taylor came forward and explained that each metal coil is in a wooden saddle and chained on each corner of the saddle. He went on to say that even with every precaution being taken there are occasions when a roll will let loose. He continued by saying that it is very rare and has not happened in years but it does happen. He went on explain the reasoning behind the preference for the metal panels versus masonry, one being that a hi-low may back into the masonry wall causing it to collapse. He finished by saying that the metal panels look just like concrete, possibly even better than concrete and represent a more modern look and feel and are safer.
- Mr. Zilka stated that the concrete panels would still be damaged if hit with a hi-low.
- Mr. Taylor answered yes, but that it would not collapse like masonry and hurt someone. He went on to say that all they would have to do is clip in a new panel.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the applicant required a site that had railway access.
- Mr. Taylor answered yes.
- Mr. Zilka questioned how many railcars would be coming in and out of the site per day or night.
- Mr. Taylor answered that he did not know the answer due to the fact that it would depend on the railroad's delivery schedule.
- Mr. Zilka stated that he did not know if Mr. Taylor was aware or not of the fact that there are many, many problems on Eureka Road due to the trains.
- Mr Taylor stated that the proposed site was designed with extra rail spurs on site so that all the switching will be done on site and will not obstruct Eureka Road.

- Mr. Zilka questioned how much noise would be created once the plant is up and running.
- Mr. Taylor answered that there will be no noise from the plant at all.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether anyone in the neighborhood will hear anything.
- Mr. Taylor answered that no hearing protection is required in the plant itself and went on to say that inner walls will have insulation for both energy efficiency and sound deadening. He finished by directing the board members to the Lee Steel website so they can see the other two Lee Steel facilities as far as maintenance and the pride they have in their buildings and business.
- Mr. Morris asked Mr. Taylor to explain the process by which they process the steel.
- Mr. Taylor again directed the board members to his website where there is a video showing the process. He then went on to explain that they take the coils of steel and slit them down to the various widths where they are then transported to the stamping industry. He then explained further that they are used in various ways such as auto parts, guard rails and filing cabinets.
- Mr. Morris questioned whether the steel was cut and what the process is for the cutting.
- Mr. Taylor answered that the steel is uncoiled and ran through rotary knives to the size the client requests and then is recoiled and shipped out.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether this is all done cold.
- Mr. Taylor answered yes and went on to say that no heat is required for the processing at all.
- Mr. Morris questioned whether this process creates any smell.
- Mr. Taylor answered that it creates no smell at all.
- Mr. Taylor stated that the new Eco Pickling system they will installing in the proposed building is eco friendly and only requires the use of water and little bit of steel grit and the only by product from this process is steam. He went on to say that they will then in turn use the steam produced from this process to heat the building which will make this a totally green operation.
- Mr. Morris again questioned what the noise level would be from outside the building.
- Mr. Taylor answered absolutely none. He went on to say that his company will provide the steel that will be used on the lower portion of the proposed building. He continued by saying that he would like to not only use the steel siding on just the lower back two sides of the building but on the entire lower portion of the building to make it consistent.
- Mr. Morris stated that the Board will have to follow the requirements of the Ordinance which require 50% block or brick. He went on to say that if the Board is going to grant a variance then they have to make sure they are doing the building the way they want it done. He continued by saying that he is not so sure that he is sold on the product provided this evening as being brick or block.
- Mr. Taylor questioned whether it is the look of the product that the Board is looking for.
- Mr. Morris answered not necessarily because that is not what the Ordinance states.

