

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2012**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Freitag at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call Showing: Daniel McAnally, Melvin Zilka, Leroy Burcroff, Michael Glotfelty, David Paul and Diane Banks Lambert, Byron Butler and Cathy Freitag.  
Excused: Michael Prybyla  
Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner, Linda McNeil, Sr. Secretary
3. Motion by Zilka supported by Burcroff to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Burcroff, McAnally, Butler, Paul, Glotfelty, Lambert 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, December 19, 2011.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
6. New Business
  - A. PC-2012-001; Pritula & Sons Warehouse/Storage Facility, 28445 Beverly Road, requesting site plan approval to construct an 11,800- square foot storage building located on the south side of Beverly Road between Middlebelt and Inkster Roads. Parcel # 82-80-003-99-0041-702. (Action Required: Review site plan)
7. Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission
  - A. PC-2010-006/007; Five Bay Auto Service (35350 Goddard) – Revised Lighting Plan
8. Reports
  - A. Chairperson
  - B. City Planner
    1. Michigan Medical Marihuana (MMA)

2. Status of Pending Planning Commission Cases
  
9. Reports on Interest Designation
  
10. Communications
  - A. Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Romulus Board of Zoning Appeals held on December 7, 2011.
  
11. Adjournment
  
12. Motion by Paul supported by McAnally to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, December 19, 2011. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Paul, Glotfelty, Zilka, Burcroff, Lambert and Freitag. Nays – none. Abstain – Butler. Motion carried.
  
13. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items – None.
  
14. New Business:
  - A. PC-2012-001; Pritula & Sons Warehouse/Storage Facility, 28445 Beverly Road, requesting site plan approval to construct an 11,800- square foot storage building located on the south side of Beverly Road between Middlebelt and Inkster Roads. Parcel # 82-80-003-99-0041-702. (Action Required: Review site plan.)

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

- Matt Diffin, Diffin Development Consultants, came forward representing the petitioner.
- Ms. Maise gave a brief summary and stated that this was a previously approved site plan for the Honey Bee facility in 2009. She went on to say that the building was never built and that the Planning Commission approved an extension that expired in April of 2011. Ms. Maise noted that Mr. Pritula will have a different tenant when the building is complete and that while the plans are the same, the only change is that the parcel has been split and the back piece has been combined with the parcel next to it.
- Mr. Diffin gave a brief overview of the project and stated it's an 11,800-square foot building with a small strip of concrete being added in front, parking spaces striped in the back and a small swale that will drain into the existing system. He went on to say that he has no tenant at this time, but is hoping to get it built and then leased out.
- Ms. Freitag wanted clarification as to whether this was a speculative storage building.
- Mr. Diffin answered yes.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned whether it was going to be used for equipment repair.
- Mr. Diffin answered that it could be.

- Mr. Glotfelty questioned whether there would be on-site fuel storage or a sediment retention basin for power washing equipment.
- Mr. Diffin answered that he would assume that any tenant that required that type of equipment would have it installed after the fact. He went on to say that would be handled through the Certificate of Occupancy process, and as far as he was aware, there would be no on-site fuel storage and they really wouldn't know that until they have a prospective tenant.
- Mr. Paul questioned whether it was a new water system.
- Mr. Diffin answered no, that there is an existing system on the west side the feeds the hydrants and that they are proposing a new main on the east side with a new hydrant on the end.
- Mr. Paul asked if they are putting a new main in.
- Mr. Diffin answered yes.
- Mr. Paul stated that the new main is not indicated on the drawings.
- Mr. Diffin answered that it's on the utility drawing.
- Mr. Paul questioned whether Mr. Diffin received the letter from the Department of Public Works in reference to the easements for that system.
- Mr. Diffin answered yes, and that they are more than happy to provide the easements for the existing system and the required easements for the new system all the way to the rear of the property so if that rear parcel is ever developed, the water can be extended even further. He noted that some of the easements may have been previously provided.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the fence at the rear of the existing greenhouse will be moved.
- Mr. Diffin answered yes.
- Ms. Freitag also questioned whether the pile of asphalt near the fence was going to be moved in order to move the fence.
- Mr. Diffin answered yes, that the entire area would be cleaned up and that currently the fence does not run parallel to the property line.
- Mr. McAnally brought to Mr. Diffin's attention that the plans indicate "Beverly" Road and that may need to be corrected.
- Mr. Diffin indicated he will correct the plans.
- Ms. Lambert commented to Mr. Pritula that he is a great community partner and that she is always happy when he brings his projects forward to the Planning Commission and she went on to say that she hopes he gets it rented quickly.
- Ms. Maise reviewed the recommendations in the Summary Report in regards to the Planning Commission's motion and further recommended adding a condition in regards to future uses, specifically that any uses that require approval per Article 11, would be submitted for such review.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether Mr. Diffin had any additional questions in regards to the future use condition.
- Mr. Diffin answered no, that he had read the Ordinance.

