

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ROMULUS PLANNING
COMMISSION HELD ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2012**

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, Dave Paul,
Michael Prybyla, Melvin Zilka and Cathy Freitag
Excused: Leroy Burcroff
Absent: Byron Butler
Also in attendance: Carol Maise, City Planner & Linda McNeil, Sr. Secretary
3. Motion by Zilka supported by Prybyla to approve the agenda as presented. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Zilka, Prybyla, Glotfelty, Lambert, McAnally, Paul 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, October 15, 2012.
5. Comments from Public on Non Agenda Items
6. Public Hearings
 - A. PC-2012-022/023; DTE/Mich Con Fueling Station, requesting SLU/SPR approval for a compressed natural gas fueling station located on a 15.43+- acre parcel on the west side of Inkster Road between Beverly and VanBorn Roads. The subject property is located at 5980 Inkster Road. Parcel # 82-80-001-99-0001-700. Zoning: M-T; Industrial Transportation District. (Action required: Hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council on special land use and take action on site plan.)
 - B. PC-2012-031; City of Romulus – Cogswell/Ecorse Area Rezoning, a request to consider a proposed amendment to the Zoning Map for the City of Romulus to rezone three parcels of property zoned M-1, Light Industrial and portions of three parcels of property zoned both M-1 and M-2, to M-2 General Industrial District. The properties proposed for rezoning include 6 parcels as follows: 80-024-99-0001-702, 80-24-99-0001-703, 80-024-99-0001-704, 80-024-99-0004-701, 80-024-99-0004-702, & 80-024-99-0004-703. (Action required: Hold a public hearing and make recommendation to City Council.)
7. Old Business
8. New Business
 - A. PC-2012-029; Romulus Dollar General, requesting site plan approval for a 9,100 sq. ft. Dollar General retail store located on a 1.25+- acre parcel on the south side of VanBorn

between Wayne and Fourth Streets. The subject property is located at 35201 VanBorn. Parcel # 82-80-014-99-0009-200. Zoning: C-1 Local Business District. (Action required: Take action on site plan.)

- B. PC-2012-030; Reefer Peterbilt Building Expansion, requesting site plan approval for a 7,760-sq. ft. building addition and 44,537-sq. ft. pavement improvement located on a 2.47+- acre parcels on the west side of Brandt between Middlebelt and Merriman Roads. The subject property is located at 6924 Brandt. Parcel #'s 82-80-007-02-0008-000 and 82-80-007-002-0007-000. Zoning: M-1 Light Industrial District. (Action required: Take action on site plan.)

9. Cases Involving Advice or Input from the Planning Commission

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

B. City Planner

1. Planning Department Status Report

11. Reports on Interest Designation

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

4. Motion by Prybyla supported by Paul to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on Monday, October 15, 2012. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Prybyla, Paul, McAnally, Zilka, Glotfelty, Lambert and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion carried.

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

6. Public Hearings

A. PC-2012-022/023; DTE/Mich Con Fueling Station, requesting SLU/SPR approval for a compressed natural gas fueling station located on a 15.43+- acre parcel on the west side of Inkster Road between Beverly and VanBorn Roads. The subject property is located at 5980 Inkster Road. Parcel # 82-80-001-99-0001-700. Zoning: M-T; Industrial Transportation District. (Action required: Hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council on special land use and take action on site plan.)

- Steven Sorensen, Engineer, PEA, Inc., gave a brief overview of the DTE/MichCon project. Waste Management is partnering with DTE/MichCon so they are able to fuel their vehicles with compressed natural gas versus petroleum gas to save money. The project will be developed in two phases. Phase one being the development of the fueling stations at the rear of the site where the trucks will be fueled on a nightly basis. Phase two of the project will be the fast fuel portion of the project which will be located at the front of the property. The fast fuel option will have

two pumps available for other individuals who may be interested in getting into using the CNG or for others who have already converted to the CNG to use as a fueling station. He finished by saying that he has been involved with the development of seven or eight of these CNG fueling stations and that Mr. Roy Baker would be able to answer any further questions with regards to the operations of these facilities.