- Mr. Taylor questioned that if the building is 300 feet in, could he put steel all the way down.
- Mr. Morris stated that the Ordinance does not allow for the building standards to be ignored by someone who owns 80 acres to build whatever they want just because nobody will see it. He finished by saying that this will continue to be discussed.
- Mr. Chandler questioned Ms. Maise as to whether other alternative products were suggested.
- Ms. Maise answered that Mr. Keyes the Economic Development Director conveyed to her that the petitioner may be presenting to the Board this evening other alternative building products. She went on to say that she would also want input from the Building Director on the alternative products being proposed. She further stated that along with the upgrade from the ribbed panel siding, the Ordinance does also allow for upgrading to the landscaping as the landscape plan currently submitted is minimal in size and quantity. She went on to say that because the applicant has stated that visibility is not important to them, that gives the Board the ability to look at some alternatives in regards to the building materials and landscaping. She finished by saying that she just is not sure that they can reach a compromise this evening as the alternative materials have just been presented.
- Mr. Chandler stated that what the Board is looking for by granting the variance is an attractive looking building with spruced up decorative panels rather than a building that looks like the one south of the proposed site.
- Mr. Taylor stated that what is being proposed is the newest materials that were not available years ago. He went on to say that the steel panels being used on the lower portion of the building will look like tilt up panels and will give the building a cleaner, more modern look. He finished by saying the proposed office panels on the front of the building will look like brushed aluminum, the same as they used for their office in Novi that they have received awards for.
- Mr. Chandler stated that these alternative materials will still require a variance.
- Ms. Maise stated that they will also require variances for a wetland setback and a loading setback. She went on to say that they will be back before the Board next month so it would be appropriate to table this. That will give staff a chance to get more information in and review the proposed alternative materials.
- Mr. Chandler stated the petitioner has the right idea in upgrading the materials but maybe in the meantime they can come up with something a little better.
- Mr. Taylor stated that they are trying to work within the challenges of a site that previous developers have walked away from. He went on to say that in order to mitigate the wetland challenges of this site, he is under contract for 90 acres across the railroad tracks from the proposed site.
- Mr. Morris stated that the petitioner should not hold the City of Romulus responsible for that.
- Mr. Taylor stated that he been in contact with Mr. Keyes in regards to donating the 90 acres for a park. He went on to say that he, Mr. Keyes and King & McGregor (Mr. Taylor's wetlands consultant) are in negotiations to make that happen.

- Mr. Morris questioned whether the petitioner is willing to put the upgraded materials around the entire lower portion of the proposed building.
- Mr. Taylor stated yes, that he would be willing to put it around the entire lower portion of the building if the Board was willing to lower the requirement of twenty (20) feet to eight (8) or ten (10) feet.

Motion by Allison supported by Zilka to table BZA-2012-004 Lee Steel until the next meeting. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Allison, Zilka, Morris, Long & Chandler. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

## 6. Old Business

- A. BZA-2012-001; Bright Star Sign on behalf of America's Best Value Inn, requesting a variance to *Sec. 29-7* to allow a 100-square foot electronic reader board (ERB) changeable message sign; a 30-square foot electronic reader board part of a permitted sign structure is permitted. A variance of 70 square feet is requested. The applicant is also requesting a variance to allow a full color electronic reader board of red, green and blue; the ordinance limits ERB signs to one of the following colors: red, orange, or yellow. Since the existing sign is nonconforming in terms of height and area, a variance in accordance with *Section 29-8.2.c.* is also needed to replace a nonconforming sign with another nonconforming sign. The subject property is located at 7600 Merriman Rd. DP# 82-80-037-99-0027-707. (This item was tabled by the BZA on April 4, 2012).

Motion by Zilka supported by Morris to remove from the table BZA-2012-001 Bright Star Sign. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Morris, Long, Allison & Chandler. Nays: - None. Motion Carried.

Linda Kaiser, Bright Star Sign and Amer Kuza came forward representing the owner.

- Linda Kaiser directed the Board members to the pictures she provided in their packets and she gave a brief explanation of the reasons why lowering the sign would be a hardship. She stated that the trees obstruct the view of the sign when traveling south on Merriman Road. She went on to say that Clarion has a 4X9 LED sign that is well over the twenty feet. She continued by saying that America's Best has an existing changeable message board and needs the LED sign to display corporate logos in color. She went on to say that one color can be displayed per day but that they would like to display the corporate logos in color when needed. She continued by stating that they are willing to display amber alerts and city functions when needed. She finished by saying that the landscaping enhancements have already been started and will be completed soon.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether anything from the previous variance request has changed.