Motion by Lambert supported by Burcroff to approve the site plan for PC-2012-001 Pritula & Sons Warehouse and Storage Building at 28445 Beverly Road subject to the Planning Commission finding that:

1. The existing greenbelt and parking lot landscaping meets the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is found acceptable as proposed subject to any dead or dying plant material being replaced; and
2. The irrigation for the rear portion of the property can be waived subject to a site compliance bond of \$5,000 for 1 year as noted on the Landscape Plan. If it is determined after the 1 year period that the landscaping is not in a healthy condition, this waiver will be reconsidered by the Planning Commission.

The site plan approval is also subject to the submittal of eleven (11) copies of a revised site plan for administrative review addressing the following:

1. The parcel ID numbers of the subject site and surrounding parcel and all associated notes on all sheets must be updated.
2. The note on Sheet 3 and title block referencing the tenant as a bee facility must be updated.
3. Parking calculations for the new storage building must be noted as described above.
4. A note must be added to the site plan stating that any needed repairs or resurfacing of the existing pavement will be determined by the Building and Safety Director.
5. All references to the 2000 Fire Code must be updated on Sheet 3.
6. A note must be added to the Landscape Plan stating that any dead or dying plant material will be replaced.
7. Note #2 to the left on the Landscape Plan must be corrected since a waiver to the irrigation requirement is proposed.
8. The dedication of 33 feet of the Beverly Road frontage for right-of-way to the City.
9. If any future uses require approval per Article 11 of the City of Romulus Zoning Ordinance, the applicant shall come back to the Planning Commission for further approval. This must be noted on the site plan.

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

7. Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission –

A. PC-2010-006/007; Five Bay Auto Service (35350 Goddard) – Revised Lighting Plan

- Ms. Maise gave a brief overview of the communications that have taken place in regards to the lighting for the Five Bay Auto. She indicated that she was basically looking for some input from the Planning Commission regarding the fixtures that have been installed on the front and sides of the building. She went on to say that the petitioner is

here this evening so that the Planning Commission can ask him what his intentions are and direct any questions to him directly.