- Mr. Roy Baker, Architect, NSA, stated that there are approximately fifteen (15) CNG fueling stations in the State of Michigan and he has been involved in the development of thirteen of these facilities, which are very environmentally friendly. He went on to explain that over 400,000 vehicles in the United States run on compressed natural gas. The Honda Civic is available right off the lot that is 100% converted to natural gas with a range of 250 miles with the cost of the compressed natural gas being approximately \$2.65 per gallon. There are a lot more of these facilities in California, Texas and Oklahoma, but the closest one in this area is located at the Meijer's in Taylor, and another one that is located in the Ann Arbor Saline area. There has been some interest shown around the airport for fleet use. He finished by saying that one of the many benefits is that the product is a home-grown fuel source and is more environmentally friendly with regards to fuel emissions than gasoline or diesel fuel.
- Ms. Maise stated that there are essentially two separate projects being proposed. One being the site plan approval for the development of the fueling stations at the rear of the Waste Management property for private use by Waste Management for the fueling of their vehicles. The second being the special land use approval for the development of the fast fuel station that will be for public use. She went on to reference her report and explain that, with regards to the site plan, items one through five are all waivers. The first three are waivers to the front setback, canopy and berm requirements due to this being an existing site. The two remaining waivers are for the new driveways that are being proposed to accommodate the new fueling station and to keep it separate from the rest of the facility. The petitioner is working with our engineer who has endorsed the proposed driveway which is subject to approval from Wayne County. She noted that conditions six and seven are both pertaining to fencing and the use of barbed wire. The Planning Commission has the authority with regards to the use of the barbed wire, but the Board of Zoning Appeals has the authority with regards to the variance for the placement of the fencing in the front yard. The remaining conditions with regards to the site plan approval are all minor in nature. With regards to the special land use approval she is recommending that Planning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the special land use of the public access fueling station component conditioned upon road improvements required by Wayne County and site plan approval with all the conditions that go along with it.

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

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting up for comments from the public. No one came forward.

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

- Mr. Paul questioned how the Waste Management vehicles are being fueled currently.
- Mr. Sorensen answered that the petroleum and diesel pumps that are currently fueling the Waste Management vehicles will be removed once the full conversion to compressed natural gas is complete. Jersey barriers will separate the area where the slow fill is being completed and the process will take up to six to eight hours.

- Mr. Baker stated that it is like trickle charging a battery.
- Mr. Paul questioned how long a slow fill takes compared to a regular petroleum fill.
- Mr. Baker answered that a slow fill takes approximately six to eight hours as opposed to a petroleum fill that takes approximately five to ten minutes.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned whether the public would have access to this slow fill yard.
- Mr. Sorensen answered that the entire slow fill area will be fenced off and will only be accessible through a gate.
- Mr. McAnally questioned the need for the barbed wire fencing.
- Mr. Sorensen answered that the barbed wire will match the existing fencing and will separate the public portion from the Waste Management portion of the site.
- Ms. Lambert questioned where the new barbed wire fencing that requires a variance would be located in relation to the entrance to the facility.
- Mr. Sorensen showed on the map where the new fencing will be located and stated that the area will close off the fast fuel portion of the property from the rest of the property.
- Mr. Baker stated that the compressor enclosure area will have decorative wrought iron fencing which would not include barbed wire.
- Ms. Lambert stated that she is not crazy about the barbed wire and is going to have to be convinced that there is a need for it.
- Ms. Maise stated that the barbed wire should be screened as much as possible, but with the barbed wire being so close to the driveway, she is not sure how much of the barbed wire will be visible. The applicant will have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance and will also have to show practical difficulty. She finished by saying that the question is, does it need to be barbed wire for the portion of the fence in the front.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether barbed wire is really needed in that area.
- Mr. Baker stated that they are simply matching what is existing. He finished by saying that if the Planning Commission has an issue with the barbed wire and it is a deal breaker than the barbed wire can go away.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether the purpose of the barbed wire fencing is to keep people from entering the site.
- Mr. Baker stated that someone thought the barbed wire was a good idea thirty years ago and now it still remains. He finished by saying that it does not mean it's a good idea today.
- Mr. Sorensen questioned whether the variance would still be required if the fencing was not barbed wire.
- Ms. Maise answered that the variance would still be required due to it being located in the front yard. She went on to say that it would be easier to argue the practical difficulty due to the fact that you are trying to separate the two uses for security purposes, but that the concern is the barbed wire.
- Ms. Lambert stated that the barbed wire is not a deal breaker for her but she would welcome comments from her fellow commissioners.
- Mr. McAnally stated that this is not a maximum security prison and that he does not feel the need for barbed wire has been proven.
- Ms. Freitag stated that if the purpose is simply to match the existing then why doesn't the petitioner remove what is there.
- Mr. Baker stated that the petitioner is not looking to remove the existing.
- Mr. Freitag stated that the Planning Commission is not asking for the petitioner to do that.
- Mr. McAnally stated that he would prefer not to see the barbed wire used.