- Ms. Maise answered no, but they have provided additional supporting information to prove their case. She went on to say that previously they had not provided enough information to support the criteria of the ordinance. She finished by saying that the Board now has to decide if the information provided does meet that criteria.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether there was anything the Board could do to help the petitioner.
- Ms. Maise stated that unfortunately the Sign Ordinance does not allow for signs to get bigger and bigger the further you get from the proposed site. She went on to say that one of the pictures shows that not only can you not see the petitioner's sign, but that you cannot see the other signs also. She continued by stating that the petitioner is located in the middle of the block and does have challenges that some of the other hotels closer to the interchange do not have.
- Ms. Kaiser stated that changeable copy signs are hard to see but with the LED sign it will attract the eye and the customer will know that they are approaching the hotel so they can turn in at a speed that is safe for everyone. She finished by saying that the petitioner is reducing the size of the changeable copy sign from 64 square feet to 50 square feet.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the petitioner is considering removing some of the trees blocking the sign.
- Mr. Kuza answered that he only owns four of the trees heading from the airport going north and that all the other trees belong to the owner of the strip center.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether trimming some of the petitioners trees would help.
- Mr. Kuza answered that he would pretty much have to remove the trees because once you trimmed all of the tree that obstructs the sign you wouldn't have much tree left. He went on to say that he is doing a complete renovation of the landscaping and is painting the sign poles. He finished by saying that the hotel has been struggling financially for the last couple years and he hopes that the sign will make a difference.
- Mr. Chandler questioned Ms. Maise as to whether there was a suggestion to lower the sign.
- Ms. Maise answered that anytime you want to change a sign that is non-conforming, you want to try and bring it closer into compliance. She went on to say that lowering the sign would be an option but in this case it would make it worse for the petitioner.
- Ms. Kaiser stated again that the petitioner will be reducing the changeable message board from 64 square feet to 50 square feet. She finished by saying again that Clarion has a sign that is well over the 64 square feet, with no obstruction and they have a LED sign.
- Mr. Morris questioned Ms. Maise as to the size of the Clarion sign.
- Ms. Kaiser answered that the sign is approximately 4 X 9.
- Ms. Maise questioned whether the Board granted a variance for the Clarion sign.
- The Board in unison answered that they did.
- Ms. Kaiser again stated that the Clarion sign has no obstruction.
- Ms. Allison questioned Mr. Kuza as to what percentage of his customers are shuttled over from the airport versus pedestrian cars coming to his facility.

- Mr. Kuza answered that he would estimate it to be 50/50.
- Ms. Allison questioned whether signage was important to his business.
- Mr. Kuza answered yes. He went on to say that although he does get a percentage of business coming from the other direction down Merriman Road, being that he is the last hotel coming out of the airport, the signage is very important.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether the background color on the top portion of the America's Best sign was going to be changed to make it more visible.
- Mr. Kuza stated that decision is not up to him, that the franchise makes the decision as to what colors are used for the hotel signage.
- Mr. Morris questioned whether they were reducing the size of the changeable message board.
- Ms. Kaiser stated that the current sign is 64 square feet and the new sign will be 50 square feet.
- Ms. Maise answered yes. She went on to say that they are reducing the size from the existing sign which would bring them more in to compliance.
- Mr. Morris stated that in regards to the changeable sign, with the technology that is available today, the Sign Ordinance may be a little out of date and may need to be updated.
- Ms. Allison questioned whether the sign would obstruct any of the other local businesses signs.
- Ms. Kaiser reminded Ms. Allison that the proposed sign would be smaller than the existing sign.
- Mr. Kuza answered no, that it is not obstructing any other signs.
- Ms. Allison stated that that was her point, that it would not disturb any of the other businesses in the area.
- Mr. Chandler verified that the existing sign is non-conforming and that if the Board denies the variance request nothing is going to change.
- Ms. Maise answered yes and that the applicant is entitled to continue to use the sign as is.
- Mr. Chandler then questioned whether the only thing that would change is that the sign will become an electronic sign.
- Ms. Kaiser answered that the sign would also be smaller in size. She went on to say, that as you know, the City of Romulus has an electronic sign, and the color will catch the eye and allow the customer to slow down and turn in the hotel in a safe manner.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether the petitioner really felt that the electronic sign would make a difference in the business.
- Ms. Kasier stated yes, that it would help build the business.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether one color would be sufficient.
- Ms. Kasier stated that the petitioner wants the full color to be able to display corporate logos for the companies that book functions at the hotel. She finished by saying that the petitioner would certainly be willing to display the corporate logo in one color and the text in another color.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether each line of text could be changed individually.

