ROSEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING

MANAGER'S CONFERENCE ROOM
29777 GRATIOT AVENUE
ROSEVILLE, MI 48066
(586) 445-5440

MONDAY, JULY 2, 2007
6:45 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:	Chairman	Otto Wilhelm
	Commissioners	Kurmmell Knox Joseph Montgomery Robert Neibel Nancy Sunderman-Elert Robert Splane John Surhigh Geraldine White
ABSENT:		Frank Maisano (excused)
OTHERS PRESENT:		Benjamin Tallerico, Planning Consultant Jolynn Friedmann, Recording Secretary

Chairman Otto Wilhelm called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

Chairman Otto Wilhelm explained to the Commission that he received an e-mail from Commissioner Frank Maisano stating that his father-in-law passed away so he will not be in attendance this evening.

I. ROLL CALL (SEE FACE PAGE)

COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE moved, COMMISSIONER ROBERT SPLANE seconded to excuse absent Commissioners Kurmmell Knox, Frank Maisano and Robert Neibel.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Commissioners Kurmmell Knox and Robert Neibel arrived to the meeting at 6:51 p.m.

II. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY-NOT TO INCLUDE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS.

No one from the public wished to be heard.

III. OLD BUSINESS

- **SITE PLAN REVIEW-** J.C. Cornillie Fuel Oil, PP# 14-09-227-003 as to Lot #14, 15 & 16 located on Cornillie Street West of Little Mack, Gary Kwapis of Heins & Kwapis Architects, P.C. for J.C. Cornillie Fuel Oil, petitioner.

Brian Wilson, Community Planning and Management, 43260 Garfield and George Lampson appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico reviewed the site plan and gave the following review to the Commission referencing the City of Roseville Zoning Code of Ordinances:

- It should be noted that the applicant indicated at the public hearing that they were going to be purchasing the property. Should this transaction take place, a lot split will most likely need to occur upon the property being divided into separate parcels. This review does not focus on the details of the lot split as we do not possess adequate legal descriptions to make necessary determinations; However, we note that the existing building on the lot that fronts Little Mack appears to meet setback preliminarily requirements for the I-1 Zoning District should the lots be split. This would result in the frontage for parcel being located off of Cornillie Drive. This review is based upon that premise.

Per Article 18, Schedule of Regulations, limiting height, bulk, density and area by zoning district, the following regulations apply with the building being oriented to Cornillie Drive as opposed to Little Mack:

- The applicant does not meet the building height requirements as proposed and may be required to request a variance.
- The Ordinance does not specify a setback from Cornillie Drive. The applicant has placed two (2) measurements on the plan: one (1) existing building which is measured from the property line or right-of-way at a distance of 15 ´ and the other which is the proposed office building is measured from the centerline of Cornillie Drive at 105.43 ´. We are unsure as to why the applicant chose to measure setbacks from two (2) different points of reference.
- The development must have 17 parking spaces initially and add another 37 to be held in reserve. Overall 54 spaces are required. The applicant indicates that 20 as opposed to the

former 33 are provided and 35 as opposed to the former 102 are banked, totaling 55 as opposed the former 135. The 55 spaces meet the Ordinance requirements.

- Mr. Tallerico questions the applicant's net usable floor area of 11,090 square feet in that while the gross area has increased from 58,340 to 48,940 and the building area has increased from 63,786 to 64,386, the proposed net usable area remains the same. Ordinance requirements per the definition of Floor Area, Nonresidential (for the purpose of computing parking) specifically states that "for all industrial and research uses, "usable floor area" shall include the floor area that is used for, or intended to be used for the storage or processing of merchandise." Recalculation of this figure may have impacts on required parking, but further information and explanation is needed from the applicant to determine their interpretation of useable floor area.

Article 20 addresses off-street parking, parking layout and unloading standards.

- Although the applicant has provided a drawing at a scale of 1" = 30´ as opposed to the original 1" = 50´, it does not appear that some of the dimensions have been made any clearer. As an example, parking spaces are required to meet Ordinance standards of 9´ in width by 19´ in length. The parking spaces shown on the June 14, 2007 submittal vary in their sizes.
- In accordance with Article 22, off-street parking areas shall be screened and landscaping provided. Landscaping needs to be provided in these areas.
- The petitioner has provided a "loading dock" area on the west side of the building to the west of the office which is located within the front yard. This is prohibited per Section 2003(4) which states that loading space is permitted in the rear yard only.

Per Section 2003, Off-Street Loading and Unloading: All spaces shall be laid out in the dimensions of at least 10 ´ by 80´ by 80 ´ with a clearance of at least 14´ in height. Each dock looks to be 10´ in width by 70´ in length. The two "docks" comprise an area of approximately 2,400 square ´, 50 ´ less than the previous plan had indicated. Elevations have not been provided to determine height requirements, but the applicant has indicated 8 foot chain link fencing and gates with an evergreen hedge for screening purposes. Per Section 2003, Off-Street Loading and Unloading, (6) loading, unloading spaces shall be effectively screened from view from any public street.

- Access to a loading space shall be provided directly from a public street and shall be arranged so as to provide sufficient off-street maneuvering space as well as adequate ingress to and egress from a street or service drive. The applicant has located the loading docks off of Cornillie Drive; however, they are located a mere 50´ from the property line which does not provide sufficient off-street maneuvering space.
- The area required for loading and unloading shall be physically separated from the off-street parking requirements and shall be laid out so that when in use, the loading and unloading area will not disrupt or diminish access to any off-street parking space or their corresponding vehicle maneuvering lanes or service drives. The applicant's current loading and unloading location do not meet this requirement.
- Loading and unloading spaces shall be effectively screened from view from any public street. The applicant has not addressed the screening requirements to screen the space from Cornillie Drive.
- Subparagraph 9 states that all loading and unloading operations shall be conducted in the rear yard. The applicant has not met this provision.