- Mr. Prybyla stated that he has no objection to the barbed wire.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he has no objection to the barbed wire. He finished by saying that it is an industrial application for security purposes and that he would like to have it for his personal business.
- Ms. Freitag stated that the barbed wire is not a deal breaker for her but she does not prefer the look of it.
- Mr. Zilka stated that the Planning Commission may not be aware of whether Waste Management has had any issues over the years and that he has no objection to the barbed wire.
- Ms. Maise stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals is great at mitigating situations like this. She went on to say that with a closer look at it, during the variance review, additional landscaping may be required.
- Ms. Lambert stated that the intent is not for the petitioner to have to spend more money due to the barbed wire.
- Ms. Maise stated she will take a better look at it during the variance review and additional screening may be required.
- Ms. Freitag stated that it looks like most of the expense incurred for this project will be for the development of the public area due to the Wayne County requirements.
- Mr. Sorensen stated that he is currently working with Wayne County as to what all the requirements will be. He finished by saying that yes, the public area will be the most costly portion of the project.

Motion by McAnally supported by Glotfelty to recommend approval of the Special Land Use request PC-2012-022, DTE-MichCon Compressed Natural Gas Fuel Station, at 5980 Inkster to the City Council upon the finding that the site as designed, is consistent with the Master Plan, compatible with adjacent land uses, has a minimal impact on the environment, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, is compatible with public services, and has a minimal impact on traffic subject to:

1. Road improvements as required by Wayne County and
2. Site plan review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

Motion by Lambert supported by Zilka to approve the site plan for PC-2012-023, DTE-MichCon Compressed Natural Gas Fueling Station, conditioned upon the following:

1. A waiver to *Section 11.07(b)(2)* to allow a front setback of 54 feet instead of 60 feet for the fuel station and to allow the existing 5-foot side setback to continue where 15 feet is required.
2. A waiver to *Section 11.07(b)(3)* to allow the canopy to be set back 54 feet from the property line where 60 feet is required.
3. A waiver to *Section 13.02(c)* to allow the existing berm and trees supplemented with new evergreen trees to fulfill the greenbelt requirements.
4. A waiver to *Section 14.06(c)* to allow 3 driveways where 2 driveways are permitted based on the amount of street frontage.
5. A waiver to *Section 14.06(e)* to allow the spacing between the driveways to be 216.12 feet where 350 feet is required.

6. A variance to allow a fence in the front yard setback must be granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
7. Use of barbed wire for the new fencing shall be determined by the Zoning Board of Appeals.
8. Inkster Road will be widened and improved in accordance with the requirements of Wayne County.
9. Signs, logos and paint scheme to be considered part of the maximum wall sign permitted and can be reviewed and approved administratively.
10. Administrative review and approval of a revised lighting plan if canopy lighting is desired.
11. Submittal of eleven (11) copies of the revised cover sheet with corrected waiver and variance references.

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

B. PC-2012-031; City of Romulus – Cogswell/Ecorse Area Rezoning, a request to consider a proposed amendment to the Zoning Map for the City of Romulus to rezone three parcels of property zoned M-1, Light Industrial and portions of three parcels of property zoned both M-1 and M-2, to M-2 General Industrial District. The properties proposed for rezoning include 6 parcels as follows: 80-024-99-0001-702, 80-24-99-0001-703, 80-024-99-0001-704, 80-024-99-0004-701, 80-024-99-0004-702, & 80-024-99-0004-703. (Action required: Hold a public hearing and make recommendation to City Council.)