- Ms. Kasier answered that the petitioner would have the ability to do pretty much whatever he wanted with this particular sign. She finished by giving the example that the text could be all green and the logo could be red, white, blue and orange.
- Ms. Maise questioned what direction the Board was going in as far as the color is concerned. She then went on to say that if the Board allows the use of one color only, that would be in compliance with the Ordinance. She finished by saying that if they were considering more than one color, then the sign would then not be in compliance with the Ordinance.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether the petitioner could do a single color one day and a different color on another day.
- Ms. Kaiser stated that the petitioner would be willing to do one color per day if the Board did not want multiple colors used in one day.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether the petitioner would be happy with just the color red.
- Mr. Kuza answered that he would like to have the flexibility to use multiple colors.
- Mr. Long questioned whether the sign that the petitioner was purchasing has the ability to be programmed to display multiple colors at a time.
- Ms. Kaiser answered that the petitioner has the option to purchase a sign that just displays one color at a time or a sign that displays multiple colors at a time.
- Mr. Long stated that regardless of the Board's decision the petitioner will more than likely purchase a multi-color sign.
- Ms. Kaiser answered that she is sure the petitioner will purchase a multi color sign due to the fact that times are changing.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether there are full color signs within the city already.
- Ms. Maise answered that she did not think so.
- Mr. Kuza stated that there are full color signs located in the downtown area.
- Mr. Chandler questioned whether the electronic signs owned by the City of Romulus are multi-colored.
- Mr. Kuza answered yes they are.
- Ms. Maise stated that the Sign Ordinance probably needs to be addressed by the Planning Commission. She went on to say that when the application first came in to the Building Department, the sign was thought to be a moveable sign due to all the graphics. She then went on to say that when the applicant applied for the variance, the sign was changed and that the issue is the graphics versus just wording.

Motion by Long supported by Allison to approve BZA-2012-001; Bright Star Sign to approve a variance to allow a 50 square foot electronic copy sign and to allow the use of one color at a time per day. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Long, Allison, Zilka, Morris & Chandler. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

- B. BZA-2008-004; Special Tree requesting an amendment to the use variance granted on September 3, 2008 to amend the wording on the motion to include the reference to “adult foster care group home”.

- Mr. Joseph Richert came forward representing Special Tree and gave a brief overview of his request for the amendment to the use variance motion. He started by saying that the original use variance was granted to allow expansion of the existing rehabilitation center and that the site plan was then approved by the Planning Commission. He continued by saying that when he applied to the State of Michigan for the Adult Foster Group Home License, the State of Michigan indicated that the approval was not specific enough. He went on to say that the State of Michigan requires that the variance specifically state that it allows for a 20-bed Adult Foster Care Large Group Home. He continued by explaining that you don't necessarily have to be licensed to be an assisted living facility but that his facility needs to be licensed because they want it to be supervised. He finished by saying that the facility is about 60 days from being completed and that if the Zoning Board of Appeals grants his request for the amendment to the original variance, he can continue on with the licensing process through the State of Michigan.
- Mr. Morris questioned whether granting the amendment to the variance request would adversely affect the City of Romulus in any way.
- Ms. Maise answered that the large group home facilities are not allowed in the single family district and that is why they came to the Zoning Board of Appeals to begin with.
- Mr. Morris stated to Mr. Richert that he has a very nice facility.
- Mr. Richert stated that the word large is the technical word that they use in the regulations. He went on to say that the one thing that protects the City of Romulus is limiting it to twenty beds.
- Mr. Chandler stated that some of the group homes are limited to six beds.
- Ms. Maise stated that those are the ones that are allowed in the single family district.

Motion by Zilka supported by Allison to amend the variance for BZA-2008-004 to amend the original variance to include 20-bed Adult Foster Care Large Group Home. Roll Call Vote – Ayes – Zilka, Allison, Morris, Long & Chandler. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

C. Board of Zoning Appeals Rules of Procedure – currently under review by the City Attorney

- Mr. Chandler questioned the status of the Zoning Board Rules of Procedure.
- Ms. Maise answered that after consulting with Kevin Watts in regards to when the approvals become valid she requested that Mr. Watts take a look at the whole document. She finished by saying that the Rules of Procedure will be back before the Zoning Board of Appeals next month.

7. New Business

- Mr. Chandler questioned the status of the ID cards.
- Ms. Maise stated that Mr. Chandler needed to contact Lois in the Human Resource Department to make an appointment.

8. Communications

- Ms. Maise stated that although no official applications have been received she has been in contact with the Lee Steel people and they will need two additional variances. She went on to tell the Board members to tentatively plan on having a June meeting.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether he heard the Lee Steel people correctly in saying that they would access their site by the west driveway.
- Ms. Maise answered that they will access their site by way of the east driveway. She went on to say that they will have an access easement that will loop around and they will also grant an access easement to the north side of the property. She finished by saying that the site plan is very close to being done and they should go to Planning Commission in May.
- Mr. Zilka stated that that particular site is a good place for them.

9. Discussion

10. Adjournment

Motion by Zilka supported by Long to adjourn at 8:25 p.m. Ayes – Zilka, Long, Morris & Chandler. Nays – None. Motion Carried.



---

Donald Morris, Secretary  
Zoning Board of Appeals