Section 2206 addresses Landscape Planting Standards. The following regulations apply under Section 2207:

- The applicant has not provided information regarding a schedule of planting.
- Clear corner vision requirements (per Section 2307) must be adhered to and dimensioned on

the plan near street or driveway intersections. This has been indicated on the plan.

- The type of groundcover to be used has been identified as a hydroseed mixture by the applicant.
- All open ground areas on the site shall be provided with coverage of grass, ground cover, shrubs or other approved landscaping material. The applicant has not indicated hydroseed as the type of landscaping material. The applicant has not indicated hydroseed as the type of landscaping coverage.
- Trees should be a minimum thickness of at least two inches. The trees proposed meet Ordinance requirements and mulching methods have been identified.
- Irrigation has been mentioned in the General Notes section.
- Notations regarding the care and maintenance have been provided along with a statement indicating that plant materials meet current American Association of Nurserymen standards.
- The planning plan is now the same scale as the site plan, a minimum of 1" = 30´.
- Existing and proposed contours have been depicted not to exceed two foot intervals.
- Existing tree cover has not been provided, as the applicant states that the current site has no tree coverage.
- Cost estimates should be submitted as part of the site plan review package and were not included.

Section 2305 addresses exterior site lighting. The applicant has not provided any information in regards to the lighting with the exception of 250 watt lights on the building at a height of which appears to be approximately 22´. This exceeds the 12-foot height limitations of Ordinance (Section 2305(4) (c).

The applicant has not submitted any signage information but has noted that they will be submitted at a later date and be in compliance with the Roseville Sign Ordinance, Chapter 264 in the Roseville Code of Ordinances, as amended.

Mr. Tallerico summarized the following items the petitioner will need to address in the site plan as indicated in the specific sections above:

- ❖ Acknowledgement of the applicant's intent to purchase the property was made at the public hearing. This may result in the need for a lot split which has not been thoroughly reviewed within this document.
- ❖ Note that the review is now premised on the development fronting Cornillie Drive as opposed to Little Mack.
- ❖ The proposed building(s) does/do not meet Ordinance maximum height requirements. Revise building or appeal for approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- ❖ The applicant needs to provide the correct front yard setbacks (property/right-of-way vs. centerline of Cornillie).
- ❖ The applicant proposed 80 fewer parking spaces but still meets Ordinance requirements.
- ❖ Parking dimensions are not uniform on the plan.
- ❖ Parking may need recalculation. Refer to earlier note regarding useable floor area.
- ❖ Confirm that enough handicapped spaces are provided per State rules and regulations.
- ❖ Maneuvering lanes are also difficult to determine due to the scale and legibility of the plan. Correct dimensions must be provided.
- ❖ Drainage patterns are not provided.
- ❖ "Provide elevations for the loading dock area" provide sufficient off-street maneuvering space (as it appears now, trucks will be required to utilize Cornillie to maneuver into the loading dock area, which is prohibited by Ordinance).
- ❖ Note that loading space is permitted only in the rear yard and is required to be separated from off-street parking. The plan indicates that the current location is in the front yard and is not separated from off-street parking potentially limiting access.
- ❖ Loading and unloading areas must be screened from any public street.
- ❖ A schedule of planting needs to be provided.

- Storm water retention or detention needs to be made part of the landscaping features.
- Cost estimates for landscaping should be submitted.
- Lighting plans need to be submitted.
- Building lights exceed the Ordinance height limits of 12´.
- Signage information has been addressed, but not submitted.

Mr. Tallerico stated that the two major issues with this site plan are with the loading dock and the height of the building.

Brian Wilson stated that the petitioner does have a drainage plan in place and has met with the City's consulting engineering firm regarding this issue.

Chairperson Otto Wilhelm stated that when this plan comes back before the Commission a Computer Aided Drawing (CAD) of the site plan will be required for review by the Commission; a hand drawing is unacceptable for the final site plan review.

Mr. Tallerico stated that the petitioner will need to justify the usable floor area when they reappear before the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Wilhelm explained to the Commission that they may make a recommendation to approve or deny the height variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals and referenced Article 18, Schedule of Regulations in the Zoning Code of Ordinances.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery commented that he is unclear as to the usable floor area and asked Mr. Tallerico if a variance is needed for the plan to meet the parking requirement; Mr. Tallerico stated that a variance is not needed, but the usable floor area must be justified by the petitioner.

COMMISSIONER JOSEPH MONTGOMERY moved, COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX seconded to deny the site plan review for J.C. Cornillie Fuel Oil, PP# 14-09-227-003 as to Lot #14, 15 & 16 located on Cornillie Street West of Little Mack for the following reasons:

a. Per Article 18, Schedule of Regulations, the maximum height of the structure exceeds the Zoning Code of Ordinances by 20´.
b. The "loading dock" area has been presented on the west side of the building, to the west of the office which is located within the front yard; this is prohibited per Section 2003(4) of the Zoning Code of Ordinances which states that loading space is permitted in the rear yard only.

The Planning Commission hereby recommends to the Zoning Board of Appeals that the height variance be granted.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

IV. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER ROBERT NEIBEL moved, COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE seconded that the agenda having been acted upon, the meeting is hereby adjourned at 7:15 p.m.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,
RAE A. OLDAUGH, City Clerk

PLEASE NOTE: A cassette tape of this meeting is on file
with the Clerk's Office for further information.