- Ms. Maise stated this is a City initiated rezoning of six parcels that are privately owned and that the owner is in concurrence with the proposal. The property was developed by Liberty Properties with two industrial buildings initially, with plans for a third building. When looking at the reoccupancy of the northernmost building, 6505 Cogswell, it was discovered that there is split zoning on the property, some M-1 and some M-2. Two other properties in that area also have both zoning designates. So after comparing the Master Plan Map to the Zoning Map it was decided that this was a good time to get this area cleaned up, again with the concurrence of the property owner. The whole area is planned for M-2 General Industrial, but over the years, with some divisions and property sales, there are jagged zoning. The City does not like split zoned properties, especially those with buildings on them that could be reoccupied, since you have uses that are permitted in one district that are not permitted in another. She went on explain the difference between the allowed uses between the M-1 Light industrial District and the M-2 General Industrial District and the biggest difference is the outside storage. The current uses do fit very nicely into the M-2 District, and also work in the M-I District, but bases on their large size they do require special land use approval. She finished by giving a brief summary of her report regarding the criteria and stated that her recommendation is, if the Planning Commission is in agreement with her report, to recommend to City Council to rezone portions of these six parcels of property.
- Ms. Freitag questioned whether there is a proposed tenant.
- Mr. Peter Rogers, CBRE, stated that A-123 is occupying the building off Ecorse Road and there are two tenants occupying the building located at 6505 Cogswell.

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

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting up for comments from the public.

- Ms. Kennard questioned who would be occupying the properties that are being rezoned.
- Ms. Maise answered that A-123 occupies the building that fronts Ecorse Road and Dawn Foods and Medline occupy the building located at 6505 Cogswell.
- Ms. Kennard questioned whether the rezoning of the proposed parcels will have any effect on the adjoining properties with regards to increasing taxes.
- Ms. Maise stated that there are plans for an additional building that will be similar to the existing buildings and that will certainly generate additional tax revenue. She finished by saying that there is no proposed tenant for that building as of yet.
- Ms. Kennard questioned whether the construction of the proposed building would have a direct impact on increasing taxes to the residents.
- Ms. Maise answered that it would not increase taxes to the residents, but that it would increase the city's tax base.

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

- Mr. Paul stated that when the three little factories were there, it was originally zoned M-1. Now that the new warehouses are there they have blended and fit in quite well and he stated that he is in agreement with the rezoning.

Motion by Paul supported by Prybyla to recommend to the City Council, approval to rezone parcels #80 024 99 0004 701, #80 024 99 0004 702, and #80 024 99 0004 703 from M-1, Light Industrial District to M-2, General Industrial District and portions of parcels #80 024 99 0001 702, #80 024 99 0001 703, and #80 024 99 0001 704, from M-1, Light Industrial District to M-2, General Industrial District. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Paul, Prybyla, McAnally, Zilka, Glotfelty, Lambert & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

7. Old Business – None.

8. New Business

- A. PC-2012-029; Romulus Dollar General, requesting site plan approval for a 9,100 sq. ft. Dollar General retail store located on a 1.25+- acre parcel on the south side of VanBorn between Wayne and Fourth Streets. The subject property is located at 35201 VanBorn. Parcel # 82-80-014-99-0009-200. Zoning: C-1 Local Business District. (Action required: Take action on site plan.)
- Brian Gillespie, Hurley & Stewart LLC., stated that the petitioner is proposing to build a 9,100 square foot Dollar General on VanBorn between Washington and Biddle Streets. He noted that it is a simple run of the mill plan with basic parking and a truck turn around and loading area.
 - Ms. Maise stated that the proposed Dollar General is a standard retail building that is permitted in the C-1 District. It is unique in the fact that it has three front yards which will provide for some very nice landscaping on the street frontages. The rear yard, although it has some existing vegetation, will also include the installation of a vinyl fence along with some additional evergreens. A waiver is required with regards to the spacing for the driveways, but Wayne County is ok with the locations of those driveways. There are also two other aspects that need

Planning Commission approval which is the approval of the dumpster in the front yard and the use of vinyl fencing along the rear yard as opposed to a masonry wall. She finished by saying that the vinyl fence will be supplemented with additional vegetation and that the remainder of the recommendations are just minor site plan changes.