- Ms. Freitag questioned Ms. Maise as to whether or not there is a revised site plan that they are being asked to approve this evening.
- Ms. Maise answered no.
- Mr. Burcroff stated that due to the Planning Commission By-Laws, he is going to abstain from discussion or on any action taken on this project due to the fact that his family owns property near this project. He asked to be excused for the remainder of the meeting in order to stay consistent with past practice.
- Ms. Freitag commented that she saw no problem with Mr. Burcroff being excused at this point.
- Mr. Butler asked to be excused for the same reason.
- Ms. Freitag indicated that Mr. Butler was also excused.
- Mr. Paul commented that the lighting system was changed and questioned whether the petitioner had checked with the City of Romulus first to see if the different lighting was approved.
- Mr. Bazzi answered yes.
- Mr. Paul questioned who he had spoken to at the City of Romulus.
- Mr. Bazzi answered that Marco from Area Construction had spoken to Ms. Maise. He also stated that the electrician had approached him and indicated that the current lighting was a more efficient lighting. Mr. Bazzi expressed to Marco that the City of Romulus would not approve it. Mr. Bazzi went on to say that the lighting on the back wall was installed and approved, and that they misunderstood Ms. Maise in thinking that that particular lighting was approved for the entire building, so then Mr. Bazzi told the electrician to replace them with the correct ones and soon thereafter received the letter from the Planning Department.
- Ms. Maise answered that at the time she was asked to review the lights, only the north side was up, while none of the goosenecks had been installed. She went on to say that the fixture that is up is actually nicer than the one that was originally approved for the north side and that was a very easy administrative change. Since the intent was met.
- Mr. Paul stated he likes the lights better than the others also.
- Ms. Maise went on to say that Marco had indicated that he needed something on city letterhead, and the letter dated December 9<sup>th</sup> states the north side only. When Ms. Maise followed up with Marco, she specifically asked whether the goosenecks were going up on the other three sides and Marco did confirm that yes, the goosenecks are going up.
- Mr. Bazzi stated that is when the misunderstanding took place.
- Ms. Maise stated that Moe may have spoken to someone else but that it was not her.
- Mr. Paul stated that the lights were on today when he did the site visit and that he likes them better than the goosenecks.
- Mr. Bazzi stated that they are more efficient, last longer and light the parking lot better. When he spoke to Marco, he told him that Ms. Maise approved them but he did not know she only approved the one side.

- Ms. Freitag stated that Ms. Maise approved the north/back side only.
- Ms. Maise stated that the north side were the only lights up at the time she reviewed them and that she made it very clear they were approved for the north side only and that she did not have the authority to make those changes to the approved goosenecks.
- Ms. Freitag stated that if she recalls correctly, that on both occasions when they reviewed the site plan, the Planning Commission spent quite a bit of time on the lighting plan. She went on to say that she thought the goosenecks were a little more expensive.
- Mr. Bazzi answered that the price was the same.
- Ms. Freitag stated that at the time the contractor indicated it was a cost issue and when we asked Mr. Bazzi, he indicated there was not a cost issue and that if the goosenecks were what we wanted, then that was what they would do, and that is what the Commission approved on the site plan.
- Mr. Bazzi stated that is correct and that if the Planning Commission wants him to replace them with the goosenecks, that is what he will do.
- Ms. Lambert stated that she has seen the lights and they are very attractive. It may not be what we approved but they are very attractive. She noted that we do not want to set precedence where applicants are going outside their approved plans, but Mr. Bazzi does not own the building and he is not the contractor. The contractor put the lights up, and in this instance, they are a very attractive addition to the building and she would be in favor of letting them stay as they are.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the Planning Commission has to have a revised site plan to approve them, and went on to say, as Ms. Lambert said, we do not want to set a precedence.
- Ms. Maise stated that the changes to the back lights were so similar that it was handled administratively, but something like this is a little bit bigger and she asked how the Planning Commission has handled something like this in the past. She explained that typically the applicant comes in and makes application in writing and pays the review fee and we go through the process. This applicant has come in a little more informally and she is not sure how the Planning Commission has handled site plan revisions like this.
- Ms. Freitag stated that we have never had in issue like this before. The other ones have had more extensive changes and have had to resubmit new site plans.
- Ms. Maise stated this isn't a change, but the Planning Department will need supporting documentation to reflect whatever motion you may make this evening for our files.
- Ms. Freitag stated the lights are beautiful, but she is concerned that someone else could modify their building and then to come before us after the fact.
- Ms. Maise questioned Mr. Bazzi what his timing was as far as looking for an inspection and C of O.
- Mr. Bazzi answered a couple weeks.
- Ms. Maise stated that there are some landscaping issues that need to be addressed, but if the Planning Commission did want Mr. Bazzi to resubmit that may hold him up from being able to open.