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting up to questions from the commissioners.

- Mr. Paul stated that there are no details on the site plan with regards to the storm sewer treatment plant.
- Mr. Gillespie noted that he was told that he would not need the detailed engineering sheets for this meeting and that he would have them available during the engineering review.
- Ms. Maise replied that Mr. Gillespie was told to pull some of the detailed engineering sheets because they were so detailed that it would overwhelm the Planning Commission. She finished by saying that both Roberto and Marcus from OHM are ok with the storm sewer.
- Mr. Paul questioned what type of treatment is being utilized.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that it is a half moon shaped chamber that is lined with stone that complies with Wayne County's regulations.
- Mr. Paul asked if it filters through the sand and takes the water out.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that it is a slow release process and will probably never get used.
- Mr. Paul questioned how the existing concrete wall will be incorporated in with the proposed vinyl fence and landscaping.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that the vinyl fence will pick up where the existing concrete wall leaves off and both will be covered with extensive landscaping.
- Mr. Paul questioned how far the vinyl fencing will extend.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that the vinyl fence will extend the entire length of the rear property line starting at the west end of the existing concrete wall.
- Mr. Paul stated that his concern is whether the concrete wall, vinyl fence and landscaping will hide the rear wall of the proposed building from the homeowners.
- Mr. Gillespie answered yes that the \$50,000 landscaping plan should accomplish that.
- Ms. Maise stated that even though this development did not require special land use, due to the proximity to the homeowners, we did notify and invite them to attend the meeting this evening.
- Ms. Lambert questioned Mr. Gillespie as to the definition of brick veneer and EFIS and whether he had a sample of the product with him this evening.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that the exterior would be 75% brick.
- Ms. Maise stated that this plan is much simpler than previous plans and does indicate the use brick.
- Mr. Lambert stated that on page four of the planner's report it states the exterior will be primarily brick veneer.
- Ms. Maise stated that a veneer is fine, that is what is currently be used at the Dollar General on Wayne Road.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that they will not be utilizing vinyl siding but actual brick. He gave the Planning Commissioner's a sample of the brick and stated that it was not the exact color that would be utilized.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the petitioner was proposing a vinyl or wooden fence, as the plans state they would be proposing a wooden fence.

- Mr. Gillespie answered that the plans have since been updated to include a solid white six-foot high vinyl fence.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated he is familiar with, and has installed storm sewer treatments like the one being proposed, but would like to have seen the detailed drawings.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that the revised plans that will be submitted after this meeting will include the detailed drawings of the storm sewer treatment.
- Mr. Glotfelty questioned who will be responsible for pumping it out.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that he believes the storm sewer treatment is an easement to Wayne County and believes Wayne County would be responsible for pumping it out.
- Mr. Paul stated that Wayne County will not clean the storm sewer system and that it would be the owner's responsibility. He finished by questioning whether the petitioner intends to tie into the existing sanitary sewer that is on the site currently.
- Mr. Gillespie answered yes.
- Mr. Anton Chastang, 5871 Biddle, questioned whether there would be easements onto Biddle and Washington or just VanBorn.
- Ms. Maise answered that the access would only be from VanBorn Road. The driveway for this site is wider than normal due to the truck traffic with regards to loading and unloading. She finished by saying that they did not want traffic flowing into the residential areas.
- Mr. Chastang stated that he does not understand how the six-foot vinyl fence will benefit as a barrier between the residential and commercial development.
- Ms. Maise stated that the six foot vinyl fence will be supplemented with plantings.
- Mr. Gillespie showed Mr. Chastang on the plans where the supplemental plantings are located. He continued by saying that from Mr. Chastang's view more than likely all he will be able to see is the white fence. He finished by saying that they may be able to do some additional landscaping if Mr. Chastang would like.
- Mr. Chastang questioned what the plans are for the big tree that is located on the proposed site.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that it will be requested that the fence be located around the existing tree as they do not want to disturb the roots of such a large tree. Some trimming will be done to the tree for the construction of the proposed building but Mr. Chastang will not be able to notice the trimming from his property.
- Mr. Chastang questioned the need for another dollar store in our community.
- Ms. Maise stated that due to the distance between the proposed store and the existing store on Wayne Road a traffic study was not required. The zoning of the site makes this a permitted use and had it been located next door to an existing dollar store, the Planning Commission would have the ability to request a market study.
- Mr. Chastang questioned whether there would be another opportunity for public comment on this project.
- Ms. Maise stated that due to this being a permitted use that the ability to make any comments are out of courtesy based on the proximity of the proposed development to the adjacent homeowners. Any comments made tonight are appreciated and also that the applicant is willing to work with the adjacent homeowners. She finished by saying that the ARC Committee felt that with the combination of the vinyl fence and the supplemental landscaping they are recommending that Planning Commission approve the site plan.
- Mr. Chastang stated that he appreciates the courtesy but is very concerned with the encroachment onto the residential properties.

- Ms. Maise questioned whether Mr. Chastang knew that the property next to him was zoned commercial.
- Mr. Chastang answered that he was aware of that.
- Ms. Maise stated that the applicant has upgraded the site and there's a greater setback required and an extensive buffer along with the entire back of the building being brick to protect the residents.
- Mr. Chastang questioned whether similar trees would be the buffer around the corner.
- Ms. Maise answered yes.
- Mr. Chastang asked Mr. Gillespie to explain the landscape plan to him one more time so that he is clear on the plan.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that the landscape plan includes pine like trees, vinyl fencing, two inch caliper like trees mixed with pine like trees and other additional landscaping. They will be cleaning up a lot of the overgrowth of existing vegetation also.
- Mr. Chastang questioned where the vinyl fence would be located in relation to his existing fence.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that the fence would extend the entire length of the rear property connecting to the existing block wall.
- Mr. Chastang questioned what the distance will be between his existing fence and the proposed vinyl fence.
- Mr. Chastang answered that they will more than likely try to keep proposed fence as close to the property line as possible due to the large trees at the rear of the proposed site. He finished by saying that the contractor will not want to disturb the roots of such a large tree and may opt to locate the fence around the existing trees.
- Mr. Chastang questioned what the typical impact is on the residents when you build a store of this nature with regards to traffic and residential value.
- Ms. Maise answered that due to the fact that this project does not require special land use and the fact that they have met all the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission does not legally have the ability to deny this project. The impact is that the petitioner is taking a piece of property with an old abandoned building on it and upgrading it with a new retail facility, which will bring in additional tax dollars. She finished by saying that with the unique features being the three frontages, the petitioner is doing an extensive amount of landscaping and utilizing upgraded material on all four sides of the building.
- Mr. McAnally questioned the purpose of the gate that is located at the rear south side of the property.
- Mr. Gillespie answered that the gate is existing and is not located on the petitioners' property.
- Mr. McAnally stated that Ms. Maise is correct. When a property is zoned commercial and the project is a permitted use in that district, and meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission does not have the ability to vote no on a project.
- Ms. Freitag stated that she would hope that Dollar General would be a good neighbor for the adjoining properties.
- Mr. Gillespie stated that this is a completely different developer than the one that developed the Dollar General located on Wayne Road.

Motion by McAnally supported by Paul to approve the site plan for PC-2012-029 Romulus Dollar General at 35201 Van Born approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A waiver to the spacing requirements of *Section 14.06(b)* per *Section 14.06(j)* based the recommendation of the City Engineer and endorsement from Wayne County.
2. Approval of the dumpster in the front yard since the site has frontage on three (3) streets.
3. Approval of a vinyl fence in lieu of a wall or berm between the site and the property to the south.
4. No outdoor sales, display or storage including cart storage will be permitted on the sidewalks in front or along the side of the building. If vending machines or similar items are desired, a variance from the BZA will be required.
5. The submittal of eleven (11) sets of a revised site plan addressing the following:
 - a. Proposed setback dimensions must be noted on the site plan.
 - b. Reference to the driveway spacing waiver request must be noted on the site plan.
 - c. Additional information must be provided for administrative review of the location and screening of roof-top HVAC equipment by the Building and Safety Director.
 - d. A note must be added to the waste receptacle enclosure detail on Sheet C-5 stating that the face brick will match that of the building.
 - e. Manufacturer's specification sheets (cut sheets) of the proposed light fixtures must be copied onto the lighting plan and must meet the requirements of *Section 13.06(d)*.
 - f. Consistency between the lighting plan and the building elevation with regard to lighting on the west elevation must be provided.
 - g. Additional information, including construction materials, on the proposed canopy on the front of the building must be submitted.
 - h. Minor revisions to the landscape plan must be made as noted above.
 - i. The reference to "Broadway" on Sheet C-1 must be corrected.