- Ms. Lambert questioned whether the Planning Commission could, in this particular incidence only, use the documentation provided which includes specifications on the lighting, as a matter of record and approve the revised lighting. She went on to say this would allow Mr. Bazzi to not have to pay any further review fees and is not held up from opening his new business.
- Mr. Maise stated that she takes direction from the Planning Commission, so that is an option.
- Ms. Freitag stated she has no problem with that whatsoever. She just does not want to have someone come to Planning Commission later and do something just the opposite of what was approved and not necessarily make it nicer or prettier.
- Mr. Bazzi stated he is just here because of the misunderstanding.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the Planning Commission could approve the revised lighting as a one-time exception because of the misunderstanding.
- Ms. Freitag stated the Planning Commission has the option to request an amended site plan without having to make the applicant do a revised site plan.
- Ms. Maise stated that it is an amendment to the site plan. There is no ordinance requirement that states specifically what kind of lighting it has to be, this is a subjective, discretionary item that went along with the Special Land Use and the Planning Commission can amend it however they find appropriate.
- Ms. Freitag stated her concern was to do it in such a way that it will not affect other applicants that come before them, thinking they can do something like that.
- Mr. Paul stated that he agrees with Ms. Freitag as long as they give the Planning Department and Building Department the amended site plan.
- Ms. Freitag stated that the Planning Commission can take a vote that this is a one-time special amendment to this particular site plan for these lights.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether everyone is in agreement to that.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he thinks it is a dangerous precedence and went on to say that Mr. Bazzi stated that the contractor was the one that made the error, but yet the contractor is not here this evening to discuss it. He stated that is a problem as far as he's concerned and that when the lighting for this project was discussed, because this was the entrance to our downtown area, we wanted a distinctive look to the building, and the lighting approved for this site plan made this a distinctive look, and that is one of things he pushed for and wanted. He also went on to say that if the Planning Commission wishes to make a motion and vote on it, then go for it but these are his feelings.
- Mr. Bazzi stated he would do whatever the Planning Commission wants him to do.
- Ms. Lambert stated that with all due respect to Mr. McAnally, she understands what he is saying but, that is by far the nicest building on that corner even without gooseneck lights.
- Ms. Freitag stated that numerous people have asked if that building was going to be a Denny's.

Motion by Lambert supported by Zilka to make an amendment to the site plan for PC-2010-006/007 Five Bay Auto for the light fixture modification to the front and sides of the building per the City Planner's letters dated December 9, 2011 and January 9, 2012 as a one-time exception that is not to set precedence. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Lambert, Zilka, Paul, Glotfelty and Freitag. Nays – McAnally. Motion Carried.

## 8. Reports

### A. Chairperson

- Ms. Freitag wished everyone a Happy New Year and stated that based on the Development Activity report submitted by the City Planner it looks like it just may be a very good year for the City of Romulus in regards to the Planning and Building Departments.
- Ms. Maise stated to keep in mind these are just the items in the hopper at this time. She went on to say that every day the Planning Department is getting more inquiries and it is a very exciting time right now.
- Mr. Zilka questioned what the status was with the Subway at Wayne and Wahrman.
- Ms. Maise answered that they were finishing up the addition for final inspection.
- Mr. Zilka questioned also the status of McLane Foodservice on Wahrman.
- Ms. Maise answered that they are good to go as far as the Planning Department is concerned.

### B. City Planner

- Ms. Maise stated that she will continue to give the Planning Commission a copy of the Development Activity Report as she thinks they may find that very informative. She went on to say that in the next few months they will be cleaning up some of the ordinance amendments that were looked at 3 or 4 years ago. She also noted that they may want to do some more City initiated rezonings once they take another look at the Master Plan.
- Ms. Freitag questioned what the status is on the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act.
- Ms. Maise answered that the draft is in and that she and Mr. Keyes have taken a look at it and Mr. Keyes wants to pull the subcommittee together on it before bringing it to the Planning Commission.

## 9. Reports of Interest Designation

## 10. Communications - None

11. Adjournment– Motion by Lambert supported by Zilka to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Lambert, Zilka, Glotfelty, Paul, McAnally and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

lm



Daniel McAnally, Secretary  
City of Romulus Planning Commission