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

- B. PC-2012-030; Reefer Peterbilt Building Expansion, requesting site plan approval for a 7,760-sq. ft. building addition and 44,537-sq. ft. pavement improvement located on a 2.47+- acre parcels on the west side of Brandt between Middlebelt and Merriman Roads. The subject property is located at 6924 Brandt. Parcel #'s 82-80-007-02-0008-000 and 82-80-007-002-0007-000. Zoning: M-1 Light Industrial District. (Action required: Take action on site plan.)
- Ms. Maise stated that this project is unique due the use variance aspect and explained that although Reefer Peterbilt has been operating from this site for many years, the use is not a permitted use in the district. Reefer Peterbilt received a use variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals in 2011, however when there are any changes to the property, such as the proposed pavement expansion and building addition, the Ordinance requires that the Board of Zoning Appeals get involved since the use variance needs to be amended. Site plan approval is also required and any other changes go back to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

- Mr. Steve Sorensen, Engineer, PEA Inc., stated that when Reefer Peterbilt received the use variance last year that were looking to just get in and make some pavement improvements fairly quickly and pursue site plan approval for the building addition at a later date. As the plans for the building addition have developed they realized that they needed to be a little bit deeper to accommodate the trucks being worked on in the bays, which would account for the increase in size. The other issue is the curbing and because of the large trucks the city likes the taller one-foot curb. Due to the site being so flat and having drainage issues the petitioner is able to accommodate that request and has chosen to redesign the site so that they can accommodate that request along with the petitioners' grading plan. In the process of accommodating these issues an additional issue arose that requires a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. The petitioner has been in business here in Romulus a long time but requires additional space to operate their business. The back lot is gravel and is in bad shape, does not drain well and does not have catch basins. He finished by saying that the petitioner wants to improve the lot and continue to do business here in Romulus.

Chairperson Freitag opened the meeting up to questions from the commissioners.

- Mr. Glotfelty questioned whether the petitioner would be doing any power washing or whether they would be putting in a retention basin to catch any sand or grease from the vehicles.
- Mr. Sorensen stated that it does appear as though the architect has indicated on the plans that there will be trench drains located at each of the doors, but does not indicate anything with regards to sediment. If those areas are draining to the storm drain, there is an above ground detention pond and a mechanical treatment for sedimentation.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that he was looking for more detail on the sedimentation treatment system.
- Mr. Sorensen stated that the treatment system will be sized to treat the full flow and will meet both Wayne County's and Ordinance requirements.
- Mr. Glotfelty stated that typically in an industrial situation they use a system that has a grease trap that also catches the sand. He finished by questioning whether there would be any fuel storage on site.
- Mr. Sorensen answered that they will be servicing vehicles on site but is not aware of whether or not there will be any fuel stored on site. He finished by apologizing for not having the answer but will check with the petitioner and report back.
- Mr. Paul questioned the need and the location of the two six-inch sanitary sewer leads that are located right directly in front of the bay doors where trucks will going in and out.
- Mr. Sorensen answered that he believes that the two floor drains will connect to the sanitary sewer not the storm sewer.
- Mr. Paul stated that there needs to some kind of trap there to prevent the sanitary sewer from filling up with grease and sand.
- Mr. Sorensen stated that Mr. Paul has a very valid point that he will make sure that is addressed when the revised plans are submitted.
- Ms. Maise stated that these concerns can be made part of the conditions of approval so that they are addressed in the engineering review.
- Mr. McAnally questioned if the PIPP report would be required or not.
- Ms. Maise answered that she has spoken with the Fire Chief with regards to the PIPP report and he has indicated that in some cases it is under the State's authority and in other cases he requires it. She finished by saying that is why she defers to the Fire Chief with regards to it being a condition of approval.

- Mr. McAnally stated that he wants to clarify if the Fire Chief does require the PIPP report, the Planning Commission then in fact has included it as a condition of approval.
- Ms. Maise noted that it is a condition of the Ordinance unless the Fire Chief states that another authority has already required the PIPP report.
- Mr. Zilka questioned whether the petitioner would be willing to install a new fence along the south side of the property due to the disrepair of the existing fence.
- Mr. Sorensen replied that the plans indicate that the petitioner does intend to install new fencing, from the building to the southwest corner of basin, as opposed to repairing the existing.

Motion by Lambert supported by Glotfelty to approve the site plan for PC-2012-030; Reefer Peterbilt Building Expansion at 6924 Brandt be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A waiver to *Section 17.12(b)* to allow a berm and evergreen plantings to screen the truck and trailer storage in the front yard and a waiver to the screening requirement along the side and rear lots lines since the adjacent property is industrial.
2. A waiver to the curbing requirement of *Section 14.02(b)(2)* for the parking lot south of the driveway.
3. An amendment to the use variance from the BZA to allow a 7,770 –square foot building addition; to allow more than 27 trucks and trailers to be stored outdoors; and to change the hours of operations from 7am - 6 pm to 7am – 11pm, Monday through Friday and 8am – 12pm on Saturdays.
4. A PIPP Plan shall be required during engineering review if determined necessary by the Fire Chief.
5. Any additional repairs to the existing fencing beyond that shown on the site plan will be determined by the Building Department prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
6. Two (2) additional Cleveland select pears to be added to the north side of the driveway instead of the row of shrubs.
7. A lot combination is required prior to issuance of a building permit.
8. Grease traps for sedimentation for both Sanitary and Storm Sewers shall be reviewed and approved administratively.
9. Any outdoor fuel storage shall be reviewed and approved administratively.

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

- C. 2013 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Dates. (Action required: Review dates and make a motion.)

Motion by Zilka supported by Prybyla to approve the 2013 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Dates as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Zilka, Prybyla, Glotfelty, Lambert, McAnally, Paul & Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

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

10. Reports

A. Chairperson

- Ms. Freitag wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and reminded everyone to be safe and thankful for all their blessings.

B. City Planner

- Ms. Maise stated that the activity in the Planning Department continues to grow. As of right now there will probably be a Planning Commission meeting in December as we have had several applicants that plan on resubmitting to be on the agenda. She noted that the moratorium on Medical Marijuana will expire in December and a six month extension will be brought before City Council at their upcoming meeting. While Special Council was initially used, we are shifting over to Kevin Watts, who is very up to date and has attended several seminars with regards to the medical marijuana. There is so much litigation going on currently that it would not be in anyone's best interest to write an ordinance when it will likely change.
- Ms. Freitag stated that one of the dispensaries that made a presentation to the Planning Commission has since has some problems with regards to illegal activity.

11. Reports of Interest Designation

- Mr. Zilka stated that the farmers have all gotten their crops up. He also wanted to congratulate Mr. Keyes and the City of Romulus for receiving the E-Cities award for the third year in a row. He finished by saying that he believes it is in large part to the City working with the applicants with regards to the requirements.
- Ms. Freitag stated that the criteria, in order to receive the award, is very strict.
- Mr. Zilka stated that everyone at the city should be commended for a job well done. He finished by saying that he drives by Lee Steel everyday and finds it hard to believe that we were lucky enough to get a facility like that in our city.
- Ms. Freitag stated that it is the only facility like that in the country.
- Ms. Maise noted that the approval of the Cogswell rezoning will allow for the reoccupancy of a very significant tenant. The Lear 1 building is also reoccupied and we are currently working with them with regards to some issues. She finished by saying that she has a meeting tomorrow with an applicant on Ecorse Road that has occupied an existing building for twenty years that is looking to make some improvements.

12. Communications - None

13. Adjournment

Motion by McAnally supported by Prybyla to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – McAnally, Prybyla, Glotfelty, Lambert, Zilka, Paul, and Freitag. Nays – None. Motion Carried.

lm



Daniel McAnally, Secretary
City of Romulus Planning Commission

